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**Monday, September 10, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00–09:30</td>
<td><strong>Registration of participants</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09:30–09:50   | **Opening Ceremony**  
*Opening Address*: Chan Kim, Administrator, Cultural Heritage Administration  
*Welcoming Address*: Bohn Choong Koo, Vice Governor, Chungcheongnam-do Province  
*Ryong-Woo Rhi*, Governor, Buyeo-gun County  
*Congratulatory Address*: Stefano De Caro, Director-General of ICCROM  
*Hae Un Rii*, President of ICOMOS-Korea                                                                 |
| 09:50–10:00   | **Photo Session**                                                                                                                            |
| 10:00–10:10   | **Break time**                                                                                                                             |
| 10:10–10:30   | **Session Chair: Jong-Sup Chong, ICOMOS-Korea / Seoul National University, Korea**  
**Conference Aims and Objectives:**  
Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation: Concepts and Actions  
Sohyun Park, ICOMOS-Korea / Seoul National University, Korea                                                                 |
| 10:30–11:00   | **Thematic Presentation 1: World Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development**  
*the Challenges Ahead*  
Giovanni Boccardi, UNESCO World Heritage Centre                                                                 |
| 11:00–11:30   | **Thematic Presentation 2: Norway: Finalizing a New, Holistic World Heritage Policy**  
Ingunn Kvisterøy, Ministry of the Environment, Norway                                                                 |
| 11:30–12:00   | **Thematic Presentation 3: Engaging Communities – Approaches to Capacity Building**  
Gamini Wijesuriya, ICCROM                                                                 |
| 12:00–12:30   | **Thematic Presentation 4: The Role and Involvement of Communities in the Sustainable Development of World Heritage Sites in East Asia**  
Beatrice Kaldun, UNESCO Beijing Office                                                                 |
| 12:30–14:00   | **Lunch**                                                                                                                                   |
| 14:00–14:30   | **Session Chair: Sang Hae Lee, ICOMOS-Korea / Sungkyunkwan University, Korea**  
**Case Study 1: Kathmandu Valley**  
*Kathmandu Valley World Heritage Property: Conservation and Community*  
Kai Weise, PAHAR / UNESCO Consultant, Nepal                                                                 |
| 14:30–15:00   | **Case Study 2: Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras**  
*The Role of the Ifugao Communities in the Conservation and Management of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras World Heritage Property*  
Joycelyn Mananghaya, UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines / Feati University, Philippines                                                                 |
| 15:00–15:30   | **Case Study 3: Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape**  
*Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape*  
Bounlap Keokangna, Vat Phou World Heritage Management Office, Lao PDR.                                                                 |
| 15:30–16:00   | **Case Study 4: Taj Mahal**  
*Challenges and Potentials for World Heritage Involving Communities Case Study: Taj Mahal, India*  
Navin Pipani, Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage, India                                                                 |
| 16:00–16:30   | **Break Time**                                                                                                                             |
| 16:30–18:00   | **Plenary Debate 1** (Moderator: Hyosang Jo, Cultural Heritage Administration, Korea)                                                      |
| 18:00–20:00   | **Welcome Dinner hosted by Cultural Heritage Administration**                                                                          |
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### Tuesday, September 11, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30–09:00</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Presentation 5: World Heritage: Benefits Beyond Borders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amreswar Galli, International Institute for the Inclusive Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00–09:30</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Presentation 6: World Heritage Conservation and the Role of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Local Communities - Focusing on Historic Villages and Cities</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilwon Han, ICOMOS-Korea / Hannam University, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30–09:45</td>
<td><strong>Break Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45–10:15</td>
<td><strong>Case Study 5: West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>West Lake Cultural Landscape: Stakeholders and World Heritage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaoqian Ruan, Monitoring and Management Center of Hangzhou West Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Cultural Heritage, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15–10:45</td>
<td><strong>Case Study 6: Historic Monuments of Ancient Kyoto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Involving Communities for Sustainable Structure and Efforts with regard</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*to the Revival of Traditional Cultures in Kyoto, the City of World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cultural Heritage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoshifumi Muneta, ICOMOS Japan / Kyoto Prefectural University, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45–11:15</td>
<td><strong>Case Study 7: Historic Villages of Korea: Hahoe and Yangdong</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Development of Residents' Self-conservation System for Yangdong Historic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Village - Progress in 2 Years after the Village was Inscribed on the</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>World Heritage List</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dongjin Kang, Kyungsung University, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15–11:30</td>
<td><strong>Break Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–13:00</td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong> <em>(Moderator: Giovanni Boccardi, UNESCO World Heritage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Centre)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Panel Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hae Un Rii, ICOMOS-Korea / Dongguk University, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hee-tae Kim, Jeollanam-do Province, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Im San Kang, The National Trust for Cultural Heritage, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyunghwan Kang, Cultural Heritage Administration, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Plenary Debate 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00–14:30</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30–16:00</td>
<td><strong>Field Visit to the Korea National University of Cultural Heritage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting of Conference Outcomes by Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00–16:30</td>
<td><strong>Break Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30–18:00</td>
<td><strong>Plenary Debate 3 (So hyun Park, ICOMOS-Korea / Seoul National University, Korea)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30–20:00</td>
<td><strong>Farewell Dinner hosted by ICOMOS-Korea</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wednesday, September 12, 2012

Field Visit (for invitations only)
02. Working Document

- Conference Aims and Objectives
- Thematic Presentation
- Case Study
Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation: Concepts and Actions
Sohyun Park, ICOMOS-Korea / Seoul National University, Korea
[Conference Aims and Objectives]

Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation: Concepts and Actions

Sohyun Park
ICOMOS-Korea / Seoul National University, Korea

Trends in the Discussion of World Heritage Conservation: What is Community Involvement and Why Do We Care for it?

For the past 40 years since the World Heritage Convention was declared in 1972, there have been numerous international efforts, which lead to the various changes in the heritage conservation and management. From individual monuments to historic urban landscapes, accommodating intangible values and everyday living heritages, the scope of heritage concepts has been expanded meaningfully and so has conservation measures. Beyond the conservation of physical heritage itself, we now came to value the quality of life of the local communities, who are related to that heritage.

The theme of the 40 Years Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention is, as expected, “World Heritage and Sustainable Development: the Role of Local Communities.” Previously, we tended to focus more on the conservation of physical heritage itself, and that is still relevant. These days, however, we reflect the ultimate goal of heritage conservation, and agree to pay more attentions to the people and community than before, who own, use, live in or with that heritage. Encouraging the community to initiate and participate in the heritage conservation would be what we mean by promoting community involvement. And, we recognize that sustainable development of and for the community would be the ultimate goal of heritage conservation. The 2012 Buyeo International Conference, too, shares this view, commemorating the 40th year anniversary of the World Heritage Convention.

The critical factor of heritage conservation and sustainable development is people, the local community, after all. There exist various stakeholders, who appreciate heritage, live in and around heritage, own heritage, and manage heritage. In order to conserve heritage, they are challenged by many threats of different kinds. The processes of consensus building and conflict resolution among various stakeholders are as important as the products of the conservation projects.

Before the 2012 Buyeo International Conference, of course, there have been a lot of discussions about the community involvement topic. In the results of the 35th World Heritage Committee, for example, the significance of the participation of the local community was again emphasized. The revised Operational Guidelines, too, encourages the management of world heritage through the participatory means. Especially, the cultural contexts and the traditional practices of heritage
conservation are highly recognized, as it is necessary to acknowledge the cultural characteristics of local communities and their various approaches to heritage conservation. With these backgrounds, the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea (CHA) and the ICOMOS-Korea have been preparing the 2012 Buyeo Conference for the past two years. During the 35th and 36th World Heritage Committees, two workshops were hosted by the Korean Delegations, in which the topic of how to implement community involvement in world heritage conservation, the actual goal of the Buyoe Conference was shared and discussed together. Along with these international efforts, the ICOMOS-Korea and CHA have been working on the preparation of the national principles for heritage conservation, which is tentatively named as the Korea Document. In it, desirable heritage conservation principles are to be provided, which include the issues of community involvement, too. Other recent activities, such as the Periodic Reporting in the Asia Pacific region, also promoted us to communicate more about relatively new approaches to heritage conservation, such as the community involvement. [Chart I]

As a part of the 40th Year Anniversary of World Heritage Convention, the 2012 Buyeo International Conference aims to illuminate both distinctiveness and commonness of community involvement in World Heritage Conservation of Asia, which might or might not be different from those of Europe, Americas, and Africa. For this purpose, we invited seven representative cases of World Heritage sites in Asia that share similar but different issues of community involvement in heritage conservation.

[Chart 1. The context of 2012 Buyeo International Conference in relation with international and domestic research projects and workshops]
Discussion of Community Involvement in Asia with 7 invited cases.

Community Involvement in heritage conservation responds to the regional and local characteristics of the political and socio-cultural contexts, as well as to the heritage characteristics themselves. Considering these contexts and the Criteria for World Heritage Inscription, seven representative cases of world cultural heritage in Asia were selected for invitation for the Buyeo International Conference. Those are the cases from Nepal, India, the Philippines, Laos, China, Japan, and Korea. [Chart 2.]

Each case addresses how local communities confront the challenges of heritage conservation and adapt to maintain world heritage values in their own local ways as well as in the expected international modes. We could share each case’s meaningful implications.

[Chart 2. Brief Summary of the Invited 7 Cases for 2012 Buyeo International Conference]

The key questions for the case descriptions are referred to the Appendix of this introduction note. They were provided to the speakers, when they were invited to write about the selected cases. [Appendix 1]

Expected Outcomes of 2012 Buyeo International Conference

The 2012 Buyeo International Conference expects its outcomes as follows, which have supplementary contents to the previous discussions of community involvement in world heritage conservation. First, certain characteristics of the selected Asian cases could be drawn for further discussions, which perhaps could be compared with those of the European, American, and African
cases. Second, while the selected cases focus on local contexts, certain common grounds of community dynamics and operations could be drawn through discussions among participating members of this conference. These issues would be discussed along with the balancing points between the local practices and the international principles. Third, and most importantly among others, a list of recommendations for institutionalizing the issues of community involvement in world heritage conservation would be drawn, which, hopefully in the long run, could be referred to the revision of the current Operational Guidelines. The recommendations would be grouped into three steps, such as the preparation step for the world heritage nomination; the review step for world heritage inscription; and the management step for post-inscription. Each step would require different agents, goals, and approaches, responding to the unique local cultures as well as to the international principles. The recommendation would be drawn through in-depth discussions among the conference participants, which would be the highlight of 2012 Buyeo International Conference.

The expected outcomes, such as the above recommendation list, would serve as checklists for each step of world heritage nomination, inscription, and post-inscription. These could be regarded as an advancement of the previous discussions of community involvement, which have been searching for practical implementing measures. This would be a meaningful contribution of the 2012 Buyeo International Conference.

[Chart 3 Expected Outcome of 2012 Buyeo International Conference (draft) ]
Appendix 1. Key Questions, provided for the case descriptions of 2012 Buyeo International conference

**Key Questions**

① What could be critical issues in the conservation and management of your world heritage case? Those issues may be universal as well as local. What are generally-shared issues and what are locally-specific issues?

② Regarding those issues, how would you relate them to community involvement themes?

③ Who could be the community members in and around your world heritage case? Please identify them in detail, for example, their demographic characters, lifestyles, demands for the world heritage site, etc.

④ Who are main stakeholders or players in conserving and maintaining your case site?

⑤ How are the official processes of decision making in conserving and maintaining your case site? Are there rooms for the community members to participate in each decision making step? If so, how do they work?

⑥ Does a good governance system exist in those processes? If so, does it operate in a horizontal cooperation mode or what kinds of mechanism does it have to function? Please describe it in detail, focusing on how it operates?

⑦ In your case site, how could you promote a better governance system? What are the hindrances in doing so?

⑧ Is there local uniqueness in that system? If so, please explain it in relation to its local cultures or traditional rituals.

⑨ In your case site, are there traditional or indigenous factors in community operations that help the community members maintain their authentic lifestyles and inheritances?

⑩ What would you suggest as “regionally-specific protocols... to give practical operational guidelines for conservation practitioners working in Asia or (in your site)” as mentioned in the Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia (2009)?

⑪ What would you suggest to establish a Site Management Network to facilitate exchange information on better practice of heritage conservation and management among us?

**Reference**

WHC-10/35.COM/12D, WHC-10/35.COM/12E
Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 2011
Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia, 2009
Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, World Heritage Nomination Dossier, Historic Villages of Korea: Hahoe and Yangdong, 2009
Thematic Presentation

Thematic Presentation 1
World Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development: the Challenges Ahead
Giovanni Boccardi, UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Thematic Presentation 2
Norway: Finalizing a New, Historic World Heritage Policy
Ingunn Kvisterøy, Ministry of the Environment, Norway

Thematic Presentation 3
Engaging Communities – Approaches to Capacity Building
Gamini Wijesuriya, ICCROM

Thematic Presentation 4
The Role and Involvement of Communities in the Sustainable Development of World Heritage Sites in East Asia
Beatrice Kaldun, UNESCO Beijing Office

Thematic Presentation 5
World Heritage: Benefits Beyond Borders
Amareswar Galla, International Institute for the Inclusive Museum

Thematic Presentation 6
World Heritage Conservation and the Role of Local Communities – Focusing on Historic Villages and Cities
Pilwon Han, ICOMOS-Korea / Hannam University, Korea
The contribution of World Heritage to Sustainable Development

As an attribute of natural and cultural diversity, World Heritage plays a fundamental role in fostering sustainable development and as a spring of our wellbeing.

Through a variety of goods and services and as a storehouse of knowledge, a well-protected World Heritage property contributes directly to providing basic goods, security and health, through access to clean air, water, food and other key resources as well as by attracting investments and ensuring green, locally-based, stable and decent jobs, only some of which may be related to tourism. Most activities associated to the stewardship of cultural and natural heritage, indeed, are green “by design” since they embody an intrinsically more sustainable pattern of land use, consumption and production, developed over centuries if not millennia of slow adaptation. This is true for natural protected areas rich in biodiversity, of course, but also for cultural landscapes and historic cities.

A well maintained heritage is also very important in addressing risks related to natural and human-made disasters. Experience has shown how the degradation of natural resources, neglected rural areas, urban sprawl and poorly engineered new constructions increase the vulnerability of communities to disaster risks, especially in poorer countries. On the other hand, a well-conserved natural and historic environment considerably reduces underlying disaster risks’ factors, strengthens the resilience of communities and saves lives.

World Heritage, of course, is also essential to the spiritual wellbeing of people for its powerful symbolic and aesthetic dimensions. The conservation of the diversity of the cultural and natural heritage, fair access to it and the equitable sharing of the benefits deriving from its use, enhance the feeling of place and belonging, mutual respect for others and a sense of purpose and ability to provide for others, which contribute to the social cohesion of the community as well as to individual and collective freedom of choice and action.

At times of crisis, moreover, access to and care for the heritage may help vulnerable people recover a sense of continuity, dignity and empowerment. In conflict and post-conflict situations, in particular, the acknowledgment and conservation of heritage, based on shared values and interests, may foster mutual recognition, tolerance and respect among different communities, which is a precondition for a society’s peaceful development.
For all of these reasons, World Heritage – and heritage in general - is crucial to sustainable human development and to the strengthening of mutual understanding and peace.

Recognition of the positive role of heritage for sustainable development within international policies

UNESCO has been promoting this concept at least since the 1980s, through a number of initiatives, including the International Decade on Culture and Development, which culminated in the 1995 report “Our Creative Diversity”, by the Perez de Cuellar Commission. Recently, these efforts have resulted in two landmark resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, N. 65/166 and N. 66/208 (respectively in 2011 and 2012), which emphasize the critical importance of culture as “an essential component of human development, a source of identity, innovation and creativity for the individual and the community”. A comprehensive explanation of the links between culture (and heritage) and development is available through a web-site recently developed by UNESCO.

The role of culture and heritage for sustainable development was also recognized in the outcome document of the recently-held United Nations Conference on Sustainable development, known as Rio + 20, entitled: “The Future We Want”, which included a number of important references to culture and heritage. The document recognized, for example, that “many people, especially the poor, depend directly on ecosystems for their livelihoods, their economic, social and physical well-being, and their cultural heritage” (Para. 30) and that “all cultures and civilizations can contribute to sustainable development” (Para. 41). It also stressed “the need for conservation as appropriate of the natural and cultural heritage of human settlements, the revitalization of historic districts, and the rehabilitation of city centers” (Para. 134), and emphasized the “intrinsic value of biological diversity, as well as its ecological, genetic, social, economic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values” (Para. 197).

These references acquire a special significance if considered in the context of another, more fundamental conclusion of the Rio + 20 Conference, that is the realization that progress cannot be defined solely on the basis of GDP, but should instead refer to a new development index and set of indicators that would account for the larger dimension of human wellbeing, emphasizing equity, dignity, happiness and sustainability.

The World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly of the States Parties to the 1972 Convention already acknowledged the great potential of World Heritage as a contributor to sustainable development when they noted (e.g. in Para. 132 of the Operational Guidelines for its implementation) that “World Heritage management systems should integrate the principles of Sustainable Development”, or when they stated (in the “Strategic Action Plan for 2022”, adopted at

---

1 This is accessible online at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001055/105586e.pdf
3 Accessible online at: http://www.unsd2012.org/content/documents/727The%20Future%20We%20Want%2019%20June%201230pm.pdf
4 In its report “Resilient People, Resilient Planet”, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon’s High-Level Global Sustainability Panel concluded that “the international community should measure development beyond GDP and develop a new sustainable development index or set of indicators.” These views are also reflected in the OECD’s Better Life Initiative, the Report of the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission and numerous other similar initiatives, which call for a broad range of social indicators to complement GDP figures.
5 The “Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention” are a sort of bylaws of the World Heritage system, which are revised every five years. They can be accessed online at: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide11-en.pdf
the 18th General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention in 2011) that World Heritage should “consider the social, economic and environmental needs...”

The issue

Despite the almost universal recognition of heritage’s great potential as a contributor to sustainable development, and somehow paradoxically, achieving sustainable development benefits is not yet an explicit objective of the World Heritage Convention, which – in its processes - continues to focus primarily on protecting “Outstanding Universal Value” (OUV), that is the fundamental requirement for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List. Although, as we have just seen, sustainable development is referred to as a principle in the Operational Guidelines and other key policy texts of the Convention, the current operational procedures for its implementation do not include specific recommendations, checks and controls that would enable governments to fully harness the potential of World Heritage for sustainable development, on one hand, and to ensure that their heritage conservation and management policies and programmes are aligned with broader sustainable development goals, on the other hand.

This means that many opportunities could be missed in the implementation of the Convention simply because those responsible may not consider them or may not know how to translate them in concrete sustainable development gains. Conversely, the current procedures of the Convention offer no clear means to encourage heritage conservation and management to better align its activities with important sustainable development objectives, such as the respect of human rights, addressing basic needs of local communities or non-depletion of natural resources.

This apparent ‘gap’ of the Convention, with respect to current thinking on the relationship between heritage and sustainable development, is somewhat surprising if one considers the great wealth of practical experience, in this regard, which has been developed particularly at World Heritage sites throughout the world. In some ways, one would like to say, practice is well ahead of policy. At the same time, it should be recalled that the World Heritage Convention is a legal instrument ratified by States, with a clearly spelled-out mission enshrined in a fundamental text that cannot be easily modified.

The need for a policy

Recognizing this challenge, the World Heritage Committee agreed, already in 2010, “that it would be desirable to further consider, in the implementation of the Convention, policies and procedures that maintain the Outstanding Universal value of properties, and also contribute to sustainable development” (Decision 34 COM 5D (Brasilia, 2010).

Two years later, at its 36th Session (Saint Petersburg, 2012), the Committee reiterated that the integration of sustainable development into the processes of the Convention should have been promoted through a specific policy. Paragraph 5 of the relevant decision (36 COM 5C) reads as follows:

---

“The World Heritage Committee,
Requests the World Heritage Centre, with the support of the Advisory Bodies to convene a small expert working group to develop, within a year, a proposal for a policy on the integration of sustainable development into the processes of the World Heritage Convention, for possible inclusion in the future Policy Guidance document. This policy should take into consideration the outcomes of the Ouro Preto Meeting, of other meetings that are taking place in the anniversary year across the world and of the Rio + 20 Conference, as well as integrate the relevant reflection from previous and ongoing discussions on related topics, in connection with the UNESCO initiative to promote the role of culture in development;” (emphasis added)7

To stimulate a reflection on the topic and mobilize the international community around this goal, moreover, the States Parties to the 1972 Convention chose “World Heritage and Sustainable Development: the Role of Communities”, as the official theme for its 40th Anniversary, in 2012.

Throughout the year, a great number of Conferences and workshops have been organized and are still being held throughout the world, all exploring under different angles the above topic and resulting in a wealth of principles, recommendations, declarations and case-studies in their support. These are adding to the already rich reflection which has been going on for a number of years on topics related to World Heritage, and heritage in general, and Sustainable Development, specifically on subjects such as Human Rights, gender, indigenous people, tourism etc.8

All these ideas are being, or will be incorporated in the outcome documents of these consultations. In due time, the idea is of course to consolidate this reflection into specific recommendations that will find their way into the policies of the World Heritage Convention. In this way, these new approaches will become the reference and established practice for nearly 1000 of the most outstanding heritage properties around the planet and, even more significantly, for national heritage policies that – in many countries – are inspired by the standards set by the 1972 Convention.

Clarifying the scope and aims of the policy

Implementing this decision by the Committee would require first of all clarifying some important questions. What would the integration of sustainable development in the processes of the Convention actually imply, in practice? What would ‘sustainable development’ mean exactly in the context of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and what should be accepted in its name, for example when assessing the impact of a development proposal on the Outstanding Universal Value of a listed property?

On the other hand, is contributing to or complying with sustainable development requirements outside the scope of the Convention? Would the World Heritage Committee have the mandate and/or required expertise to deliberate on whether measures taken for the protection and

---

7 See Doc. WHC/36COM.5C (accessible from: http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM/documents/) for more details on the context to this decision.
management of a World heritage property are in line with sustainable development, however defined? For example on whether human rights have been violated in the context of a World Heritage sites’ conservation and management strategy?

These are legitimate questions that would need to be addressed as a background to the policy requested by the World Heritage Committee.

Admittedly, the definition of sustainable development may be rather vague and constantly evolving. At the same time, the social, economic and environmental issues that underpin the notion of sustainable development are very real and relevant to the main challenges facing the planet today. Moreover, there are a number of international policy documents, including the Millennium Declaration, the MDGs, the outcome document of the Rio + 20 Conference etc. which constitute a valid reference for defining what constitutes sustainable development. On the other hand, the concept of OUV is in itself rather ambiguous and difficult to capture in quantitative terms, and yet it has been used for forty years as the cornerstone of the Convention because it was felt that it corresponded to a reality within the social context.

It is clear, at any rate, that the aim of such a policy would not be to establish criteria for choosing between protecting Outstanding Universal Value or achieving sustainable development. Neither the policy would change the mandate and main goal of the Convention. On the contrary, the purpose would be to empower governments and local authorities in charge of implementing the Convention to maximize all possible sustainable development benefits from World Heritage while all the time pursuing the overall goal of the Convention, which is to maintain the heritage value of the inscribed properties.

The policy could do this by providing a vision of what could be an ideal relationship between World Heritage conservation and sustainable development; by alerting States Parties and other World Heritage actors to risks and opportunities that may arise, in relation to sustainable development, in the various stages of the implementation of the Convention; and by providing good practice models that may be applied.

Such an approach, moreover, would contribute to bringing the World Heritage Convention up-to-date with the current international trends and, more importantly, to making conservation and management more sustainable in the long run, by addressing the aspirations of the local communities and tapping on their inherent capacities and potentials.

Engaging communities within a sustainable development perspective

Coming to the specific theme of this Conference on “World Heritage Involving Communities”, held from 10 to 12 September in Buyeo, Republic of Korea, one question that the new above-mentioned policy should certainly address is how to strengthen the engagement of communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Various references already exist, in this regard, in the Operational Guidelines. At various places, the Guidelines encourage a strong involvement of local communities, however defined, in the processes...
of nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List, and particularly in the context of site management and conservation\(^9\). The principle is therefore there and very clearly stated. What is missing, however, are specific ways of checking whether States parties have actually complied with this principle in the various stages of implementation of the Convention.

Introducing these checks would imply of course defining exactly what is intended for “local communities”; how does one go about involving them; what limits, if any, should be set to local autonomy and decision-making, if the overwhelming goal of protecting OUV is to be attained; etc. In this particular regard, one interesting issue that the Buyeo Conference has highlighted is the complex relationship between three separate but related objectives. These are: 1) protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of properties, as defined by the World Heritage Committee; 2) engaging their communities in a way that respect their cultural diversity, long established traditions and knowledge systems; and 3) applying internationally accepted standards of sustainable development, including democracy, gender balance and consideration for human rights.

Pursuing each of these objectives may, in theory, “pull the blanket” towards one side, while exposing the other sides, and a balance is clearly required. For example, local communities, at times, may express priorities that are incompatible with the protection of OUV. Or they might wish to protect OUV, but through a ‘traditional’ decision making process that excludes significant portions of the society, for example women and youth.

This is a very common situation in many regions of the world, not just in Asia. Following in particular the integration of the Nara Document on Authenticity\(^{10}\) within the World Heritage Convention, it has become apparent that intangible elements are often inextricably linked to the tangible attributes of a World Heritage property, and support its Outstanding Universal Value. At the same time, if local communities are to be meaningfully engaged and take centre stage in the identification, conservation and presentation of their heritage, this will of course require taking into account their cultural context and sensitivities.

But how far should one go in acknowledging local traditions, if these appear to contradict with principles of inclusiveness and good governance? And more fundamentally, is the protection of cultural heritage a goal in itself, or only a means to achieve an inclusive human development and the wellbeing of local communities? If the latter were the case, what implications would this have on the mandate and legal framework underpinning the work of national heritage Agencies? This is a debate that is connected with parallel discussions on aspects such as human rights, gender, indigenous groups etc. and may have far reaching consequences for the way we go about conserving heritage.

The contribution of the Buyeo meeting to elucidating the complex nexus among these apparently conflicting aims will be of utmost value.

---

\(^9\) See for example paragraphs 12, 40, 64, 119, 123, and in Annexes 3 (12), 4 (8) etc.

Introduction

Norway is a relatively small, but long, country (3-4000 km long), with a relatively small population of less than 5 million people. Since we live spread out over large areas, it has always been important for the center to have a close dialogue with and distribute power to the periphery and its local communities. “District policy” we call it. This is a major issue in every Norwegian election and it is well reflected in our Parliament’s decisions.

Norwegian local communities do have clear and loud voices. This includes local communities at our World Heritage properties. These voices have made it increasingly clear over the last two decades, that the government should rethink and improve the involvement of the local communities linked to or living at our Word Heritage properties.

When “local community” came up as a topic for the 40th anniversary of the Convention in Brasilia two years ago, this was clearly in line with the Norwegian discussions. With enthusiastic support from our World Heritage communities, the Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO and other Ministries, we were pleased organize the conference “Living with World Heritage” at Røros in May this year.

Parallel in time, the Ministry of the Environment was working on a new policy for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The role of the local community was one important challenge for the implementation, but we were also facing others. Nationally, we experienced a growing complexity of interests and responsibilities, of access to resources and power, while UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee and its Advisory Bodies continued to develop standards and requirements that challenge the States Parties on many levels. How could we as a State Party, fulfill these aspirations and requirements, nationally and internationally?

During the thirty five years since the Norway ratified the Convention, the policy guiding our national and international work, had been some White Paper paragraphs, mainly stating the following: The implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Norway shall be an example of best practice management – and, our World Heritage Properties shall be light houses setting the standard for all our cultural and natural heritage management.
Obviously, these paragraphs did not give ample advice or instruction to solve the many, detailed, challenging and growing numbers of questions facing us as a government, some of which have been mentioned initially. In late 2010, the Ministry of the Environment decided to start developing a new, holistic policy for our implementation of the Convention. The draft policy was finalized in March 2012.

Participating in the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Convention, focusing on the role of local communities, inspired and gave input to our work with the new policy.

In this presentation I will introduce you to our local World Heritage Communities, continue with the Røros conference and then see how the recommendations and principles from the conference is met in our new policy.

Norway’s local World Heritage Communities

Norway ratified the World Heritage Convention in 1977. Within eight years we had our first four inscriptions on the List. Nineteen years later two more properties were nominated and inscribed, followed by a transnational inscription, the Struve Geodic Arc which runs through 10 countries. In addition, Norway has three tentative properties in the process of being nominated.

Our local communities are – as for most States Parties - very diverse, multi-layered and multi-sectorial with a complex set of interests. We have a large number of owners and their interest organizations, businesses/shops, museums, hotels, farmers, fishermen, indigenous people, the Church, science communities, industrial representatives – such as mining, oil and gas - in addition to all age groups and political and administrative authorities on three levels – municipal, regional and national. Most groups see the value of the heritage and have an interest in protecting and conserving it. On the other hand, quite a few may see World Heritage status an obstacle to activities and development they would rather see take place. Industrial enterprise, land and sea use are the most challenging issues.

The main stakeholders in maintaining our Norwegian World Heritage properties are the owners, the municipal authorities and key institutions such as the museums. In order to support traditional ways of living which maintains the values of the properties, efforts have been made to provide specific governmental support. Small farming by the West Norwegian Fjords and on the Vega Archipelago as well as the important eiderdown harvesting on Vega receive such specific support.

In general, our local World Heritage communities are very active and enthusiastic. They put in hundreds of hours of voluntary work, they have participating schools and youth, there is genuine political interest and impressive competence.

Local communities have power in Norway, as mentioned above, and an unfortunate example may be useful for understanding our situation. Five years ago, the population of a site to be inscribed onto Norway’s tentative list, organized a referendum voting “yes” or “no” to UNESCO, meaning yes or no to a possible World Heritage status. Locally they questioned if such a status would be positive or negative for them. The local debate was heated, almost warlike. I will not enter into the content of the struggle, but just underline the obvious, that a number of basic values were at stake – economic,
cultural, social... “The vision of the future”. The calculation of the referendum gave this result: 50.something were against; 49.something were in favor. The industrial entrepreneurs won, the conservationists lost. The most significant result of this, seemingly democratic process, was a devastating crevice splitting the population into two. Let me add that this process is not brought to an end yet.

In Norway, the local community must agree to a nomination of their heritage, cultural or natural. Even if the national authorities and experts as well as the international society agree on the unique and extraordinary value of a property, the local community may decide differently. It has become increasingly clear that we, in many cases, must strike a balance between local and national interests. Dialogue and good governance are key concepts.

These were experiences we brought into the Røros conference.

The Røros conference “Living with World Heritage”, May 2012

The Røros conference had a dual objective: (a) to give local communities from different parts of the world with the opportunity - through cooperation - to identify common concerns and needs, and (b) to provide a forum where local communities, governmental authorities and international representatives could meet and discuss directly and find solutions together.

It was decided to concentrate participation to two regions, Europe and Africa. They are two quite different regions of the world, and in this way possible interesting comparisons and possible “true” challenges and needs for World Heritage communities could be found. A few representatives form other parts of the world were also invited.

The “conference” had two parts. First of all it was based on a bottom-up approach where representatives from three Norwegian World Heritage Properties were twinned with representatives from three South African properties. They were given the opportunity to visit each other, and the result of their visits and discussion was presented at the conference.

The second part was the conference itself. The result from the twinning was some sort of a baseline. Invited lecturers and case presentations were added and discussions were held both in plenary and in workshops. UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and research institutions all participated. Governmental representatives and site managers took part, and youth was given a visible and prominent role.

The result of the conference was a collection of principles and recommendations which have been communicated widely, and hope of the organizers is that these principles and recommendations are discussed further in the other conferences and workshops that take during the 40th anniversary of the Convention.

Key principles and recommendations from Røros

The conference agreed on a definition of local community, based on Webber Ndoro’s, Director of the African World Heritage Fund, presentation at Røros:
“Local communities are multi-layered and multi-sectorial, consisting of people or groups of people with different abilities and access to resources. A local community can be a group of people living in a particular place, sharing a common life, or being linked by common interests to a World Heritage property and values attached to its assets. Local communities have interests, expectations, aspirations, obligations and need benefits. Local communities develop and change constantly, and their interests may not necessarily coincide with World Heritage interests”.

The principles and recommendations are too comprehensive to be included here, but the following quotes should give an idea of the main types of or areas of concern (the full text is attached to this presentation paper):

Principles
- Community involvement must be an integral part of understanding and sustaining heritage sites
- Local communities should be recognized as key actors in defining, managing and communicating values of WH properties
- Communities are diverse and should be recognized in their complexity
- Decisions concerning local communities should require free, prior and informed consent of that community
- Local community involvement should be based on meaningful dialogue and decision making between all stakeholders
- Local community should derive benefits as well as recognize obligations flowing from WH
- Capacity building should be provided to enhance local community understanding (including information in an understandable language)

Recommendations
- The principles adopted should be promoted by all parties in the protection and management of all heritage property
- Undertake necessary steps to achieve revision of the Operational Guidelines to incorporate more strongly the principles mentioned above and translate these into practical implementation of the Convention so that full benefits of sustainable development approaches of WH properties may be realized
- Find ways to ensure that local communities have a clearer understanding of WH terminology
- Include the requirement of meaningful involvement of young people in the nomination and periodic reporting processes
- Expand the twinning of WH properties ensuring broad and meaningful representation of their local community

Some of the principles and recommendations are formerly known to the “World Heritage Family”, some are already included in the Operational Guidelines. Therefore the wording is “incorporate more strongly”, sending the message to the States Parties, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to put more efforts into implementing them. It will be interesting to see if these ideas and inputs are supported and brought further by other regions of the world during the anniversary. The Røros conference participants anticipate that they will be reflected in the final document to be decided upon in Japan in November.
**Norway: A New, Holistic World Heritage Policy**

The key concept for the Ministry when deciding that a comprehensive policy for World Heritage implementation was to be developed, was holistic: Involvement of all parties/stake holders and sectors, locally and nationally. A working groups consisting of representatives from two ministries and three directorates was established, its mandate stating that it should: Analyze present challenges, and propose activities and priorities. Important elements in this will be building capacity and review routines and processes for the management, monitoring, conservation, reporting, local involvement, value creation, access, production of knowledge and information. The potential for value creation and relevant means to achieve them needs to be clarified. Needs for education, capacity development and research must be clarified. Key cooperation partners in civilian society must be identified and given a role in the proposed activities and follow-up.

The working group gave their advice to the Minister for Environment in December 2011, after having (a) consulted ten sector ministries and several directorates, (b) held two involvement seminars for all stakeholders and relevant actors and (c) provided a web-page on the government’s www, open for comments and inputs – individual or collective, governmental or non-governmental.

Heading of web-page: *The Ministry of the Environments wishes to hear your advice and ideas. New World Heritage Policy*

After internal discussion and political validation, the Minister sent the policy document on a broad hearing. The Ministry is now processing the comments received. The final version of the policy is expected to be issued in December. The main conclusions will be part of a new white paper on cultural heritage management, to be presented to the Parliament next year.

**Critical issues for Norway in implementing the World Heritage Convention**

The following issues were found to be the most critical for Norway’s implementation of the World Heritage Convention:

**Structural/organizational**
- Establish effective, efficient and feasible models for organizing world heritage conservation/management, locally and nationally
- Develop a new blue print for World Heritage management plan which better correlates with and is a useful tool for other obligatory law regulated plans

**Core conservation priorities**
• Secure our present World Heritage properties in order to fulfill the ambition for "best practice" for management and conservation in a global context
• If feasible, establish buffer zones as "special zones" in municipal area plans pursuant to Code (plan- og bygningsloven) para 11-8
• Carry out risk assessment at every World Heritage Site to strengthen the systematic monitoring of the properties
• Continue to be an active and relevant State Party through participation in formal organs and by contributing technical, professional and economic assistance.

Communication and information
• Every World Heritage site should have a professional centre that can communicate information on the World Heritage site, its values and why it is considered to be of importance for humanity. Such centers shall be an instrument in creating ownership and engagement in the local community.
• Develop a strategy for communication, education and information – this work has so far been given low priority. The strategy points to this topic as a priority area.
• Develop further ways to strengthen World Heritage competence and education

Value creation – sustainable development
• Prioritize World Heritage Sites in the Ministry of Environment’s new strategy for value creation related to cultural and natural heritage

How are these national issues related to community involvement issues and the principles and recommendations from Røros?

First of all it is easy to confirm that community involvement issues are relevant to all of Norway’s critical issues in implementing the World Heritage Convention. The solutions proposed received substantial support from our World Heritage communities in the hearing of the policy document. Let me present a few proposals which reflect concerns expressed at Røros.

Structural and organizational issues: Establishment of World Heritage Councils
A World Heritage Council is established when a nomination process is initiated. Let me also underline that no nomination process is initiated without local support and agreement. If disagreement develops during the nomination process, the nomination will not be sent to UNESCO. To be clear: Even if the government and its professional advisers (national and international) states the global value and importance of a property and the necessity to protect it, this may not be followed-up if the local communities are in disagreement. In Norway’s case, it may be that the local community has more power than the government or the international society.

A WH Council consists of the major local stake holders. It is up to the local community to decide who they are. Which is certainly challenging – we have communities in the community. The government requests that the municipal and regional political leaders are members, as well as key institutions for the conservation of the property, including representatives of owners. The political leaders have their administrative/professional advisers as assistants, including the WH coordinator. The council may invite representatives of the private sector – such as tourism, farming, fisheries etc. If there are indigenous peoples in the area, a representative from the Sami Parliament will be a member of the
Council (the Sami Parliament is the equivalent of the regional authorities when it comes to cultural heritage). The main ambition is to establish a forum where politicians and professionals discuss and advise. The Council advise must then be presented by e.g. the major to the formal political authority for a formal decision, if necessary. The national authority meets as observer at the council meetings to give information and to give answer to questions or clarifications. Since the main code of law regulating World Heritage conservation is handled by the municipality, it is of major importance that the communication between the central government and the local government is good.

The local World Heritage Council give advice on most matters concerning the property’s management, conservation, monitoring and reporting as well as presentation and information. This includes the opportunity to give feedback on how World Heritage information communicates at the local level.

**Communication, information and local rooting**
The most popular part of the New Policy is the proposal that every World Heritage site should have a professional centre that can communicate information on the World Heritage site, its values and why it is considered to be of importance for humanity.

Such centers are thought to be instruments in creating ownership and engagement in the local community. The new policy presents a financial model for a centers budget which makes both he national and the local levels responsible. The policy puts emphasis on the need for reaching and communicating with all the local communities.

**Strengthen further World Heritage competence and education**
The Ministry of the Environment and the directorates for cultural and nature management will have yearly gatherings for the World Heritage Coordinators to discuss key questions and provide updated information on World Heritage Committee decisions, changes in the Operational Guidelines and consequences for Norwegian properties and important events that will take place and must be prepared. Other relevant local representatives may be invited, depending on the agenda.

As an extension of this meeting, seminars or workshops on important issues will be organized. Coordinators or other representatives of the local community will be used as teachers when relevant.

Norway through the Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO has contributed substantially to the development of the educational program “World Heritage in Young Hands”. Many of our ASP schools have taken part in this in Norway and abroad; schools at our World Heritage Sites have also been very active. Not only do they have lessons in school, but practical tasks in conservation of the sites or property are integrated parts of the curriculum. Røros Upper Secondary School has organized, I believe seven or eight times, summer camps for European youth, where they are instructed by local professionals in conservation work.

Tagging stopped as a consequence of the project “Adopt a House” at Røros.

The unique thing about involving school children and youth is that the whole community becomes involved – parents, grandparents, uncles, cousins, friends. Owners!

It has been noted, however, that the further development of the program is difficult, and the new policy proposes that study programs must be provided teachers or students, at key teaching institutions. The ambition is to develop such study program in cooperation with the Ministry for Education and Research.
But basically, the policy document admits to the fact that communication and information, competence building and education have been largely neglected. Therefore the document concludes that these questions must be looked further into by developing an information, communication and education strategy.

**Value creation – sustainable development**

Finally, value creation. As stated at Røros, local communities should receive benefits that flow from a World Heritage listing. The statement or principle is perhaps closest linked to the notion of sustainable development. The New, Holistic World Heritage Policy does not have a specific chapter on sustainable development, since this is seen as a complex issue which is linked to most of the policy’s topics. The Norwegian understanding of value creation covers cultural, social, environmental and economic value creation.

What is raised in the policy document, is the intention of the government to give special priority to our World Heritage properties when support is given to boost local value creation. Such values creation may be small industrial enterprises, handicraft production, local host educational programs, tourism development etc.

**Conclusions**

Norway is a relatively small country with a relatively small population. However, the local enthusiasm at World Heritage properties is significant, and the value of the cultural and natural resources present is tremendous. There are strong forces, loud voices and fierce competition. Conclusively, a closer cooperation between levels and sectors is important, necessary and unavoidable. The Røros conference has assisted us by providing support to many of the proposals and priorities in our new World Heritage policy. We hope that the principles, recommendations and policy advice give inspiration to the further process.
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Abstract

Cultural heritage activities are seeing a change in focus from expert-driven and state-run processes towards more inclusive community and non-state sector driven endeavours. This is gradually constituting a paradigm shift worldwide. International organizations (both intergovernmental and non-governmental), as well as individual academics and professionals are discussing together with communities the merits of such engagement, and as demonstrated by the case studies, practitioners in the field are testing some of the concepts and ideas. The real challenge is to apply this knowledge base and thinking in order to influence and forge changes at national and site levels. ICCROM considers providing guidance on this subject as one of its primary tasks, while at the same time participating in the wider debate. This paper presents an approach for assessing the adequacy of community engagement at national and site levels, and highlights where capacities need to be improved or developed. Finally, the paper presents the framework of a course to be implemented by ICCROM, with a view to deliberate and obtain input from the participants of the conference.

Introduction

ICCROM is of the view that heritage is not only a legacy to be preserved for future generations, but also something for and about existent communities, which should therefore be a central theme in the heritage process. The link between heritage and living communities needs to be well understood in defining heritage and their subsequent management. The latter should aim at providing benefits to communities while drawing from their knowledge, skills and resources as well as long term commitments.

A change in focus is emerging in many countries from expert driven and state sector run heritage processes towards community and non-state sector driven endeavours. This is gradually constituting a paradigm shift worldwide. International intergovernmental and non governmental organizations to individual academics and professionals are debating this theme and, as can be seen through the case studies, practitioners in the field are testing some of the concepts and ideas. How do we translate this knowledge base and thinking to influence and forge changes at national and site levels? ICCROM considers providing guidance on this as one of its primary task, while at the same time engaging in the wider debate.
At the outset, one has to acknowledge the complexity of engaging communities in the heritage process. ‘Communities’ could mean very different entities to different sites within different contexts. This may vary from diverse groups of the local population within or in close proximity to wider groups that have some interests or legitimate grounds to engage even at an international level. Even an encyclopedic museum in a distant country, like the British Museum, the Metropolitan Museum of New York, or the Louver, can boast to represent an international community having rights on the heritage in the name of science and mankind and these rightly justify in their opinion, the displacement of heritage. The relative level of engagement of these groups in the heritage process varies considerably and it is at the site level that opportunities can be identified. Communities are not always homogeneous groups with unequivocal support for heritage conservation. Diverse views and values bring conflicts. Recognition of places as heritage impacts positively and negatively in the life of communities and can even lead to change in their life styles compelling them to look for alternate livelihoods. Engaging communities is time and resource consuming. However, the diverse forms of supports communities can bring to the heritage process, as mentioned above, can be vital to the wellbeing of cultural heritage sites and the protection of their values, particularly as society changes and becomes more and more complex.

With a view to address some of the above issues and to develop tools for engaging communities, ICCROM launched a programme on Living Heritage sites in 2003. Some of the results of this programme carried out mainly in Asia will be presented towards the end if time permits (for a brief note see annexe one). Based on this experience and also considering the need to pay attention to the issues of communities, the ICCROM General Assembly in 2011 adopted a programme titled ‘People Centered Approach to Conservation- Living Heritage’. The Goal of this programme is to promote the engagement of communities in conservation and management of heritage mainly through capacity building over the next six years. In this presentation we propose an outline for a tentative syllabus to be developed for a major training activity, perhaps the first of its nature to be conducted at an international level.

A framework for assessments

First of all we need to assess whether the paradigm shift we envisage has begun to influence the heritage process, starting from the basic level of the consciousness of the heritage, and if not what type of changes should be proposed at national and site levels. There may be different approaches, but ICCROM would like to propose that the assessments could be done by revisiting the existing management system in place for the site. In most cases, the system will be operating at a national level or a regional level addressing multiple sites. Management systems spearheading heritage management vary considerably from country to country and site to site but common characteristics prevail. In this regard ICCROM has developed a simple analytical framework to help define and assess management systems and which identifies nine components common to all management systems. A management system is made up of three elements (a legal framework, an institutional framework and resources), three processes (planning, implementation and monitoring) and three results (outcomes, outputs and feedback) as illustrated in the diagram below¹.

¹ This analysis of a heritage management system was developed as part of an ICCROM research project in conjunction with the World Heritage Centre and the other Advisory Bodies on ‘Better Defining Appropriate Management Systems for World Heritage Sites’ (2009) and will shortly be published in the new resource manual entitled ‘Managing World Heritage Cultural Sites’.
For effective engagement of communities, their involvement in the principal heritage processes – the continuous cycle of planning, implementation and monitoring processes – is of primary importance and needs to take place in all stages of the cycle. Harder but just as important to achieve, is involvement of communities in establishing the objectives of the management system in terms of outcomes (changes required to the existing situation as identified in the planning strategy) and outputs (those tangible results from a planned work programme which deliver direct support to the heritage itself and society at large) and revising them periodically according to changes in the site and its context. Ongoing community engagement in identifying the purpose of the management system and its processes is particularly important since the management system must aim to protect the heritage but also harness the mutual benefits available to communities and the site itself from a participatory approach and the community engagement that this promotes.

However, heritage institutions need to be equipped with necessary legal provisions and resources but also have the organizational capacity to achieve community engagement in many aspects of management. It is in this context that we propose to use the analytical framework established for defining and assessing management systems as a way to assess how effective the current system is for community engagement and what changes need to be done. The questions in the table below are just some examples of the checks that will help identify strengths and weaknesses of the current management system.
### ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of this assessment allocates strengths and weaknesses of the current system within the nine components, thereby assisting those involved in the identification of those measures that can help overcome weaknesses and seize those opportunities yet to be embraced.

### Capacity Building

Indeed, the next question is how to address gaps identified in the above assessment influence changes necessary? More importantly who can make these changes? Whom should we influence? Conventionally, we have tried to pass the knowledge to mid career professionals through training courses but it is very clear they alone cannot make changes for effective management of heritage. Therefore, we propose to move beyond conventional ‘training’ approach to capacity building in order to consider all audiences who are or need to be engaged in the heritage process. ICCROM believes that a well formulated capacity building programme can reach a broader audience. Moreover, it can also better equip those who are responsible for making those changes necessary to the management system to integrate community concerns and favour effective engagement through the promotion of new learning environments. UNDP has defined capacity as “the ability of
individuals, organizations and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner. In developing the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, we were able to translate this into a scheme that would distinguish three domains where capacities reside and their respective audiences which need to be addressed, with learning areas and methodologies varying accordingly as the chart below illustrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where capacities reside</th>
<th>Associated Audiences</th>
<th>Learning areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Practitioners           | Individuals and groups who directly intervene in the conservation and management of heritage | - New knowledge being generated on both theoretical and practical aspects of engaging communities.  
- Implications of engaging communities related to conservation and management issues: planning, implementation and monitoring, traditional conservation processes at the site level, resource utilization and management |
| Institutions            | Policy and decision makers that have a responsibility for the enabling environment for conservation and management. | - Justifications for engaging communities.  
- Necessary polices and guidance for improving legal, institutional (governance, decentralization) frameworks, processes and reallocating resources to empower decision-makers and policy-makers to engage communities. |
| Communities & Networks  | Including local communities living on or near properties as well as the larger networks that nurture them | - Introduce a more dynamic relationship between heritage and its context and, in turn establish greater reciprocal benefits particularly linking with sustainable development and communities.  
- Strengthen the ability of communities to engage in the decision making process and sharing the responsibilities (eg. stewardship) for management of heritage including reviving traditional management systems, communication, interpretation, access and resource use. |

**Course module: Engaging Communities (to be developed)**

Under the broader umbrella of people Centered Approach to Conservation- Living Heritage, ICCROM would like to propose a capacity building initiative dedicated to promoting community engagement. Its first phase (next year subject to funding being found) would target those most involved on a day-to-day-basis, heritage practitioners, but with a view to favouring positive repercussions for other audiences who can influence capacity for community engagement in institutional frameworks and broader networks and communities. The course that would mix more traditional classroom based components with more innovative learning environments with the aim of providing the necessary

---

2 This framework is taken from “The World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building” drafted by ICCROM in its capacity as a World Heritage Advisory Body (June 2011).
knowledge, skills and awareness related to engaging communities. It is envisaged that the first phase of the initiative would advance the level of debate and help define follow-up initiatives to better target policy makers and evolve more innovative approaches to allow communities and networks to help lead the process of opening up management systems to community engagement. The latest resources and tools available would be provided to the participants for this purpose.

THIS PART HAS TO BE DEVELOPED WITH THE INPUT FROM THE CONFERENCE

Target Audience: Practitioners but carefully selected to include some already exposed to policy makers or working with communities and networks.

Time period:
Venue:
Objectives:

SYLLABUS

Module 1: Emerging Concepts
1. Why the people-centered approach?
   i. Defining Communities
   ii. Why Communities? (WH references)
   iii. Issues of Continuity and Change
2. Addressing different audiences
   i. Practitioners: through workshops and training activities
   ii. Institutions: Policies, legislation, resources
   iii. Communities and networks: engagement processes using different tools, Strengthening their ability to engage in the decision making process and management

Module 2: Benefits
3. Benefits to Communities? Social, economic, other
   i. Sustainable development
   ii. Sustainable tourism
4. Benefits to heritage
   i. Knowledge (including traditional knowledge systems),
   ii. Engagement of communities in conservation, maintenance, monitoring, resources

Module 3: Tools
5. Assessing management systems
   i. Understanding gaps
   ii. Addressing gaps
6. Participatory process
   i. Engagements, empowerment
   ii. community museums, cultural mapping, LHA

Case studies (regional specific, international)
ANNESE ONE

LIVING HERITAGE APPROACH

Living Heritage- a definition
In 2003, ICCROM launched the Living Heritage Sites programme mainly carried out in the Mekong River Region to develop a community based approach to conservation and management of heritage emphasizing the need to keep ‘living dimension’ of heritage as the core of the decision making process. The living dimension was translated as the ‘continuity’ which merits due recognition as a key attribute in defining and managing heritage. Living Heritage is characterized by the continuity of use (original function) or the purpose for which they were originally established. This in turn maintains the continuity of community connections, expressions of both tangible and intangible, and care through traditional or established means.

This heritage is strongly linked to a community, subject to a continuous process of evolution and in this sense change is embraced as part of the continuity or living nature of the heritage place. Those connected communities take the responsibility to maintain the heritage by traditional or established means. Furthermore, such heritage is linked or has relevance to the contemporary life of community who endeavour to draw different benefits. These are essential elements that should be given due consideration in assessing values and identifying attributes that manifest them. When undertaking the condition assessments both positive and negative impacts should be considered, and the outcomes or outputs in the conservation and management process should be based upon such results. Outcomes and outputs intended, should aim at benefiting both heritage as well as communities.

Living Heritage approach
There was a need to develop a tool mainly as an approach that could capture and potentially address the issues of conservation and management of living heritage. For this, a proposal was developed at the strategy meeting in 2003. Based on this, the new approach had to be developed by examining the existing approaches which we mentioned as fabric and values based. In comparing and
contrasting with the two, the programme came up with an improved approach which is labeled as Living Heritage Approach. It is more complementary to the existing approaches than a competitor and can be summarized as follows:

**As a philosophy:** It emphasizes continuity as the primary driver for the definition, conservation and management of heritage.

**As a process:** It facilitates a community led (bottom up), interactive approach to conservation, emphasising core community values (recognises hierarchy of values & stakeholders), recognising changes and utilising traditional (practices, materials, knowledge) or established management systems in order to deliver benefits to the community (eg. spiritual, social, economic, development aspects) while taking care of the fabric.

**As a product:** Community empowered (strong role in decision making) to safeguard heritage with new decision making mechanisms.

This approach can be primarily applicable to living heritage but also easily adaptable to heritage in general. Because of the people centered approach, this addresses some of the gaps in the other approaches such as diversity and context dependency in defining, conservation and management of heritage.

Authors gratefully acknowledge the comments and suggestions made my Ms Jane Thompson, a colleague working with ICCROM on the development of Management Systems Framework and the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy mentioned in the text.
Today, the World Heritage Convention needs our renewed commitment, recognizing that culture is not just a by-product but rather at the heart of sustainable development. We must be equally committed to ensuring the sustainable management of each site once it has been inscribed and protect its Outstanding Universal Value. World Heritage must be more than a ‘label’ – it is a long term responsibility that must engage all stakeholders.

As addressed in earlier presentations, World Heritage – in its natural and cultural dimension – is at the core of the sustainable development agenda. This has been duly acknowledged by resolutions on culture and development in 2010 and 2011 at the UN General Assembly. This increasing recognition of the links between culture and development could be attributed to the success of UNESCO’s global advocacy efforts. The 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention falls in the same year as the critical Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. This represents an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the value and role of World Heritage in sustainable development and our experiences from Asia are an essential contribution.

1. Case studies for the involvement of local communities in East Asia

Since relevant authorities and management offices of World Heritage sites in most sites actively involve local communities in different ways in its strive for sustainable development, I would like to provide a snapshot of examples of UNESCO support to selected sites in East Asia, namely in China, Mongolia and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK).

1.1 Libo Karst, South China Karst World Heritage, China
Let me start with the Libo Karst as the host site of the 2012 Libo Forum which I will address in the second part of my presentation.

The site of Libo in Guizhou Province – on the World Heritage List since 2007 as part of the South China Karst – is peculiar in China, as even though it is a natural site, the density of human population in the core area is relatively high at 19 inhabitants per hectare and greater than that of the buffer area where the density is less than 14 inhabitants per hectare. Considering the situation, authorities decided to manage the site very carefully as the existing ecosystems are very fragile and have a very low resilience to change. As a result, authorities took concrete measures to facilitate the adaptation
of the local communities to the changing environment, in particular the changes in their lifestyles due to strict limitations on the scope of economic activities. For instance, it is important to highlight that local people are not allowed to use the forested areas in an unsustainable manner, which led to the development of different models for land use.

Tourism constitutes and is viewed by local communities as an important economic opportunity. Although the tourism infrastructure in Libo is not yet well developed, the main focus for tourism within the area is its strong cultural values, those associated with the traditional ways of life of the existing ethnic minority communities and the relationship they have with their surroundings. The continuation and support for traditional land uses and heritage values therefore forms a major component of the approach which is currently promoted in order to maintain the integrity of the World Heritage site and the way its Outstanding Universal values is protected.

In Libo, protective infrastructure and measures have been established in both the core area and the buffer zones to enable adequate protection. Visitor management approaches feature strongly in the core area and rehabilitation programmes exist in the buffer zones to counteract the problems associated with the desertification of the soils in this area. In addition further investment is directed towards safeguarding and promoting the authenticity and integrity of the cultures of the local communities.

However, whilst a Management Plan for the area exists, needs for further improvement have been identified to establish a more coordinated approach to the management of the area through the establishment of an official, fully recognised and coordinated World Heritage Management Committee.

1.2 Lushan National Park, China
The cultural heritage of the Lushan National Park in southern Chinese Jiangxi Province – inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape site in 1996 – has an important bearing on the history of China and is of extremely high scientific and aesthetic value with powerful associations with Chinese spiritual and cultural life. Mount Lushan was the first of China’s famous mountains to serve as the inspiration of outstanding cultural creations. The natural beauty of Mount Lushan has inspired many Chinese artists, writers, philosophers, and scientists. During the Tang Dynasty (7th-10th Century), Lushan became a religious centre for Buddhist sects. This identification as a spiritual centre resulted in other religions being attracted to Lushan. Other great religions such as Islam, Taoism and Christianity, have established centres at Lushan. Its spiritual and political significance has endured to the present day. During the 1930s and 1940s it was the official summer capital of the Republic of China, and with the establishment of the People's Republic in 1949 it was the venue for meetings of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party under the chairmanship of Mao Zedong. Mount Lushan has been shaped by a diversity of historical figures and research undertaken by Chinese experts clearly express that social data of local communities reflect such diversity.

With this in mind, the UNESCO project on the Conservation and Management of World Heritage sites in China launched in Sichuan Province and in 2009 at Lushan National Park aims at improving the local capacities of site managers, local communities and stakeholders and enhance the participation and involvement of the local community into the preservation and management of the site. As part of the project, the understanding of the significance of the values of Mount Lushan as a cultural landscape is being addressed. Teams of local experts from academic and managerial
authorities undertook a survey covering more than 300 people from the local community, including administrative officers, tourists, religious groups, employees of the tourism industry and local residents. The result of this social survey of public participation sought to illustrate the role and values of the local communities and stakeholders which is expected to contribute to the social, cultural and natural values for the sustainable management of Lushan National Park World Heritage site. It appears that local communities can be ranged into five main social groups: (i) community residents, (ii) managers of heritage sites, (iii) tourists and visitors, (iv) tourism professionals and (v) religious groups. Overall, the survey results indicate a lack of awareness of local people of the World Heritage status of Mount Lushan. However, the great natural and cultural value of the site is widely acknowledged and there is a wide consensus that the Outstanding Universal Value of the site lies in its interactions between natural formations, cultural sites and human lifestyles. Local communities consider that the protection of the local natural ecological environment is most important more than any other social, touristic and cultural aspects, thereby illustrating the recognition of Mount Lushan’s natural environment as the basis of Lushan’s social and cultural value. Meanwhile, culture professionals surveyed consider the traditional lifestyle of Mount Lushan’s residents as an integral part of the site’s value and therefore focus their efforts on a balanced development of local economies, tourism and preservation of cultural traditional aspects through integrated actions targeting enhanced employment and improvement of educational and medical facilities. Overall the findings of the survey and additional integrated research will serve not only to better understand the value of the site but also to integrate this understanding into the management approaches for Lushan.

Within this context, another activity in the UNESCO project addresses the conservation of the so-called ‘villas’, the heritage resident houses dating back to the early 20th century which today provide housing to many of the local residents. The activity focuses on the development of a Lushan Villa Conservation Guideline through the process of piloting the restoration of one villa, while at the same time addressing the value of the villas as continued residences for the local community rather than serving increasingly and exclusively as tourist accommodation.

1.3 Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape, Mongolia
The Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape – located in Central Mongolia, 360 km southwest of Ulaanbaatar – was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004 as a cultural landscape site. It is one of the key areas in Mongolia where the links between nomadic pastoralism and the associated settlements can be seen most clearly, and where there is a high density of cultural remains, the Orkhon Valley was at the centre of traffic across the Asian steppes and became the capital of first the Uighur Empire and then later of the Mongol Empire. It is fully illustrative of the nomadic cultures of Central Asia, which developed in accordance with the constraints and opportunities of their often-harsh environment and retains a very active role within contemporary society, and is still closely associated with the traditional way of life.

The character of the Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape is primarily linked to the preservation of the nomadic lifestyle which has nurtured and sustained the human and natural ecological balance of the Orkhon Valley pasture lands over many centuries. This nomadic lifestyle and the character of the Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape are very much threatened at present by desertification, by over grazing and by excessive and unplanned tourism. The globalizing attractions of contemporary life and related modern development also constitute a significant threat to this lifestyle.
Since its inscription as a World Heritage site and the introduction of a Management Plan and structure, the aim has been to reconcile the preservation of the OUV of the site with the traditional lifestyle as key element and the local communities as the driving force of its own development while also establishing the Orkhon Valley as a tourism area with benefits to the local community.

UNESCO has supported the careful development as well as revision of the Management Plan to uphold these key elements, and strengthen this approach. With well targeted projects UNESCO has and is supporting the sustainable development with the local community at its core and as key driver.

These projects are addressing specifically:

- **Awareness raising of the young people** on the values and importance of heritage conservation through targeted programmes in the area of World Heritage Education. All 7 schools located within the boundaries of the World Heritage site have established dedicated rooms and class time devoted to the understanding of World Heritage and sustainable development (ESD).

- A recent project is targeting the young people of the World Heritage site, as well as cultural custodians and workers and the community at large in combining the understanding of the heritage value of the site with action-oriented understanding, towards the prevention of illicit trafficking of the rich cultural treasures of the Orkhon Valley.

- As a mechanism for **sustainable development** of the local communities of the Orkhon Valley World Heritage site, a project is currently being carried out that supports the production of traditional **handicrafts** through targeted research, capacity building, establishment of quality standards and enhanced marketing.

**1.4 Democratic People’s Republic of Korea**

Heritage sites in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (thereinafter referred as DPRK) are protected by three main normative instruments protecting cultural heritage and providing an overall framework for its management: the Socialist Constitution of DPRK (1948, last revised in 2009), the Presidential Decree 35 and the 1994 Law of the DPR Korea on Protection of Cultural Property. These three main documents are then completed by additional specialized laws pertaining to land use (1977), environment protection (1986), forestry (1992) and city management (1992).

Cultural property in the DPR Korea is classified into National Treasure Sites and Preservation Sites according to its historical significance as well as its formative and artistic value. The National Treasure Sites and the Preservation Sites are also protected by the State, but are distinguished according to their historical and cultural value. The evaluation of cultural heritage is deliberated by the State Historical Property Deliberation and Evaluation Committee. The evaluated and registered historical sites are then under State Protection. All kinds of acts that cause damage to them will be considered as an infringement on State ownership and will be subject to administrative and penal punishment as stipulated in the Law on Protection of Cultural Property.

The National Bureau for Cultural Property Conservation (NBCPC) is the supreme guidance organ in charge of the preservation and management of the historical sites and relics across the country. It has specialized departments in charge of property, construction, science and technology, museums, scenic spots, natural monuments and so on. The NBCPC undertakes to assess, register, protect and manage the property; prepare regulations and policies to implement the Law on Protection of
Cultural Property; provide directions for the work of the departments of cultural preservation under provincial People’s Committees and the cultural property management offices, and guide and control the management process; and organize the presentation and awareness-building activities for the promotion of the cultural property.

At the local level, each local City People’s Committee comprises a dedicated Section for Cultural Preservation responsible for the long-term and annual planning of heritage sites’ management. Site managers directly implement the annual plan for on-site protection and management. Furthermore, provincial, city and county People’s Committees allocate cultural sites and relics to local institutions, enterprises, organizations and schools to ensure regular public management as stipulated in Article 49 of Chapter 6, the Law on Protection of Cultural Property, DPR Korea. They directly participate in the protection and management of the sites and regularly monitor any acts which might affect site protection under the direction of the city and county People’s Committees and cultural property management offices.

This highlights in an interesting way the full participation of the local community (local institutions, enterprises, organizations and schools) in the protection, management as well as monitoring of their heritage site.

At the same time the DPRK authorities identified the need to provide more adequate information to the local community in better understanding the context and issues of the (World) Heritage site and its OUV. To this end focus was put on the development of educational and awareness raising materials especially for young people with the support of UNESCO including the production of a CD-ROM for use in the classroom to strengthen the World Heritage Education of the young generation.

Meanwhile, UNESCO has also supported DPRK’s only enlisted World Heritage site, the Complex of Koguryo Tombs (inscribed in 2004) in the technical enhancement of conservation measures and building relevant staff capacity in these conservation techniques so as to better fulfil their roles of caretakers of the site.

Meanwhile, due to the fact that there is no easy access to the international community for the expert community in DPRK, including access to international standards and latest information on all aspects relevant for the protection, conservation and management of a World Heritage site, a key role of UNESCO is to encourage and facilitate dialogue, and exchange, and enable access to current international trends in conservation and management approaches with the world community.

Through these few various examples taken from cultural sites in China, Mongolia, and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, added to the case studies presented throughout the Buyeo Forum we can observe that local communities are in many cases already actively involved in the decision-making process and management of World Heritage properties. However, without any general and common framework, the degree of involvement of local communities greatly varies from country to country and from site to site and is mostly dependent on the local political, economic and social context. All these approaches are important models and case studies to feed into the international

---

1 Article 49 (Assignment of responsibility of the preservation and management of cultural property): Cultural property preservation guidance agencies, local power organs and other relevant bodies shall assign responsibility for the preservation and management of cultural property to the local state organs and other interest groups in the areas under their jurisdiction, integrate cultural property protection plans into the local development plans and implement them without fail.
2. A framework for the involvement of local communities in the management of World Heritage sites: the 2012 Libo Statement of Intent

Along with the many benefits deriving from inscription on the World Heritage List, it is evident that special challenges exist for those living near, working at, or visiting World Heritage sites and the range of stakeholders including governmental authorities, private sector and civil society at large. The reality of World Heritage sites usually is the balancing of its key commitment: protecting its Outstanding Universal value, while meeting the following challenges:

- Developing and meeting high standards of management;
- Satisfying the expectations from visitors;
- Coping with unforeseen challenges such as natural and man-made disasters as well as climate change;
- Enhancing the living standard of those living near or at World Heritage sites;
- Ensuring the economic and social development of the World Heritage site as part of the local or regional development agenda;

In achieving these goals, all involved stakeholders have both responsibilities and benefits and their participation is crucial. The 40th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention focuses on this key challenge: World Heritage and Sustainable Development to illustrate how the participation of local communities can – and should – result in a ‘win-win scenario’ for everyone who is committed to protecting the world’s heritage.

To participate in this global dialogue, UNESCO (Beijing Office) together with the Chinese authorities organized the Libo Forum in May-June 2012 in Guizhou Province, China. Drawing on experiences from China and the international community the Forum explored the role and contribution that local people and communities can and should have in securing the sustainable use and stewardship of World Heritage sites in China and around the world. The event therefore provided an excellent opportunity for those involved in the management of World Heritage in China, to share experiences and exchange new ideas with international colleagues in terms of the challenges and benefits arising from involving and connecting people who live in and use World Heritage with sustainable development approaches.

The aims of the forum were: (1) To increase awareness and understanding of the role and relevance of communities in promoting sustainable development in World Heritage sites, (2) To share best practice of the benefits of community participation in World Heritage stewardship, (3) To develop a “Statement of Intent” to highlight the role of local communities in maintaining the Outstanding Universal Values of World Heritage sites.

Participants gave thematic presentations on the World Heritage Convention, the means of optimizing the benefits and value of World Heritage Properties as well as the promotion and protection of biodiversity, sustainable planning and development of local communities, and their role and involvement in World Heritage matters. In addition, the participants shared and exchanged good practices and experiences. Participants visited the Libo World Heritage site of the South China Karst and acknowledged the pride that the local community has as well as the problems they encounter.
The participants could witness the contribution that local people and minority communities can make to the conservation and sustainable development of World Heritage properties.

Based on good practices carried out in various World Heritage sites across Asia and innovative mechanisms put forward during discussions between World Heritage sites managers and experts, the participants of the Libo Forum collectively recognized and acknowledged the World Heritage Convention as an important tool and agreed on a statement of intent, in respect of the relationship of World Heritage and sustainable development, the role and potential of local people, and the interaction of nature and humans. The Statement of Intent is organized around six main priorities:

1. The **World Heritage Convention** has had a powerful and unique impact upon global conservation and the world’s heritage since its inception forty years ago. Each State Party and site represented acting individually and as part of an extended global family, remains totally committed to safeguarding the integrity and authenticity of the site(s) under their guardianship in order that they are protected, shared and enjoyed by future generations.

2. The Government and relevant authorities and those responsible for World Heritage properties will work together to enable **national legislation** to be applied more effectively locally in order to ensure the responsible and integrated management of World Heritage properties and enhance their values.

3. The **public, especially young people** shall be encouraged to increase their understanding of and be given opportunities to be involved in the protection of World Heritage properties.

4. Encourage and enable **local communities** to work together and be involved with local governments, professional institutions and stakeholders to support and care for World Heritage properties, in creative and responsible ways. This is particularly important in the context of tourism planning and management.

5. Local people's skills, inherited traditions, beliefs and the spiritual values which they have for their World Heritage properties, are valuable **intangible assets** which add additional importance and a significant inheritance value to the qualities and uniqueness of a World Heritage property. These resources and values should be acknowledged and accounted for in the sustainable management approaches, so they can be passed on to future generations. **Local communities are important stakeholders and should make a positive contribution to the management and sustainable development** of these properties so that everybody benefits.

6. **Establish effective ways, including information technology** to ensure local people and communities increase their understanding of the importance of World Heritage values and how sustainable development is relevant to their well being, so that ‘win-win’ outcomes arise for both local communities and World Heritage properties.

The Libo Statement of Intent provides a clear guideline and common understanding of sustainable development, especially through the involvement of local community and the Libo Statement together with the Libo Forum can be summarized in the simple statement: “One Global Heritage...One Shared Responsibility”.

49
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Abstract

This presentation is based on the book entitled World Heritage: Benefits Beyond Borders (Ed.) Amareswar Galla, UNESCO & Cambridge University Press. It is scheduled to be launched in Kyoto on 8th November 2012. It is a thematic collection of case studies of World Heritage sites providing an understanding of their Outstanding Universal Value in the context of sustainable development with a particular focus on stakeholder community benefits. This volume is published as a milestone project on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention.

The volume is cross-disciplinary in scope. It is a meeting point for natural and social scientists, researchers and practitioners, professionals and community representatives. There twenty-six case studies representing a global spread of constructive and engaging examples. They have been selected on the principle of representativeness: Outstanding Universal Value; inscription criteria; economic, social and environmental sustainability; inscriptions under natural, cultural and mixed sites; landscape as well as scientific and industrial heritage; and a regional balance of examples from around the world taking into consideration environmental, linguistic and cultural diversity.

Each case study assesses what is important for sustainable development with regard to the World Heritage site concerned; the management framework required for ensuring and enabling sustainable development and community engagement; benefits to local communities and ecosystems; lessons for sharing with other World Heritage sites; and the anticipated way forward in bringing together local and neighbouring communities through the environmental, economic and social dimensions of
sustainability. As far as possible, evidence-based benefits are presented written in the spirit of the call for transformations by the UNESCO Director-General: ‘integrated cooperation mechanisms and more participatory governance structures for culture’, ‘deeper statistical understanding of the importance of the cultural sector to development’ and ‘greater awareness-raising about the cultural dimension of development’.¹

This book will complement the existing literature on World Heritage which focuses on specific types of sites or specific issues, and will provide a broader, multi-issue context for understanding World Heritage. It is pitched to the wider public. One of the strengths of the volume is its emphasis on a more holistic and integrated view, linking World Heritage to the role that local communities play in its management and protection, and to issues of ecosystem sustainability, management obstacles and possibilities, and the maintenance of biodiversity, as well as linguistic and cultural diversity.

The case studies in the book have been grouped into five themes that address the concerns of safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage sites in the 21st century:
1. Bridging the gulf between nature and culture; 2. Urbanism and sustainable heritage development; 3. Integrated planning and indigenous engagement; 4. Living heritage and safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value; and 5. More than the monumental.

It is within the process of producing this volume that the presenter will reflect in his, Buyeo, ROK, paper on the critical aspects of community engagement in the Asian context/s of safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value.

¹ Points taken from speech by Irina Bokova at Diversity of Cultural Expression: Ministerial Forum of the Asia-Pacific Region, Dhaka (Bangladesh), 9 May 2012.
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Abstract

Members of the local communities can become global citizens by sharing their understanding and interpretation of the world heritage with outsiders. Moreover, sharing such perception is the first step for the local community in resolving the issues and conflicts between insiders and outsiders over the world heritage and in conserving the heritage itself. All this can happen only when the local community comes to communicate with outsiders who are participating in the activities of the community using the heritage. Future strategies for world heritage conservation should be oriented towards stronger ties and capabilities of the local communities, supporting the communities to take the lead in the conservation activities.
Introduction

The nature of the world heritage determines the connection with the local community. Among various types of world heritages, historic villages and cities are distinguished from others for the wide spatial scope, for being the spatial foundation of the local communities and for including the community’s lifestyle in their values. The local community’s role in world heritage conservation is especially important in historic villages and cities compared to other types of heritages.

Firstly, this paper explores the relationship of the world heritage and the local community in historic villages and cities in the present era. Based on the discussion, it touches upon the desirable roles of the local community in world heritage conservation, the conservation methods for communities to be involved and the approaches to such methods. When a historic village or a city is inscribed on the World Heritage List, it has the positive effects of pride for the local community and increased tourism income. However, it may also result in difficult issues as residents taking closed attitudes towards visitors, conflicts from contrasting opinions of the community and the outsiders such as the central and local governments and discord within the community itself. Here, the focus will be on identifying the local community’s role in world heritage conservation, directed to resolve such conflicts and issues.

Local communities and global citizens, local and world heritages

Let’s first look at the forms of relationship and the desirable relationship between a world heritage and the local community. In the era of globalization, individuals cannot entirely stay in the position as a local community member since many aspects of life occur at a global scale, outside local boundaries. Thus, an individual is needed to be in positions as a local community member and as a global citizen at the same time. When a local community member is interested, and directly and indirectly involved in the universal issues of humankind with a mind open to the world, he/she becomes a global citizen beyond the boundaries of a specific village or city.

World heritages are also in the same situation in this era. A local heritage that is acknowledged for outstanding universal value is inscribed on the World Heritage List, thus becoming the heritage of both the local community and the global citizens. A local heritage can be a world heritage only when it has both the locality and the universality. Here, locality refers to the properties that have significance and value in a particular region, i.e. properties related to the local community. On the other hand, universality refers to the properties that have significance and value for all humankind, not limited to a specific region. Due to the universality of having the values universal to humankind despite the location of the heritage in a certain region, global citizens accept the heritages spatially far away as being related to themselves and local community members become interested in the values universal to humanity. In general, the visual elements of the heritage such as the physical aspects and the mode realizing the non-physical aspect assume locality. Meanwhile, universality frequently refers to the significance and values universal to humankind embedded in the visual elements.

In this respect, world heritages serve as mediums linking local community members to global citizens and global citizens to specific regions. If a local community member lives in a historic village or a city inscribed on the World Heritage List, they can be positioned as global citizens by sharing the
perception of the significance and values universal to humankind with the global citizens.

At this point, the issue arises on whether it is possible for the insiders (local community members) and the outsiders (global citizens) to actually share the significance and the values of the heritage. World heritages were neither made nor used by the current local community members but has been built on the frames formed over a long period by ancestors from the pre-modern era. In particular, the East Asian region experienced a huge shift in its lifestyle and the value system in the modern times and thus, the current local community members should also learn about the significance and value of the world heritage through education and the local cultures passed down. World heritages are the objects of learning and interpretation even to the local community. The matters regarding how the local community is interpreting the value of its region as a world heritage, whether community members share such perception and whether that perception can be shared with global citizens are crucial in seeking ways for local communities to be involved in world heritage conservation.

In the past, East Asian villages or cities were persistent based on the shared understanding and interpretation of the villages or the cities by local communities. The fengshui theory, which symbolically interprets the landscape and space worked as the basis for such shared recognition. However, it became difficult to share the symbolism and meaning of the landscape or space in the present-day society with various value systems, but without the framework or theory of the interpretation. Without a shared perception, however, it is not possible to feel the internal need to conserve the landscape or space. Therefore, the prerequisite for the local community to participate in and contribute to the conservation of historic villages and cities is the shared acknowledgement on the dwelling space by community members.

Even if the local community internally shares the understanding of the world heritage, conflicts may also arise regarding the object and method of conservation in case outsiders such as the government or global organizations have different views from the local community’s common understanding. Many conflicts around world heritage conservation today seem to occur when outsiders lead the conservation activities based on their understanding and interpretation. Under such circumstances, local community members are alienated from their own local heritage and become confused about being global citizens. Thus, the starting point for local communities to participate in and contribute to world heritage conservation is to share the understanding and interpretation on the significance and values of the heritages with outsiders. This is possible through communication between local communities and outsiders. Considering that an amicable communication is possible through actual encounters, the next section will touch upon ways for the local community and the outsiders to get together.

**Using and experiencing world heritages**

It is only fair that no heritage can be used without being conserved. Then, is it a must for conserving the heritage? Let’s look at this matter in connection with the local communities.

The fact that the place a community exists is a world heritage contributes to the pride of the community members and increases the sense of belonging and affection for it. The story becomes different when the world heritage is visited and used by the outsiders before the local community is
fully prepared.

World heritages are the most attractive must-visit destinations and the targets of cultural tourism. Once a place becomes inscribed on the World Heritage List, many outsiders swarm the dwelling spaces of the local community and use them in different ways from the norms of spatial use of the local community without understanding them. The outsiders’ visit and use cause inconveniences to the daily lives of the local community. They violate the privacy and pollute the living environment with noise and waste. Local community members suffer damages from the world heritage itself. The discontent becomes greater in case the profits are not equally distributed to the community members if the visits and use are charged.

Hence, an established set of standards is required for the visits and use by outsiders. This paper points out that such standards should be associated with how the local community uses the heritage. In other words, the outsiders’ visit and use of the heritage can be controlled and smoothly accepted only when the local community uses its world heritage in an appropriate manner.

The local community members will be able to understand the practical values as well as the symbolic ones of the heritage through their own proper utilization. They will also be motivated to exert active efforts in conserving the heritages that have a variety of values. While the local community deserves to utilize the world heritage, there should be certain restrictions. The use of the heritage should be limited to activities conforming to the symbolism, significance, and the values of the heritage. Such activities include continuing the activities historically accommodated by the heritage, those carried out for the public interest of the community or helping to strengthen the sense of community. It is also important for the local community to have an open heart to share the activities with outsiders.

Generally, it is not desirable to use the heritage aiming for short-term profits. In a longer-term perspective, heritages have educational, environmental, cultural, aesthetic, historical and social values, all with much more significance than the economic value. Approaching a heritage only in the economic aspect may lead to weaker sense of community and internal conflict. The economic values should be accepted as a derivative value of the heritage, not an intrinsic one.

The outsiders should change their perception of seeing heritages merely as objects of visual admiration to objects of experience. Outsiders can learn about the values of world heritages and accept them as something related to their existence through experiences. If heritages are limitedly accepted as objects of visual admiration, the local community members will also be a part of the visual admiration and the separation between the insider (subject) and the Outsider (observer) will become sharper. It will result in an undesirable situation of the insiders becoming “others” by global citizens due to the world heritage.

The experience of the outsiders should not be activities by themselves only. It is advisable that the experiences should occur with outsiders being involved in the activities of the local community in a specific heritage. At that moment, outsiders temporarily become the members of the local community and strengthen the activities of the community. This integration of the local community’s utilization and the outsiders’ experiences removes the boundary between insiders and outsiders, enabling the outsiders to learn the true value of the heritage and the local community members to share the understanding of the universal value of the heritage by meeting and communicating with the outsiders. This is a useful channel for the local community members to
become global citizens.

Figure 1. Residents’ ritual and visitors’ experience
(Demonstration of the memorial services of Yangjin-dang (Yangjin residence) at Hahoe Village)

The changeability and constancy of the world heritage

All heritages have both changeability and constancy. Generally, the formal and technical aspects tend to be changeable with the times whereas the meaning, internal structure or the spiritual aspects tend to be constant. If the value of the world heritage is sought for through visual elements, the range of acceptance towards changeability can only be minimal. This range can expand if the value is sought for through the system of symbol or meaning.

This matter can also be linked to the local community. It has been pointed out that the visual elements of the heritage and its internal meaning and values are more related to locality and universality, respectively. Ironically however, there is a tendency that the local community understands the heritage as a system of symbol or meaning while the outsiders see it as a visual object. The insiders are accustomed to the appearance the heritage and accept it as natural scenery in their daily lives, whereas outsiders are easily fascinated by the visual aspect of the heritage but have difficulties in understanding the internal meaning and the values. This difference between insiders and outsiders in accepting the world heritage results in the differences in their attitudes towards conservation. And this may cause conflicts between the local community and the outsiders regarding the conservation methods of the heritage being still used as a setting for living, such as historic villages and cities.

Since the internal significance and values of world heritages are indivisible from the visible elements, the scope of changeability should be limited to a certain level to sustain the universal value. Above all, in historical villages and cities occupying wide territories, local communities are recommended to divide the world heritage site into several districts, to set various scopes of change for each district and reach a consensus on this matter.

Local communities with strong sense of community will easily achieve such consensus. The problem here is that the solidarity of local communities in the current society, whether in a historic village or a historic city, is not as strong as was in the traditional society. The existence of local communities faded over time since the modern era especially in historic cities. Local communities constantly
change by the members moving in and out or through the generational shift. Under such circumstances, even local communities need to learn the world heritage in their region. Learning about the local world heritage together is a good way to recover and maintain the solidarity of the ever-changing communities. New community members will be able to put their own meaning by learning about the local world heritage. Education for young members is particularly important and it is desirable for the elder members to be in charge of the education than the external experts. Such education and communication among generations enable the persistence of the symbol and significance of the heritage. This persistence is the strongest motive and impetus required for local communities to conserve the heritages.

Ways for local communities to participate in the conservation of the world heritage

In order to find ways for local communities to participate in the conservation of the world heritage, it is necessary to first define the local community directly related to a certain heritage. The spatial scope of the community should be confirmed and the characteristics of the members should be understood. These characteristics include demographic, socio-cultural and economic features. In case of Korea, a historic village can be considered as a community space. On the other hand, it is more complicated to define the local communities of historic cities since they are made up of many communities with different spatial scopes and characteristics.

Based on the definition of the local community of each world heritage, the relationship between the community and the world heritage should be identified. Some communities exist in a close relationship with the heritage while others may simply be located near the heritage without any special relationship. The former has higher possibility of local communities leading conservation activities whereas the latter has limited scope of contribution to them.

It is crucial in the conservation of the heritage for local communities to constantly relate to the heritage through the daily activities and consistently share the symbolism and meaning of the heritage. The basis for local communities to be involved in the conservation of the heritage is to set an intimate relationship between the community and the heritage so that the heritage is meaningful in the daily lives of the community. Various programs should be devised to increase the accessibility to the heritage and to put important meaning in the daily lives of the local community. The community members will cherish the physical and spatial aspects as well as the symbolic and cultural values when the heritage is related to the existence of the community and also feel the need to sustain both aspects of the heritage. The realistic methods for local communities to take the lead in the conservation of the heritage will only be found through such motivation.

For local communities to actively participate in and contribute to the conservation of the heritage, it is advisable to have a system for the communities to be involved in the early stages of decision-making and system setup for the conservation of the world heritage, from the preparation stage for the inscription on the List of the World Heritage, if possible. It will be difficult for the community to be motivated to participate in the conservation activities if it is excluded from the decision-making process regarding the conservation.

As a suggestion, it is necessary to reflect the local community’s territorial recognition of the heritage as a living circle and a meaning system in setting the core and buffer zones of the heritage than to
rely on the external expert’s view emphasizing the visual influence. The community members’ perception of the area related to the heritage can be identified through diverse research techniques such as the cognitive mapping method. If we see the world heritage as an object of experiencing values and not of visual admiration, the spatial recognition of the local community is an important factor.

The local community should also take part in the substantial issues of heritage conservation. It is best for the local community to directly be in charge of the repair and maintenance of the heritage as far as possible through the cooperation of the members. Local communities may establish a social enterprise comprising of the members, allocating the tasks and fostering the expertise. This will contribute greatly to reflect the local technologies in conserving the heritage and to pass down such technologies. If the local community uses its transmitted local technologies to repair and maintain the heritage, it will increase the physical durability and maintain the authenticity of the heritage. Considering that the community members’ participation in the construction activities worked as a factor to sustain the community itself in the traditional society, it will be beneficial to strengthen the ties of the community.

The repair and maintenance of the heritage are likely to be the soundest in case the party occupying and using the heritage directly carries out such activities. The level of satisfaction of the local community regarding the heritage will improve as well. In this aspect, we must reconsider cases where the outsiders conduct and bear the costs of the maintenance work and the local community simply supervises the process. Moreover, repair and maintenance work of the heritage is labor-intensive and thus, can create jobs for the local society if the community takes the lead in maintaining the heritage. These activities will enable the community members to recognize the positive effect of the heritage conservation to the local economy.

Figure 2. Hahoe villagers repairing the walls
Further tasks and suggestions

The aforesaid relationship between the local community and the conservation of world heritage can be depicted in the diagram below. The diagram shows that the local community should be leading both the conservation and utilization of the world heritage. This is how local community members can become global citizens and is also the starting point for resolving the issues and conflicts regarding world heritages:

If so, what motives and foundation should be prepared for the local communities to actively participate in the tasks?

Recognizing the fact that they can become global citizens by sharing the understanding of the outstanding universal value of the world heritage with the outsiders can be an important motive for the local community members to be involved in the heritage conservation activities. It is essential that the local community members share the understanding that world heritage is not an asset for a particular region but a precious asset with a significance for a dignified living of all human kind including the community members. The local community will be able to take pride in contributing to human kind by conserving its local world heritage.

The local community alone cannot actively conserve the world heritage. The roles of the local community and the local and central governments should be redefined and a consultative body should be organized to establish a local-community-led governance structure. The governance structure must be different depending on the characteristics of the community. What is important in any structure is that the local community should take the actual lead as to prevent being alienated from the heritage and to provide a clue to untangle the issues and conflicts from the conservation. The heritage utilization method of the local community mentioned earlier is important in this aspect. Last but not least, all strategies for the world heritage conservation should contribute to stronger ties
and capabilities of the local communities. As is the case with most areas, the best way to improve the capabilities of local communities to conserve the world heritage is to build up the experience and foster the expertise through actual practice. The local and central governments should devise a system for the local community to be directly involved in conserving the heritage. If the institutional system regarding the world heritage focused on restrictions and external support for conservation up to now, there should be supporting systems to strengthen the conservation capabilities of the local communities through actual practices.
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Abstract

The heritage of the Kathmandu Valley that was predominantly created between the 13th and 18th century is ascribed to the Newars. The strong social integrity within the Newari community was largely due to the socio-religious organizations called Guthis. Land donated to the Guthis would generate the resources required to maintain the particular monument and ensure the continuation of rites and rituals associated with it. Most Guthis were nationalized in 1964 under the Guthi Corporation Act, which soon lead to them becoming dysfunctional due to mismanagement and the lack of resources.

The Kathmandu Valley was inscribed in 1979 as a single World Heritage property comprising of seven monument zones. In 2003, the Kathmandu Valley was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to uncontrolled development and loss of historic urban fabric. The management of the World Heritage property was improved by preparing and adopting the Integrated Management Framework which was based on the principle of devolution of powers and the involvement of the community in the management process. The involvement of a community that is undergoing massive demographic changes requires new management tools and structures. The lessons learnt in Kathmandu Valley can be a basis for establishing management systems for living World Heritage properties in the region.
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Introduction

Living cultural heritage properties are dependent on ensuring that the community that created and maintained the heritage over the centuries continues to do so while adapting to unavoidable changing circumstances. This requires the involvement of the community in the process of conservation, for the community and its activities are part of the attributes that give value to the heritage. This is definitely also the case with World Heritage properties.

Over the past decades, the understanding of cultural heritage has changed dramatically. The understanding of conservation began with a clearly monument-centric concept of heritage, focusing on preserving the tangible remains in whatever state it might have been found. The context and function was then considered to be an integral part of the heritage. New types of cultural heritage have been included in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Three categories of Cultural Landscapes are given: “landscape designed and created intentionally by man”, “organically evolved landscape” and “associative cultural landscape”. Three categories of historic towns are given: “towns no longer inhabited”, “inhabited historic towns” and “new towns of the twentieth century”. There are also Heritage Canals and Heritage Routes and in addition to these, Industrial Heritage has also been considered for inscription. The discussion on tangible cultural heritage has been further linked to the discussions on intangible heritage and cultural diversity.

With the inclusion of a complex array of properties on the World Heritage List, it has become clear that a more integrated approach to conservation is required. Conservation needs to become sustainable. This requires the consideration of present day realities, economic feasibility and social benefits. Especially within properties which are still being used or are inhabited, community involvement becomes paramount for the success of any conservation efforts. The community would not only be allowed to participate in the decision making process, but awareness building, education on heritage conservation and training of specialists and managers have also become vital components.

Kathmandu Valley was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 when the understanding of heritage conservation was still kept vague. By the time the property was put on the Danger List, an entirely new approach was needed to address the management issues arising from an urban site under great pressures of development. The traditional approach of restricting conserving to specific monuments that was carried out by a group of specialists without involvement of the local community was not going to work. The Integrated Management Framework that was developed between 2004 and 2007 envisaged a clear position of the community in participating in safeguarding the World Heritage property.

Inscription and Danger-Listing

The Kathmandu Valley used to be a lake which ruptured due to earthquakes some 25,000-30,000 years ago. This has been recorded in the ancient texts of the Swayambhu Purana as the kingdom of the water serpents Naga-Vasa-Hrada. The fact that the valley used to be a lake has had a great influence not only in creating the natural environment within the valley, but also the culture of the inhabitants. The historical timeline begins with the Kirati era (300 BC – 78 AD), followed by the
Lichchhavi Period (78 - 880 AD), a Transitional Period (880 – 1147 AD), the Malla Period (1147 – 1768) and the Shah-Rana period 1768 – 1950 AD). In contrast to Samarkand which was in the centre of the rise and fall of empires, Nepal has always been on the fringe of history. The Himalayas have been both a climatic barrier as well as a cultural barrier where the amalgamation of cultures has taken place on the fringes of the civilizations of Indian and China.

Kathmandu Valley was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979, as a ‘multiple resource nomination’, referring to the seven monument zones. The monument zones of Kathmandu Valley were considered to be of outstanding universal value (OUV) based on three criteria, which were at the time of inscription defined as follows: (iii) Be unique, extremely rare, or of great antiquity, (iv) be among the most characteristic examples of a type of structure, the type representing an important cultural, social, artistic, scientific, technological or industrial development and (vi) be most importantly associated with ideas or beliefs, with events or with persons, of outstanding historical importance or significance. The description of the property was summarized as: ‘At the crossroads of the great civilizations of Asia, seven group of Hindu and Buddhist monuments, as well as the three residential and palace areas of the royal cities of Kathmandu, Patan and Bhaktapur, illustrate Nepalese art at its height. Among the 130 monuments are pilgrimage centres, temples, shrines, bathing sites and gardens - all sites of veneration for both religious groups.’

The preparation of the nomination document and the subsequent inscription of the Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage were the outcome of various studies that were carried out during the 1970’s. In contrast to the studies, the nomination document seems to reflect a very conservative and cautious approach in defining the elements that are of OUV and that make up the World Heritage property. Importance seems to have been given more to the 132 listed monuments than to the overall context of the monument zones. The definition of the property does not seem to have been specific enough, and the attached maps were not referred to in later planning procedures.

The monuments are located within the specific context of the monument zones, which clearly contributes to their identity. The monument zone boundaries were to include a sufficient area to safeguard the context of the monument. In addition to areas with direct physical and visual linkages to the main monuments, areas with intangible linkages and urban fabric that contribute to the overall value of the monument zone were to be considered for inclusion either within the boundary or at least within the buffer zone.

The Kathmandu Valley World Heritage Site is a testimony to the unique "Newari Culture" which is still alive today. The cultural traditions of the multi-ethnic people who settled in this remote Himalayan valley over the past two millennia, referred to as the Newars, is manifested in the unique urban society which boasts of one of the most highly developed craftsmanship of brick, timber and bronze in the world. The Kathmandu Valley World Heritage Site is comprised of exceptional architectural typologies, ensembles and urban fabric which illustrate the highly developed culture of the Kathmandu Valley which reached an apogee between 1500 and 1800 AD. The exquisite examples of palaces complexes, ensembles of temples and stupas are unique to the Kathmandu Valley. The Kathmandu Valley World Heritage Site is tangibly associated with the unique coexistence and
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amalgamation of Hinduism and Buddhism with animist rituals and Tantrism. The symbolic and artistic values are manifested in the ornamentation of the buildings, the urban structure and often the surrounding natural environment, which are closely associated with legends, rituals and festivals.\(^3\)

With uncontrolled urban growth within the valley, concerns arose for the preservation of the monument zones. Already in 1992, the possibility of danger listing was contemplated. After years of discussing the status of the Kathmandu Valley, in 2003 at the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee, the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to partial or significant loss of traditional vernacular heritage since the time of inscription resulting in a general loss of authenticity and integrity of the property as a whole. As a precondition for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the State Party was recommended to legally redefine the core and support (buffer) zones of all monument zones based on the remaining outstanding universal value, accompanied with management mechanisms to adequately conserve the remaining World Heritage values of the property in the long-term. The State Party was also recommended to consider new criteria and an appropriate name.\(^4\)

The redefinition of the monument zone boundaries requires a clear understanding of the preconditions under which the property was inscribed, when nomination procedures were far less comprehensive. Over time, the perception of a World Heritage property as well as the local conditions and community involvement have undergone tremendous changes.

**Defining the Community**

The population within the Kathmandu Valley is changing dramatically with a high migration rate from all over the country. Kathmandu has recorded the highest decadal population growth (60.93 % 2001-2011) within the country which is about four times the national average. This has lead to changes in the demography within the valley with the community losing its cultural homogeneity. The average household size in Kathmandu has decrease to 3.71, far below the national average of 4.70, showing the dissolution of the extended family.

The heritage of the Kathmandu Valley that was created between the 13th and 18th century is ascribed to the Newars. During this period the inhabitants of the valley comprising of immigrants of diverse groups, were moulded into a strong ‘cultural entity’ under pressure from the foreign ruling class. The Newars are considered to be the indigenous inhabitants of the Kathmandu Valley, though their origin is unknown. Until the latter Malla period, the Newars were mainly Buddhist, but as the immigration of the Brahmins and the Chhetris increased, the social hierarchical order of the caste system was introduced and today the Hindu-Newars are a majority. The tolerance and acceptance of the different beliefs and customs have brought about the unique characteristics of the Newars to take part in each other’s festivals and celebrations, though each group has its own distinct rituals. Buddhism which must have been brought from North India during the Mauryan period was greatly influenced by the changes Buddhism went through in Tibet, where, mixing with their mystic and animistic beliefs, Vajrayana Buddhism was developed. Hinduism also went through a process of
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change in early times with followers of Vaishnavism dominated the valley and only after the Pashupati temple was build did Shaivism gain in importance and simultaneously adopt many tantric practices.

Through specialisation and surplus production, an urban culture was developed which influenced the settlement pattern. The Newari settlements were compact with a regular order which was adapted to the topography. The narrow streets were lined with three to four storied buildings forming a distinct representative street façade. The central area was usually an open space where the temples and a pond were situated. Since the fertile lower land next to the river was reserved for cultivation, the settlements were usually built on higher go

The traditional setting of compact settlements was created on the elevated land, the ‘tars’, leaving the low land and flood plains, the ‘dol chetra’ for agriculture. The Newari culture was defined by the contradiction between the highly developed urban culture, as well as a highly developed farming culture. The amalgamation of Hinduism and Buddhism into their social structure again shows this unique trait. The Newars’ religion and festivals, which were very much based on the farming culture, was however manifested in the urban setting. A ring of protective deities defined the boundaries of the settlements, beyond which where the terraced fields. The Newari buildings followed set norms. There was uniformity in form and materials used. A clear hierarchy of building heights existed, defined by the temples. The settlements were developed for pedestrian use, allowing for access through the inner courtyards. Most of the listed monuments and their surrounding context were created during the Malla period which reached an apogee between 1500 and 1800 AD.

**Traditional Community-Based Conservation**

The strong social integrity within the Newari community was largely due to the socio-religious organizations called Guthis. ‘Guthis are of three types: religious, functional and social.’ \(^5\) All community work and activities were organized in the form of Guthis and the social network formed by these organizations ensured the upkeep of religious, social and cultural activities and traditions. ‘The network of such Guthi institutions bound the Newars together at the three levels of caste, patri-linear grouping and territory’. \(^6\)

One very particular form of Guthi was the one established for the maintenance and upkeep of temples and community buildings. When these buildings were built, the patrons or financiers would donate land which would be the source of income for the maintenance of the buildings. The income would also cover the related festivals and rituals. This system of sustainable conservation probably began as early as the Lichchhavi Period (78 - 880 AD), but was well established and highly developed by the latter part of the Malla Period (1147 – 1768).

A Guthi is essentially a common interest group with collective responsibilities and privileges devised to enable the individual or group of the society to fulfill his many socio-religious obligations through group action. The founders of a Guthi usually donate some property as an endowment and the revenue generated from tilling this land would go towards the maintenance of that particular
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building and the continuation of other rites and rituals associated with it. The conservation practiced through the Guthi system is at the root of the large inherited culture of the valley. However, the process of modernisation has also affected this culture resulting in the loss of Guthi land, the main source of income for these trusts to organize and manage their heritage. With the introduction of Land Reform and Guthi Corporation, the Guthi land further dwindled and the centralized system of management replaced the decentralized autonomous system of management. Thus only a few these Guthis are today functioning in its original form.

**Nationalizing Community Activity**

The patronage to the Guthis was often performed by the royal families, even during the Malla period. However it was during the period of when the Rana prime ministers were in power, the late 19 and early 20 century, that a separate office was established to maintain records of Guthi land. This was the beginning of direct government involvement in the Guthi system. This was seen as a political move to reduce the powers of the Newar community.

The Guthi Corporation was established in 1964, consolidating all Guthis to a centrally organized unit. The Guthi Corporation was mainly formed to administer the lands belonging to the Guthis. The Guthi Corporation was to preserve cultural heritage, monuments, religious buildings, ancient ornaments and articles of religious and cultural importance along with the task of ensuring that religious rites and festivals are performed. The act also prohibits sale of land belonging to temples or spaces for public festivals and worship. There are mainly three types of Guthi land. Tainathi land was the land owned by the corporation itself, from the time of its establishment. Mohi land was the land belonging to the Guthi, but tilled by the mohi for which he paid kut, a kind of tax in the form of actual cultivation or its equivalent sum of money. Then there was Guthi raitan land which was Guthi land turned into private land by paying a fixed percentage of the land value to the Guthi after which the owner only paid the yearly land tax.7

The Guthis used to be run by the community. Once the Guthis were nationalized to be part of the Guthi Corporation, they lost their traditional identity and have become to a large degree non-operational. The income from the land became insufficient to run the corporation due to encroachment and illegal sale of Guthi land, lack of adjustment of taxes to inflation, increased overhead costs and expenses for special materials and labour required for festivals. For example for the Macchindranath festival special rope is needed to construct the chariots, which is not available in Nepal any more. The community members responsible for the construction of the chariots have a monopoly and demand high remuneration for their work. Additionally, when the chariot is pulled around the city, it often topples over damaging nearby buildings. Traditionally this was considered good luck; however today even for minor damages compensation is demanded.

The lack of clarity in function and ownership has raised concerns. The Guthi Corporation has taken over certain community responsibilities but is not in a position to raise the required resources to implement their duties. On the other hand, the Ancient Monument Preservation Act 1956 has empowering the Department of Archaeology for the government to take over responsibilities for any building or ensemble that is over a hundred years old.
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The Integrated Management Plan (IMP)

Management Plans of World Heritage properties are not plans but frameworks and processes with the objective to safeguard the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property. Management deals with site issues and their responding actions. The traditional management systems that control the actions taking place on site are often not functioning. This means that a new system is required which ensures that information on the key issues are fed into the management frameworks (institutional, legal and economic) so that decisions are taken that ensure appropriate actions on site. The Integrated Management Framework for the Kathmandu Valley was passed by the highest authority, the cabinet of the Government of Nepal. It must be ensured that the management process addresses the site specific issues. Management systems are based on two components: processes (series of actions, decisions and controls based on a flow of information) and frameworks (pre-established institutional, legal and economic parameters for the processes).

The process of preparing and establishing the management system was carried out between 2004 and 2007. The Management Plan was prepared by the authorities of the State Party, facilitated by the author, in close cooperation with the International Technical Advisor Prof. Herb Stovel and Ms Junko Okahashi from the World Heritage Centre. There was positive review on the process of establishing the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) for Kathmandu Valley. “In brief, the establishment of the IMP of the Kathmandu Valley could be seen as a model process for all World Heritage Management Plans. It is not a study document to describe the site or to provide ideals for the site-management, but has gone through a thorough process of site-based information gathering and commitment by the concerned site-management authorities, and the draft has incorporated the viewpoints and realistic possibilities of the complex management structure.”  

This then lead to the removal of Kathmandu Valley from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007.

The preparation of the IMP began with a workshop on 1 August 2005 with the title ‘Community and Conservation’. This laid the foundations for understanding the World Heritage property as a living heritage site and the following statement became the basis for establishing the management system for the property. ‘The primary objective of the Integrated Management of the Seven Monument Zones of the Kathmandu Valley is to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property as well as the locally recognised heritage values, while taking into account the standard of living, safety and economic viability of the community living within the World Heritage property.’

The principles that were to be observed in achieving the management goals were: significance-driven, integrated approach, process oriented, bottom-up approach, promote local empowerment and socially and economically sustainable.

All the component of the monument zones that are not directly owned, maintained and managed by the Department are subjected to the decisions made by the community or individuals. Conservation of private property and urban fabric can only succeed when the community gets involved. A traditional homogeneous community will have inbuilt controls or customs to deal with the upkeep and development of their area. Even though the Guthi system has ceased to function, especially since most Guthi land was nationalized in 1964, the community has replaced this structure with
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contemporary forms of community institutions. These contemporary community institutions have generally adapted to the changes in the community, even in the highly heterogeneous urban communities.

One of the constitutional rights of the Nepalese is to own land. This is understood as the owner to have absolute rights over the usage of the land, leading to judicial complications. The courts often give priority to the rights of the individuals over regulations placed on the land. It is therefore difficult to control illegal construction by making the owners responsible. It is only through community participating that such issues can be addressed.

**Outcome of the workshop on Community and Conservation**

During the initial workshop on “Community and Conservation”, representatives of the local authorities, various community leaders and leading experts in the field of conservation were invited to define the status of community involvement in the preservation of the World Heritage property. The outcome of the workshop was a general understanding of the present state of cooperation between the stakeholders and specifically the position of the community in decision-making and implementing conservation related activities.

As previously noted, there has been a long history of community based conservation and maintenance of important religious and community buildings. The Newari community had two days allocated, one just before and one right after the rainy season, for cleaning and maintaining public spaces, temples, water spouts, which included the oiling of timber and stone and the uprooting of vegetation from the buildings and traditional roofs. Such activities were organized by the Guthis. Since most Guthis were nationalized, the Guthi Corporation owns most major monuments but does not have the resources to maintain and restore the monuments especially without community support. The conservation of intangible heritage such as the festivals, rituals and handicrafts is carried out directly by the community.

The lack of clarity concerning the rights and responsibilities of the various authorities has been a major hurdle in developing the cooperation between the authorities and the community. This has been further aggravated by the lack of elected members to the local bodies due to the on-going political transformations. Even the related legislation has overlapping in defining the responsible authorities and their powers which lead to long drawn legal proceedings detrimental to the smooth functioning and cooperation between the authorities and the community members.

The laws on conservation and appropriate utilization of protected monument zones must be such that all government authorities must comply. For example this would mean that no army or police vehicles would be allowed to enter the monument zone areas that are designated as pedestrian. The flouting of such regulations by certain authorities reduces the credibility of the conservation planning provisions. This contradicts the implementation of regulations carried out on illegal buildings which is often heavy handed, alienating the community. The laws and regulations don’t take into account the difficulties in estimating and implementing restoration projects. Regulations on seismic stability does not allow for load bearing structures taller than three floors, making reconstruction using reinforced concrete easier.
As per the Department of Archaeology, the involvement of the community in restoration works depends on the type of monument. For local monuments and vernacular architecture the community can establish a user committee which works under the direct supervision of the related government authority. The establishment of the community user committee at an early stage with regular interaction with the community helps develop mutual consensus and an amicable working condition. It was noted that financial transparency and accountability is critical for successful community based conservation projects. The donations by community members must be acknowledged and the result clearly shown. Often local people are not interested in participating in a user committee since they fear that they would be responsible for any mismanagement or to pay for any increase in costs. Such fears need to be eradicated by clarifying the procedures beforehand. The community members today have a lifestyle that often does not allow for them to contribute their time. As farmers, the off-season was used to contribute to community activities. This is often not possible anymore; however people might provide funds instead. They must however be ensured that these funds are utilized correctly.

The community often would like to make changes to the monument to strengthen or add elaborate ornamentation. This usually needs to be regulated or negotiated between the local committee and the authorities. The adaptive reuse of historic buildings as restaurants, guest houses or even shops must be supported, allowing for some degree of changes to accommodate the new functions. The future sustainability of the monuments must be taken into account when planning and preparing the conservation project.

Complicated procedures within the government authorities lead to delays and mismanagement. The procedures for obtaining permission to carry out conservation or development work within the protected monument zones are so tedious that they are often circumvented. The procedures themselves are often not effective in what they were set up to achieve. Effective, streamlined and clear government procedures are essential for community groups and house owners to participate in the conservation effort.

There are no incentives for the community or individual owners of historic buildings for conservation. Tax breaks and free municipal services could be provided to those who want to conserve their buildings. People are usually reluctant to receive incentives because the procedures are often long and tedious and the then they believe that they are additionally scrutinized and harassed by the authorities. Incentives must however also ensure that they achieve what they set out to do. Certain incentives such as the municipal supply of traditional brick, tiles and wood for the reconstruction of buildings in a traditional form as defined in the building bylaws has the detrimental effect of historic buildings being demolished instead of being conserved.

The support of local craft-persons who still have the traditional knowledge of building and restoring is essential. This is the only means for the built heritage to survive over the generations. The constant training of essential crafts-persons is required such as masons, wood carvers, carpenters and metal-workers, ideally in the traditional system of apprenticeships. It is also essential that the know-how of producing the local materials is preserved. This is the case for example of ornate bricks and tiles. The availability of required materials such as specific stone and wood must be secured. These are all activities that would be carried out by the community.
The communities within the monument zones of the World Heritage property are changing. In such places as Baudhanath and Hanuman Dhoka, the community has become greatly heterogeneous with different ethnic groups, cultures and creeds. That makes it increasingly difficult to address all their concerns from a single platform. The imposing of regulations and monitoring of the developments by the higher authorities has not been affective. Only the community leaders and local authorities can negotiated an appropriate level of conservation of the urban fabric in the highly commercial areas around the main monuments.

There are various aspects of ownership of historic buildings that have been critical for the conservation of the objects. Multiple owners have lead to conflicts concerning the maintenance and upkeep of the buildings. Another critical aspect is the disastrous custom of vertical divisions of the buildings when splitting up the property between the inheritors. Regulations and procedures are needed to address these critical issues.

Illegal activities such as demolition of historic buildings or construction of inappropriate new buildings have often been dealt heavy-handedly by the officials. This has not always lead to effective solutions. There clearly needs to be more direct involvement of community groups leading to the community members being convinced of the importance of conserving heritage. Conservation must be a public concern where the individual community members contribute to the overall interest.

Management Issues and Objectives to Empowering the Community

The preparation of the Integrated Management Framework document focused on three main aspects of management: defining the property, defining the management frameworks and defining the management processes. This required the initial assessment of all issues that needed to be addressed through this process. There were several important points concerning the involvement of the community which was to become the basis for the overall approach to improving the management of the property.

The administering of the World Heritage property directly by the central authorities, which meant the Department of Archaeology was not seen as being feasible and appropriate. The main concern was that the Department of Archaeology was not in a position to liaison and interact with the community and the local inhabitants. This required the devolution of powers to the authorities at the lowest level and closest to the community. By including the local government of the seven monument zones in the management of the property, a more complicated management structure was created. It was therefore also necessary to allow the individual monument zone managers to function with certain autonomy while allowing for regular coordination through a newly established Coordinative Working Committee (CWC). The CWC was to organize regular meetings with the community of the individual monument zones in rotational basis. This allowed the community to express its concerns directly to the site managers, while the site managers of the other monument zones participated to ensure coordination over the entire World Heritage property.

Four clear management objectives were identified under the category of “Community and Awareness”. (1) Community Conservation Groups were to be established within the World Heritage areas to participate as stakeholders. (2) Awareness was to be created amongst the general public and students on the value of the World Heritage property. (3) Strategies were to be developed for
the sustainable economy of the community within the World Heritage areas without impacting the heritage value. It was also mentioned that the strategy must include that there is maximum profitability for the local community from visitors and tourism. (4) Restoration and maintenance manuals were to be prepared and distributed to owners of historic buildings.

Conclusion

From the case of Kathmandu Valley, there is a clear conclusion that for the long-term sustainability of living cultural heritage properties, it is essential that the community that created and preserved the heritage must continue to be involved in its management. This understanding became the basis for the preparation of the Integrated Management Framework documents which became the basis for the Kathmandu Valley to be taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007.

The link between the heritage property and the community is too complex to allow for generalized guidelines to be developed. Taking the lesson from properties such as the Kathmandu Valley will allow for examples to be presented at the regional level. There are however no specific steps that can be followed to ensure appropriate involvement of the community in management of World Heritage. It might be possible to set up certain principles. The community needs to be defined. It must be noted that there are many heritage properties that have lost the community which created and maintained them over the years. The community must have cultural links to the heritage and there must be a clear understanding of intent in community involvement. The question needs to be answered on why the community should be involved specifically for the individual heritage property.

The link between heritage properties and the community is a relationship that would have developed and been retained over centuries. Where possible this relationship needs to be fostered. Where this relationship has been lost, a new system needs to be developed by either creating a new community with new linkages to the heritage or by establishing a governance system which protects the heritage in spite of the possible enmity of the community. For each specific heritage property, the most appropriate means of community involvement needs to be recognized, established and encouraged.
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Abstract

Within the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras are World Heritage cluster sites acknowledged as outstanding examples of evolved living cultural landscapes covering extensive intact areas of remarkable beauty. They are directly associated with the Ifugao ethnic community who have occupied these mountains for 2 millennia carving them into terraced fields where cultivation continuously extended from generation to generation. The property has been inscribed in 1995 and was placed in the List of WH in Danger in 2001 after having experienced transformations related to socio-economy and the changing lifestyle of the people including climate change resulting to impacts on the landscape and affecting conservation and management. The 36th session of the WH Committee has lifted endangered listing with the removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger greatly attributed to the collaborative efforts extended by the local communities, the State Party and the international community. But challenges prevail, the site being a cultural landscape that is constantly exposed to external pressures including the issues of unpredictable climatic conditions regularly affecting the physical attributes of the place. The local people at the cluster sites have exhibited exemplary perseverance and dedication to maintain their fields and culture despite these continuous impacts, bravely facing the challenges on a day to day basis. They continuously play a key role in the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Values of the property. This paper attempts to cover issues of sustainability, landscape and culture conservation including the up-liftment of the lives of the people living at the Rice Terraces WH cluster sites.

Introduction

In the remote mountains of the northern part of the island of Luzon, Philippine archipelago lie the Philippine Cordilleras, a mountain range where areas have been transformed into rice terraced paddies that age as far back as 2 millennia ago. Within it are five clustered terraces of rice fields which have been recognized by UNESCO as priority sites for WH listing in 1995, with its inscription entitled “The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras.” The cluster sites have been acknowledged as outstanding examples of evolved, living cultural landscapes covering extensive areas of intact terraces of remarkable beauty located in four municipalities in the Province of Ifugao. These clustered terraces are directly associated with the Ifugao ethnic community who have occupied these mountains for thousands of years, carving them into terraced fields where cultivation has since extended continuously, from generation to generation.

Maintenance of the rice terraces exhibits cooperative approaches where the community works by utilizing a traditional systems in agriculture, with full knowledge of the rich diversity of the natural resources existing in the Ifugao agro-ecosystem. The criteria for inscription in the World Heritage List have cited the Rice Terraces as “a dramatic testimony to a community’s sustainable and primarily communal system of rice production, based on harvesting water from the forest clad mountain tops and creating stone terraces and ponds, a system that has survived for two millennia.” It further states that “the rice terraces are a memorial to the history and labour of more than a thousand generations of small-scale farmers who, working together as a community, have created a landscape based on a delicate and sustainable use of natural resources,” and that they are “an outstanding example of land-use that resulted from a harmonious interaction between people and its environment which has produced a steep terraced landscape of great aesthetic beauty, now vulnerable to social and economic changes.”
In 2001, the Rice Terraces WH property was placed in the List of WH in Danger after having experienced transformations related to socio-economy and the changing lifestyle of the people including the effects of climate change resulting to impacts on the landscape and affecting conservation and management. At the 36th session of the WH Committee held in St. Petersburg, Russia, the endangered listing of the property has been lifted and the property now reverted to the normal World Heritage List. Removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger is greatly attributed to the collaborative efforts extended by the local communities, the State Party and the international community, actively working to address the corrective measures identified by UNESCO and the Desired State of Conservation agreed upon by all concerned parties.

Whilst having been removed from the List of WH in Danger challenges prevail, the site being a cultural landscape that is constantly exposed to external pressures including the issues of unpredictable climatic conditions regularly affecting the physical attributes of the place. The local people at the cluster sites have exhibited exemplary perseverance and dedication to maintain their fields and culture despite these continuous impacts, bravely facing the challenges on a day to day basis. It has to be acknowledged that the local communities continuously play a key role in the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Values of the property. While assistance come from outside has been much appreciated and acknowledged to be very helpful in addressing major issues, it is to be noted that the communities working and living within the WH cluster sites are those who actually sustain the OUV of the property.

Following removal of the property from the List of WH in Danger, the issue that prevails at present is the sustainability of the property’s values for the next generations including concerns related to the up-liftment of the lives of the people living at the WH cluster sites. Combined efforts extended by all concerned – the international community and the State Party have led to addressing numerous major landscape issues where the granting of financial and human resources paved way to an improved system of conservation that addresses conservation concerns affecting the physical attributes of the property. However, there are still essential issues that would have to be continuously addressed in the context of sustainable development as the prevailing mode or approach.

The conditions of the site when analyzed through its physical attributes exhibit meeting some of the pillars of sustainable development. There is exists a balance between the intactness of the natural environment and the quantity and quality of built up settlements found in the area. Sustainable Development has been defined by Mostafa Tolba as having “economic growth, social development and environmental protection in order that future generations have the same or better opportunities than the present generations” (Tolba 2004). As one component of the pillars of sustainable development, communities living within WH sites play a vital role in sustaining the Outstanding Universal Values of properties.

For the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, the safeguarding of the OUV of this WH property is assured only through a framework of sustainable development. When a balance is achieved between the three pillars – communities, environment and economy, then the OUV of the property is equally assured. Continuous collaborative partnerships between government, private sector and the communities are important in ensuring sustainability, with the regular updating of management and conservation plans to help ascertain conservation of the OUV of the WH Cluster sites. This has to be undertaken vis a vis a gearing toward the achievement of optimum benefits for the
communities through economically generating but regulated activities. (Mananghaya 2012) To date the pillar on economy has not yet been fully realized, and aspirations to attain better living conditions have yet to be fulfilled for the communities of Ifugao Rice Terraces cluster sites.

The communities of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, the key players in conserving and maintaining the OUV of the WH property

There are five stakeholders considered to be playing important roles in conserving and managing the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras. These are identified in accordance to their level of importance and significance as key actors in ensuring survival and sustainability of the values of the site: 1) the local communities living within the property (farmers and the Barangay officials), 2) the local municipal and the Provincial governments of Ifugao, 3) the concerned National Government Agencies, 4) NGOs and other organizations and conservation practitioners who help monitor the site, and 5) the international community.

First and foremost of these set of stakeholders are the local community members, the people living in the site including the Barangay officials who are farmers working daily for the maintenance of the fields. There are about less than 1,000 – 9,000 people living in each WH cluster site of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras who live in very modest conditions with their houses either traditionally made or of modern materials. They are a simple people whose lives revolve around the maintenance of the fields and its surrounding areas which are cultivated with vegetables, sold on a weekly basis in local markets found at the nearest municipal centre. They are however very proud of their culture and the rice terraces which they see as the iconic expression of their identity as a group of people.

Traditional cooperation prevails in the communities of the WH cluster sites, assuring assistance for major maintenance work as well as during harvest. Cooperation is the key to maintaining the rice terraces, with the performance of the ubbu, baddang and the dang-a facilitating easy maintenance and assuring manageability of tasks in the fields. While intactness of the landscape and the authenticity of values found within are prime considerations of staying in the WH List, the regular maintenance of the fields and the traditional way of the life of the people remains to be the prime vehicle by which the true essence of the WH Convention – ‘conservation’, is achieved.

However, there are pressures affecting the continuous performance of traditions. External influences result to aspirations for a better way of life, and to changing needs. This consequently translates into demands and added requirements of living. As farmers are used to an existence of traditions handed down to them from generations to generations, added modern day pressures affect meeting their everyday needs.

But WH Listing for the people living at the site is perceived not as a burden but as a complementary means to achieve the same end, that which is the conservation and sustainability of heritage. It is seen as well as a means to elevating identity and pride (the Rice terraces) to the international community. WH Listing is further viewed as a means to achieve better quality of life and environment. Benefits associated with inscription in the List of WH in Danger were realized through the financial assistance provided by governments (local and national) and the international community that were made available for the rehabilitation and restoration of major collapsed areas. Potential benefits
from tourism associated with WH Listing can assist in alleviating the present economic conditions of the people.

The second set of stakeholders is the local government – the Municipal and the Provincial governments of Ifugao who are governed of people who are themselves direct stakeholders of the land. Most of the people working for the Ifugao government are owners of fields or have family who own fields. Like the farmers living directly at the terraces, they understand and are sensitive to the issues of the WH cluster sites. And being administrators and WH site managers, the manner by which they address the management issues of the Rice Terraces aligns with the concept of cooperation where all stakeholders help each other to attain common goals.

The many requirements to remove the site from the List of WH in Danger have put pressure on the local governments (municipal and provincial) to positively react and work on the corrective measures. The Provincial government of Ifugao was cognizant to the fact that staying in the List meant supporting the work of the people at the site as well as making sure that the physical attributes of the Rice Terraces stay intact. With the many challenges resulting from climate change such as strong typhoons leading to landslides and the collapse of rice fields, it became apparent for the need for collaborative efforts between the communities at the fields and the local governments. A scheme for the programme of work was thereby devised where support came to the people during major collapses and landslides and these were in the form of ‘funds-for-labor’ or ‘food-for-labor’.

On another aspect, local government found ways by which culture was promoted and linked to national government programs. Produce from cultural industries came into the picture as products that represent the traditional values of the place. It was through these programmes that support was ensured from a much wider audience.

The third type of stakeholder is the National Government and its agencies working in programmes that endeavor to address the needs of the people at the local level. This type of stakeholder ensures that the requirements of UNESCO are filtered down to the level of the local governments and community and that there is collaborative action undertaken amongst all to ensure progress of work. The fourth type of stakeholder are the NGOs and other organizations, as well as conservation experts who assist in monitoring the work, and at the same time attempt to engage in worth-while projects that are aligned with what UNESCO has requested. And the last set of stakeholder is the international community who has actively participated in the conservation process through its oversight monitoring schemes, which greatly assisted in noting the need for resources to support work at the site. It was through this consciousness of the international community that initiatives were catalyzed so that governments as well as international institutions eventually assisted in the support process. Therefore, funds generated by the international agencies significantly contributed in the completion of numerous rehabilitation projects, aiding support of the National Government to the site.
Key issues in the conservation and management of the Rice Terraces and their relation to sustainable development

Being an organically evolving cultural landscape, the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras experience a complex set of issues that can be associated with the extensiveness and size of the property as well as its being exposed to a variety of pressures associated with climate change, technological change, and the prevailing cultural practices of the people, all of which have become a challenge to conservation and management. Notwithstanding the presence of these issues, they do not impede achieving sustainable development for the property. This is because the level of cultural and environmental transformation is still manageable, whilst aspects of economic development maybe improved to benefit the community. The communities play a key part in achieving sustainable development in the Rice Terraces.

Cultural traditions that existed for generations are still very much present while some that have gradually declined in practice due to external pressures, have been revived. Removal of the Rice Terraces WH property from the List of WH in Danger has allowed revitalization of the Ifugao culture and its many manifestations. There has been dynamic ways by which documentation of intangible cultural heritage was undertaken, with the engagement of indigenous knowledge (IK) experts - the elders of the communities who provided information on oral history and traditions. Documentation of IK has allowed a deeper understanding of the cultural practices, and transmission of these to the present and young generation Ifugaos paved way for a better valuing of cultural heritage. Similarly, the proactive way by which the local communities reacted to the revival programs has resulted to reinvigorated cultural practices. These are manifested in more sustained carrying-out of cultural traditions such as the bakle or the harvest festival and other ceremonial activities. Traditional performances that enliven Gotads (festivals) also show of Ifugaos in their best in cultural dances and in the presentation of talents of children i.e. in the chanting the hudhud or the alim. The baki ritual in existence for centuries has also been encouraged and supported by local governments with full participation by the communities. These are performed prior to the conduct of official events as dictated by tradition as well as in community undertakings with local governments greatly assisting in the process.

The environment of the Rice terraces, on the other hand, has experienced some form of transformation that is observed in varying extents. Many areas in the Rice Terraces have remained intact, albeit in some, change is evident to some considerable degree. In areas where transformation is apparent, the need to regulate them has been thought of as imminent. Local communities have a hand in these changes as it is through them that transformations happen. So that to ensure that integrity of the landscape is preserved, UNESCO as well as the Philippine government recommended the preparation of land use and zoning plans that is community based. The Save the Ifugao Terraces Movement (SITMO), a NGO, has been working on this with funding support coming from the National Commission for Culture and the Arts and with full participation by the local communities and the local government. Work in 2 WH sites in the Municipality of Banaue is on-going while initial orientation with the local communities has ensued in other sites as early as 2004. There is positive outlook that these will be completed with the active participation of the local communities who are engaged in the decision making process. It is the people living at the sites who decide which areas they want to be developed for residential settlements, and which are those that want to be retained as rice fields, swidden farms and forests. The process of decisions making is
consultative and there is dynamic dialogue between all parties concerned to ensure that the values of the landscape is retained vis à vis allowing some level of progress for the people living within the property.

Being an indigenous group, the Ifugao people have their own ancestral rights which have prevailed through generations, and this impact on land management. External pressures have resulted to aspirations to improve their present living conditions and differing views as to how the perceived improvement takes place are manifested in the environment. To date, there are less traditional houses while new transformed versions sprout resulting to interesting variances of adaptations that reflect collages of values. The transformations are reflective of the people’s ancestral rights to self determination. Indigenous People’s rights assist in maintaining a balance between a state of sustained progress and overdevelopment. Regulated type of land management prescribed for WH properties such as the CLUZP is being developed and this forms part of what government and UNESCO agreed upon as basis for the removal of the site from the List of WH in Danger. SITMO membership is comprised of dedicated Ifugaos who work for the preservation of the Rice Terraces.

Since there is high respect in land ownership which is well ingrained in ancestral land practices, the participation of people in government initiated moves to ably manage the WH property are considered indispensable. Sustainable development in this case is achieved through the balance that exists between the respect of traditions and such concepts as regulated land use and regulated development.

In all these, monitoring and guidance are highly necessary so that the landscape remains intact. Sustained support from government together with a continuous consciousness to preserve traditional values directly emanating from the local communities themselves ensures success in the work.

The vulnerability of the site to landslides and erosion as a result of prevailing climatic conditions, on the other hand, has impacted on the normal work load of the people living at the property. Where there were less collapses and landslides in the past which enabled predictable flow of work within a yearly cycle, a greater number of landslides happening at present and its extent of damage on the property has put a toll on the local communities who are having a hard time rehabilitating these areas on their own. This is where government support comes in and with it, rehabilitation work can be facilitated. But due to limited resources, work prioritization occurs and support is given to those most needing it, whilst a long term, visionary programming of work is preferred so as to enable better accomplishment vis à vis the provision of sustained resources to the property.

Communities at the Rice Terraces are actually able to meet a quality of life that is founded on traditional standards that they have been used to in the past. However, basing it on certain international standards of what development should be, there is still much to be improved in as much as the living conditions of the people at the Rice Terraces are concerned. The people at the site are at a certain extent satisfied with their present state, but external influences and the modern requirements of living have made them aspire for an ‘improved’ state of life that is based on perceptions of what is better from an outsider’s point of view.

There is limited source of livelihood for the people at the site. Vegetables are cash crops while rice that is harvested from the fields is just enough for family consumption. Most programmes
instituted by the local government to augment the income of the people are meagerly felt and it is up to those willing to take advantage of opportunities. There are certain programmes however, that directly benefit the people. Assistance and support for rehabilitation work of large collapsed areas is an effort that is fully embraced by the people as a means to augment earnings from traditional agricultural livelihood. 50% of the cost of work is supported by the government while the people supply the other 50% counterpart.

Other livelihood programmes supported by the local government range from culturally associated industries (rice wine making, weaving, carving) while some newly instituted programmes such as coffee growing, yu-yu fish growing and others are slowly being felt to assist the people. Tourism is another livelihood potential that may assist the Rice Terraces and the preparation of a Tourism Master Plan is envisioned to help people benefit from this perceived income generating activity.

Universality of issues: those that are generally-shared and those that are locally-specific

There are common issues faced by Cultural Landscape WH properties categorized as living and evolving such as its being constantly exposed to influences and pressures from outside and its ever evolving state where change is prevalent and continuous. Unless the site is remote and inaccessible, communities living in these properties are continually exposed to external influences, leading people to have aspirations that extend more than their present capacity to cope with change. Similarly, people generally desire better quality of life for their families, which exceed what the WH property can offer in terms of meeting aims and goals in life. These aspirations often times lead to local communities migrating out of the WH property to enable the reaching of goals. This context of change therefore can be partly addressed through management approaches such as the provision of livelihood opportunities for the people on a site-based scheme, where benefits are derived from activities conducted at the site itself.

There are also issues that are local and site specific. These are those related to the specific attributes of the Rice Terraces that are being subjected to pressure such as the on-going conversion of some areas from rice fields into house plots, the effect of climate change where landslide and erosion becomes a prevalent problem that has to be constantly addressed, and others.

On Community Involvement Themes and their relationship to heritage conservation and sustainable development

The themes of community involvement in heritage conservation and management can be summed up within the pillars of sustainable development which are as follows: 1) Environment as seen in particular issues of landscape conservation and management - the daily maintenance of the rice fields and irrigation systems, the restoration and rehabilitation of collapsed areas in the rice terraces and the conservation and management of forests and watershed; 2) Culture as seen in the performance of cultural practices – in agriculture and in the everyday life of the ifugao; and 3) Economics as seen in the generation of economic activities for the people.

The role of the communities in the daily maintenance of the fields as well as in their work to preserve their environment has been highlighted in previous parts of this discourse. It is the local
communities living around the fields who directly work on the maintenance of the rice terraces and their actual hands-on work on the fields is the essence of heritage conservation at the Rice Terraces. It is the conduct of daily and sustained maintenance of the rice fields that assures the sustainability of heritage for the long term. Looking at the situation from an impact-consequential point of view, it will be the local communities living within the rice terraces who will positively benefit from the long term conservation of their environment, and who will be negatively affected if efforts to preserve the values of the site are not sustained. Threats to the environment such as the conversion of rice paddies into building plots lead to lesser harvest and will affect the visual integrity of the Rice Terraces. Uncontrolled development would in the end pave way to the ultimate disappearance of the aesthetic values of the landscape and in particular, the rice terraces. Similarly, it is the people living in the fields and their source of livelihood (vegetable planting) that will be directly affected when landslides and erosion occur. Forests and watersheds left in healthy condition and maintained by the community will result to continuous water flow for the irrigation of fields as well as prevent unnecessary erosion and landslides caused by the overharvesting of timber resources. Thus, it is essential for the local communities to continuously maintain their environment in order for sustainable development to exist.

Communities also allow sustainability of traditions through the continuous carrying out of cultural practices. Traditions that stay to the present at the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras are those related to old belief systems, agriculture, marriage and courtship, daily living and death. The Provincial and municipal governments encourage and support continuity of these traditions. Their documentation permits its transmission to the present and next generations.

The creation of economic generating activities has as well been highly encouraged and supported by the local government and welcomed by the people. These are those related to agriculture – farming and vegetable planting and those that are culturally associated (weaving, wood carving, rice wine (baya) making and others). Local government assists in cultural product development and makes available venues and opportunities by which these products are sold. Linkages are also done through the Department of Trade and Industries. Similarly, the operationalization of cooperative systems organized for the continued restoration and rehabilitation of the rice terraces in times of collapse is coordinated through government systems such as the Department of Labor and Employment. New products are also being developed to augment income of the people. Coffee growing in mountainous areas is highly encouraged to assist people in livelihood where seedlings are distributed to those interested and small plantations have been started in some areas of the forests. Coffee products have already been marketed where they come in as commercially packed goods that are highly sought after in the low lands. Other activities such as duck raising, fish pond production are also being encouraged. The marketing and selling of the traditional tinawon rice is highly supported by the local government and efforts toward its marketing and selling to the US have been made.

**On good governance, types of cooperation and mechanisms and hindrances for the operation of conservation and management work**

In as much as the maintenance and work on the fields are concerned, decision-making remains with the owners of the fields who are the farmers. The task of government is solely to encourage and support them in their efforts to continue planting and using the traditional rice variety which is what UNESCO has promoted as well. Traditional rice varieties are those that are associated and linked with the rituals of the agricultural cycle. If these traditional varieties are planted, then the rituals
continue. On the other hand, decision making for the restoration and rehabilitation of collapsed areas at the level of government is collaborative in nature. Local government consults the people living at the WH cluster sites on which collapsed areas to prioritize for restoration and rehabilitation. Both stakeholders’ groups decide on the extent of work to be covered as well as to the method of work to be done.

The existing processes try hard to promote good governance but there will always be challenges to face especially that the management of the site involves many issues that cannot be merely resolved by simple straightforward management approaches. For example, with the many concerns resulting from the condition of the site in an environment that is open to change, as well as its being in a natural setting where issues of climate change prevail, apart from the limited resources and the issues of prioritization and the difficulties of programming of work presently faced by government, perfect governance is actually difficult to achieve. However, the local government of Ifugao has been dynamic in seeking ways and means to resolve these issues and confront the challenges upfront. The people living at the sites as well cope with the many issues they are facing in maintaining the rice terraces and they have been successful so far, where the rice terraces itself having survived 2 millennia as the main measure of success. In all these, the key to good governance is cooperation and collaboration. Cooperation exists at the rice terraces where the ubbu, baddang and the dang-a remain vital instruments in the maintenance of the rice fields. In the same manner, there is cooperation and collaboration at the level by which rehabilitation work of large collapsed areas is undertaken. Here, cooperation and collaboration happen between the local government and the people living at the site, where the extent of work to be undertaken and the manner by which it is to be done is agreed upon in a harmonious manner by all concerned parties. While some sort of support is extended by the government to the people at the site at this time, all stakeholders’ groups at the end equally benefit from the work.

The present government system where decision making is devolved at the local government (provincial, municipal and barangay level) works well for the Rice Terraces. This is because local issues are best resolved at the sites, although cooperation between all levels is most welcomed. The Ifugao Cultural Heritage Office (ICHO) charged to manage cultural issues related to the Rice Terraces coordinates with other local government offices and the concerned national agencies on issues of the Rice Terraces. However, despite trying to achieve good governance practice, there is still room for improvement for the betterment of the existing system. Success in management can be brought about with the continuous provision and the making available of resources – technical and financial as well as having a substantial pool of enthusiastic and well trained people working for the same cause. The present pool of technical and administrative people working for the conservation of the rice terraces could welcome training in their technical capability to undertake huge responsibilities. It is in this case that capacity building programmes related to conservation and management come in handy to further expansion of knowledge that would enable the undertaking of challenges. On the administrative and management side, a systematic programme of work has to be instituted, where all aspects of management of the Rice Terraces will have to be considered. The Systems Approach is the best one for cultural landscape sites where there is complexity in values as exemplified in the Rice Terraces where the grassland (mapulun), forest (inalan/inalahan/acha), caneland (mabilau), woodlot (pinuchu/pinugu/muyong), swidden (habal), house terrace (latangan), drained field (na-ilid), and the pond field (payo), the uma or swidden farms, and the people and their cultural practices form part of the whole complex system that can only be better understood if it is fully documented, analyzed and systematically programmed. In particular and when coming up with
programmes for the management and conservation of the rice terraces, taking into consideration the limited resources both financial and technical, the Systems Approach can actually help identify priority issues that would have to be undertaken while allowing other issues to be considered in the scheduling process following availability of resources.

There is not so much to talk about of hindrances in achieving good governance and management in the Rice Terraces. There are a lot of challenges in fact which have been previously identified in this paper, but these can be surpassed and resolved with the Systems Approach and through good programming of work.

On traditions and the local uniqueness of the management system and the maintenance of authentic lifestyles and inheritances

Management at the level of the rice terraces is traditions-based where work on the maintenance of the fields as well as the environment surrounding it is done through age old customs that have been passed on from generation to generation. The Ifugao agricultural cycle, a technology that is based on the knowledge of astrology and the lunar months, local climate, land and its resources, is also a traditions-based management system that optimizes the use of the land and the prevailing climatic conditions. It revolves around a yearly cycle that starts with land preparation, followed with the sowing of seeds, the planting of seedlings, the maintenance of growing rice plants and lastly the harvesting of the rice produce and the resting of the land prior to the another start of another yearly agricultural cycle.

Management of work is based on the Ifugao calendar, which is divided into twelve lunar months of thirty days each, counting the two days/ nights when the moon is nalgop or completely out of sight which happens after the 28th night. This calendar is based on conditions occurring in nature and is also associated with work in the rice fields and the agricultural cycle. It also coincides with rituals called the Baki- Hongan di page or the Hongan di page which are performed at every turn of the cycle. Gods and ancestors are invoked for a good turn-out of harvest as well as in asking help so that the seedlings and plants will grow healthy and not be eaten by pests. Following the harvest are rites that are intended to appeal to the Gods and ancestors for an increase in volume of stored rice in the granary, and/or for it to stay intact and prevent it from being attacked of thieves, pests and vermin. During the baki ritual, the rice God called bulol is brought out of the granary and is offered animals (pigs, chickens and/or ducks) as sacrifice. Blood of animals is poured unto the head of the bulol and the spirits of the Ifugao Gods are believed to be transmitted to the bulol which acts as the conduit between ethereal and earthly life, thereby making the Ifugao skyworld life comprehensible, approachable and explainable.

As previously mentioned, operations in as much as agriculture is concerned, particularly the maintenance and work in the rice terraces and its surrounding areas are traditions-based. Traditional farming practices are unique in that they were developed as a means to survive, cope and adapt to the mountainous terrain of the Philippine Cordilleras. The Ifugao people are an ethnic group having its own authentic cultural traditions in agriculture and in everyday life that differ from other ethnic groups in the Philippine Cordilleras. The difference in cultural traditions is reflected in the manner by which ceremonies, belief systems and other forms of cultural manifestations are
carried out and how they have been developed through generations and passed on to the present times.

Ownership of the rice fields is also based on the traditional concept of ancestral domain wherein land properties are handed down from generation to generation. Land ownership is normally by inheritance where the eldest, whether boy or girl, is given prime choice of property while the rest of the children are handed with whatever is left. Inherited land normally goes to the elder children while properties that have been acquired after marriage through purchase are handed to the younger ones. Properties that are left unattended by family members can be cultivated by other relatives, following the granting of permission. This practice is essential in ensuring continuous maintenance of the fields.

On “regionally-specific protocol” that could provide practical operational guidelines for conservation practitioners working in Asia or at the Rice Terraces as mentioned in the Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia (2009)

One site specific methodology of the Hoi Ann Protocols for Best Practice in Asia is on Cultural Landscapes where it cites the importance of community involvement in conservation and management. The protocols specifically talks of the involvement of communities in conservation, being the ones with direct knowledge of the development of the landscape and how it is to be shaped in the future. Similarly, it states that scientific methods and technologies employed in conservation should include community ideas. One important aspect is the involvement of community in molding the future template of their own cultural landscape for their own future cultural development.

For the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras which is the first organically evolved, living cultural landscape recognized in the WH List, there are a number of issues that come to mind in relation to community involvement in conservation and management. First is the documentation of cultural landscapes where Ifugao communities form an integral part of the documentation process being the direct source of information on both the tangible and intangible aspects of Ifugao heritage. They are the source of knowledge on the Ifugao cultural practices particularly on the development of the rice terraces based on indigenous skills of agriculture, the cosmologies of the land and the metaphysical world of the Ifugao. Second is the involvement of the communities in shaping the future of their own cultural advancement, where they identify the path by which their development will be directed as well as the economic viability of their heritage. This part is important for the Ifugao communities in that they have always desired economic progress. However, the Hoi An Protocol states that “working landscapes should continue to be economically viable within the framework of authenticity.” For the Rice Terraces, it simply means that economically viable activities that do not destroy the values of the landscape and do not imply on the sustainability of cultural practices are welcomed and encouraged.

It is therefore essential that communities at the Rice Terraces are directly involved in all activities that direct their future. These should be actions that achieve a balance between economic development and the use of their resources, as well the conservation of their cultural values which have been in existence for generations.
On the establishment of a Site Management Network to facilitate exchange information on better practice of heritage conservation and management in Asia

Establishing networks for site management is important in that it is through these that exchanges on good practices are made possible. It is through exchanges with countries in Asia that the learning of experiences and approaches to conservation and management are facilitated. Workshops that involve site managers can be undertaken on a regular basis. Existing UNESCO Category 2 Centres can be tapped to organize such workshops, symposia, conferences and other forms of exchanges, while collaboration with ICCROM can be sought to enrich the process. The active involvement of WH site managers and some members of the WH communities from the Asian region are essential as they are the source of information on the Asian best practices.

On the goals of institutions in the Philippines

World Heritage inscription has increased pride of place in the minds of the Ifugao people. It has elevated to international recognition a former locally acclaimed notion of the Rice Terraces being one of the 8th Wonders of the World. It has also brought in many advantages to the property and it has drawn from both the international and national communities a variety of support and assistance that have greatly aided in maintaining the values of the site as well as its removal from the List of WH in Danger.

It is therefore in this last item of the paper that the author, in her active involvement in the conservation of the Rice Terraces done through three (3) institutions: the International Council on Monuments and Sites National Committee Philippines (ICOMOS Philippines), the UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines (UNESCO NATCOM) and the National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA) have acknowledged the role of these three organizations in the conservation and management of Philippine World Heritage Sites and in this case, the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras. All three institutions recognize the active participation of the Ifugao community in the conservation and management of the Rice Terraces. Whilst the two National Government Agencies have been providing assistance, guidance and support in terms of technical expertise as well as in the generation of financial assistance for the WH property, they equally realize that actual conservation of the Rice Terraces happens at the site. All three institutions have been involved as well in the monitoring of conservation work at the Rice Terraces.

In particular and recognizing the need to improve and/or uplift the socio-economic aspects of the Rice Terraces and its people, the UNESCO NATCOM of the Philippines has worked with NGOs for the marketing and production of the tinawon rice variety for its sale in other countries in the world. In the same light, it has encouraged the marketing and development of cultural industries where programmes aimed to improve the quality of cultural merchandize were organized. Educational programmes on heritage are continuously being undertaken for the Rice Terraces as well as research to update the database on demography and the values of the site. In the same light, the NCCA has been actively involved in projects that assist the people in their everyday lives, including those that uphold the requirements of the WH Convention. In particular, funding assistance came to the Rice Terraces for the improvement of irrigation canals and pathways, which are significantly recognized by the people as helpful in their everyday movement and transit as they bring in and out goods to the WH cluster sites. The CBLUZP is a project funded as well by the NCCA, while others are being
envisioned and conceptualized for the property. The UNESCO NATCOM and ICOMOS Philippines have equally helped by organizing workshops that brought in international experts where topics on heritage conservation as well as examples of sustainable development have inspired the representatives of the Rice Terraces’ WH Communities. Experts from ICOMOS have been tapped in a variety of ways wherein they have contributed knowledge that helped guide work for the conservation as well as the management of the site.

It is to be further noted that all three institutions have actually linked their work with the international community and in particular with UNESCO and the WH Centre. It was through the linkage that collaborative work has been achieved and has helped address the many issues and challenges faced by the local communities at the site. This has been exemplified with the recent removal of the Rice Terraces from the List of WH in Danger.

The involvement of the author and other experts in many international activities supported by the three organizations has established international linkages. These were undertaken through attendance in workshops, experts meetings, trainings, symposia and conferences wherein the topic on the Rice Terraces was discussed and presented. It was through these fora where promotion of heritage and the communities living within actually took place whilst discourses and ideas on how to attain sustainability were as well revealed. The presentation of the work on the Rice Terraces to a wider audience during these fora may have helped in the recent removal of the site from the List of WH in Danger.

But most importantly its presentation in this symposium for the celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the WH Convention is most appreciated as it actually puts in utmost recognition the communities living within the Rice Terraces WH property.
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Overview

Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape is located in Champasak District of southern Lao PDR, 500km south-east of the capital, Vientiane, on the west bank of the Mekong River. The total inscribed area covers 39,000 ha.

Vat Phou temple complex is a major example of both early and classic Khmer architecture of the 7th-12th centuries AD. This complex is the focal point of a sophisticated cultural landscape centred on the Champasak Plain, taking in the Phou Kao (mountain) to the west and the banks of the Mekong River to the east. Between them are temples, shrines, water tanks, water channels, quarries, historic field systems, ancient roads and settlement sites, including Shrestrapura, one of the earliest known urban settlements in south-east Asia, and its 9th century successor.

The Champasak Cultural Landscape, including the Vat Phou temple complex, is one of the most important sites of the greater Khmer Empire and exhibits some of earliest known evidence of urbanism in Southeast Asia. It was contrived to express the Hindu version of the relationship between nature and humanity, using an axis from mountain top to river bank to lay out a geometric pattern of temples. The remarkably well-preserved planned landscape, more than a thousand years old, represents a development over nearly a thousand years from the 5th to 15th centuries AD associated above all with the Khmer Empire.

The outstanding significance of the Champasak Cultural Landscape lies in the broad scientific perspective of the powerful Khmer culture. The temple complex of Vat Phou represents a masterpiece of human creative genius for the high quality of artistic work and the integration of its symbolic plan with the natural landscape to create a physical manifestation of a Hindu mental template of the perfect universe. The resulting expression of these ideas, not only on the ground but also in architecture and art was a unique fusion of indigenous nature symbols, religious inspiration and technical prowess.

Authenticity

Evaluation of authenticity involves five main elements:
1. **The landscape setting of the whole**: The river and the mountain, the frame of the man-made complex, remain in place and little altered; the plain in between is probably more wooded and less coherent in appearance than it was a thousand years ago. Overall, however, authenticity in this respect is high.

2. **The association of the various elements and the evidence for deliberate planning**: The various elements comprising the landscape survive well as archaeological sites or standing ruins. It is therefore relatively easy to see how the elements were articulated with one another and to understand their relationships. The axial arrangement of structures in relation to the *Lingaparvata* of Phou Kao is clearly visible.

3. **Buried archaeological sites**: The general depth of archaeological stratigraphy is no more than 0.5m in the urban sites, but neither natural nor human disturbance has so far been significant. The archaeological integrity is therefore high.

4. **Archaeological sites surviving as visible earthworks**: Of former structures now earthworks, the most notable are the ramparts around the two cities. Some damage has been caused by cuts through them (eg for modern roads), but the most serious damage has been erosion of the second and third walls of the Ancient City by a stream. Other upstanding earthworks include the roads, canals, and *baray* (reservoir), and mounds where buildings or other structures have collapsed and become overgrown. Again erosion, and some robbing and digging, have affected these features but generally they are in good condition.

5. **Standing structures**: While no ancient buildings are now intact, most survive to the tops of their walls. No large-scale restoration has occurred. The standing structures are therefore still entirely authentic with a high level of integrity despite partial collapse.

Most of the present population live away from the main archaeological complexes. Many of the inhabited houses are traditional in form, but developmental pressures are mounting. Nevertheless, overall, with little vegetational or other natural changes and minimal archaeological or restorative activity, the integrity and authenticity of the site of this property are high.

**Management and Protection**

**Overall framework**

The Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape is protected by the Provincial Decree on the Regulations for the Preservation of the Historical Site of Vat Phou and the Areas related to Vat Phou No 38/88 (October 1988). This defined a large Protection Zone, not limited to just the main standing monuments; within it are three Preservation Areas, essentially the three main archaeological complexes. The national legal framework for heritage preservation is provided by the Law Concerning National Heritage. No 08/NA which was adopted by the National Assembly in 2005.

Management is undertaken in accordance with the Champasak Heritage Management Plan which was officially adopted by the Government in September 1998. The Plan defines the boundaries of the Protection Zone and the three Areas within it, and contains regulations for the management of the entire nominated World Heritage site. These cover archaeological work, conservation, and
development control. In addition, action plans are developed every five years to identify priority management actions.

The site is managed by the Department of Vat Phou Champasak World Heritage which has staff trained in archaeology and architecture. The department cooperates closely with various international expert teams. The Government has established a National Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Committee to oversee the management of the Protection Zone and to coordinate the activities of the various Government Departments at national, provincial, and district levels.

World Heritage involving community

1. NIMCC and UNESCO, recognizing the need for community involvement in the preservation of Vat Phou, established a programme called the Heritage Awareness Through Community Outreach (HATCH) in January 1997. The underlying concept of HATCH is that the restoration, conservation, preservation and sustainable utilisation of the cultural heritage of the Champasak Plain should as far as possible be the responsibility of and carried out by the local communities. Within this concept, HATCH has three objectives:
   - to increase community awareness of the importance of the archaeology and heritage of the Vat Phou area
   - to mobilize and motivate local communities to participate in the conservation and sustainable utilisation of their heritage
   - to introduce to the local communities the Champasak Heritage Management Plan and any other activities to be carried out under the auspices of the NIMCC.

2. The intention of HATCH has been both to raise awareness and to develop the capacity of the local community to manage their own heritage. Conservation work to date has been designed to make the maximum effective use of local labour. Temporary exhibitions were displayed at the Vat Phou Festival in 1997 and 1998. These efforts should be continued and augmented.

3. In order to make the programme more effective, research has been carried out on the modern local culture of the area. Following the study of the census data, field research was carried out in the villages around Vat Phou, demonstrating among other things the integrated way in which the villagers use all aspects of their cultural and natural environment, including the areas around Vat Phou itself (for example as a source of firewood), and the close and complex socio-economic links between the various villages.

4. The central role of the village heads in the life and organization of each village is also very clear. Any future strategy must make full use of this role.

5. THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHAMPASAK HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Village Administrative Authorities are included among the bodies responsible for the national heritage in the 1997 Decree of the President of the Lao PDR on the Preservation of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage No. 03/PR (Articles 9 and 10) and should therefore take an active part in the implementation of the Champasak Heritage Management Plan within the Champasak Heritage
and Cultural Landscape Protection Zone. Village heads have shown some interest in carrying out monitoring work. They therefore will be invited to monitor protected areas on behalf of the Site Management and Training Centre and to report any infringements to the Site Manager.

A Village Liaison Committee has now been established and will need to decide its terms of reference. These should include close liaison with the Site Manager and the Site Management and Training Centre and overseeing of the development of the HATCH programme and advising on its content. The Village Liaison Committee will also be a suitable forum for establishing and agreeing upon methods and frequency for the monitoring work to be carried out by the village heads. The Committee should also advise on ways in which local customs and traditions can be used to promote positive conservation and to develop tourism-related businesses in a sustainable way.

**Implementation Achievement of Champasak Heritage Management Plan**

The Site Management Office had successfully carried out the management plan, action plan to preserve and protect the whole properties and their outstanding universal value during the past tens years.

The local government as well as local communities were well cooperated with the Site Management Office to safeguard all those standing monuments, buried archaeological remains, cultural landscape etc. to preserve its authenticity and integrity.

Archaeological research such as surveying, excavation, objective restoration and cataloging are continuing implement both on site and inside the depository room by international experts and local technical staffs.

Some of small standing monument which considering in bad condition and going to collapse in the near future have been restored by local technical staffs under budget resource of Provincial Committee for safeguarding Champasak Heritage.

Some long-term conservation and restoration projects are implementing by International Cooperation Team such as: Italian Archaeological Mission (2000-now); Lao-French Cooperation Project (FSP 2005.75); Lao-India Cooperation Project (Archaeological Survey of India); Lao- Korea Cooperation Project.

Due to the increasing of visitors of the site during the past decade it improved incomes of Local people on the field of tourism services, accommodation services, local productions etc.

**Challenges**

*Specific long-term expectations*

Long-term challenges for the management of the property principally concern the control of urban and infrastructure development within the large historic cultural landscape zone which functions as the buffer zone of the property.

In addition, other challenges may arise from environmental pressures (mainly flooding, run-off, and
erosion), visitor/tourism pressures including those of the annual festival each February, and the growing population with higher lifestyle expectations within the protected zone itself.

**Critical Issues**

The critical issues of our conservation and management systems are the site monitoring covering over than 390 sq. km in which including:

1. **The landscape setting of the whole**
2. **The association of the various elements and the evidence for deliberate planning**
3. **Buried archaeological sites**
4. **Archaeological sites surviving as visible earthworks**
5. **Standing structures**

To preserved and protected the entire properties to be survived for the next generation the central government not only issued several type of rules such as the Provincial Decree on the Regulations for the Preservation of the Historical Site of Vat Phou and the Areas related to Vat Phou No 38/88 (October 1988), the presidential degree No. 03/1997 and the Law Concerning National Heritage. No 08/NA which was adopted by the National Assembly in 2005, but we also have the Champasak Heritage Management Plan which defines the boundaries of the Protection Zone and the three Areas within it, and contains regulations specifically for the management of each zone on the entire nominated World Heritage site. These cover archaeological work, conservation, and development control.

All these law and Regulations are integrated the development activities and the preservation and protection of the whole properties: all personal development activities, communal, governmental will be carried out inside the protection area need to be authorized by the Management Office before starting. These regulation are applying to communal, village and district organization to aware people of variety different level. For those high significant standing monuments and buried archaeological remains we limited its protection boundary and adopted specific protection rule to prevent destroying cause by agriculture and building construction on its surrounding areas as far as signed an agreement with the owner of each parcel to be strictly followed those specific rules. In addition we consider the rising awareness of local people on preservation and protection of cultural property are our need, so we use them as our workers on all restoration activities, give them all the lesion of preservation and restoration of ancient monument, their properties. So from these activities they got their job with per diem, gain the lesion of restoration, familiar to these cultural heritage and cause them understood that they took a part of the property’s owner. On some standing monuments which people believe that are sacred place and come to pray respect inside, the villagers are allowed to sell offering material and their handmade products; they also share the income for development fund of village.

In the other hand, Vat Phu Festival organizing during the full moon day on the third month of Lunar calendar are attracted Buddhism all around country to visit and worship this sacred place (3 days celebrate). This event cause local people fond and pray respect to their cultural heritage until now.

Develop an interpretation and awareness raising strategy for the property, including a local community engagement programme, to enhance the interpretation of the property and
appropriation by associated living communities.

The main stakeholders of the property are: deputy district governor and some other district organization, chef of village, local community. The official processes of decision making in conserving and maintaining our site are issued after discussion in a meeting of all stakeholders and the site manager and some other concerning organization, and finally each part must respect and follow the meeting decision.

Develop a policy for engaging foreign mission base on action proposed in the Management Plan.

To facilitate exchange information on better practice of heritage conservation and management among us, the Site Management Network should be establish to provide and share information regarding our cultural properties in variety different form such as Newsletter, website etc.
Introduction

The paper aims to identify the challenges and potentials of involving local communities in the conservation and management of the World Heritage Site of Taj Mahal at Agra, India. The discussion will illustrate existing management systems at site, identifying shortcomings that need to be eliminated and gaps that need to be addressed in order to encourage active participation of communities and stakeholders at various levels of decision-making processes.

The central argument of this paper is that there are vast differences between the approaches for community involvement as suggested in the international conservation charters and guidelines and the actual practices in India. The ‘idealised’ international documents call for active and sustained community participation in the conservation and management of heritage places. This approach is highly supported and practiced in several countries in the western and ‘developed’ contexts. However, in a developing nation such as India the priorities and mechanisms of governance are driven by different political, economic and social dynamics. The nature and complexities of these
mechanisms makes the ‘system’ quite rigid and exclusive. There is rather limited scope for public participation or community involvement in this system. The majority of the Government departments and local bodies are ‘centralised’ in decision-making and operational aspects and rely heavily on a top-down administrative process.

The discussion will examine a specific case study of the Taj Mahal World Heritage site to illustrate these problems, analyse some of the key issues, assess the ground realities and propose strategies for involving communities in the conservation and management of the site.

Background of the site

The Taj Mahal was built by Mughal Emperor Shah Jahan in the loving memory of his wife Mumtaz Mahal. The mausoleum is located on the bank of River Yamuna at the edge of a vast Mughal garden (charbagh), and the site covers nearly 17 hectares, in the Agra District in Uttar Pradesh. The construction of Taj Mahal started in 1632 and completed in 1648 AD, and the mosque, mehman khana, main gateway on the south, outer courtyard and its cloisters were added subsequently and completed in 1653 AD. The construction of this iconic monument involved a massive army of craftsmen - masons, stone-cutters, inlayers, carvers, painters, calligraphers, dome builders and other artisans from the whole of the Mughal empire and also from the Central Asia and Iran.

The scale of this architectural masterpiece was grand, and it surpassed all previous artistic conceptions of Islamic art in India. The tomb structure was planned as the primary focus of a larger composition of architectural and landscape elements: mosque, mehman khana, naubat khanas, entrance gateway, jilau khana, khwaspuras, and charbagh (garden of paradise). These elements, by virtue of their design and composition, multiply the experience of the place that reaches its culmination in the marble mausoleum.

The Taj Mahal and its unique setting is considered to be the pinnacle of Mughal art and architecture in India. The site is bound by red sandstone walls on three sides and the River Yamuna on the fourth. The forecourt or Jilau Khana can be accessed through three gates in the three boundary walls and provides a congregation place for visitors coming from Agra Fort on the western side, Taj Ganj on the southern side and outer city areas on the eastern side of the site. A series of arched colonnades with green lawns enclose this open space on all four sides. The Jilau Khana has four smaller courtyard structures on its corners, of which two house the graves of Sirhind Begum and Satiun Nisa and the other two were for the attendants of the tomb and gardens called Khwaspuras.

At the south side of the Taj complex is located Taj Ganj, the historic settlement designed as part of the larger complex to inhabit the workmen and artisans who were involved with the construction of this magnificent conception. There were also serais (rest houses) where visitors to the tomb and travellers passing by the town could stay. The main entrance to the Taj Mahal gardens is a highly embellished, tall and robust red sandstone gateway that towers over the Jilau Khana. A dark and deep arched passage through this gate provides that ‘magical’ and ‘awe-inspiring’ first glimpse of the white marble tomb poised over a vast red sandstone plinth with most exquisite and tranquil charbagh gardens in the foreground. This magical moment makes everyone fall in love with Taj at the first sight. The moment is overwhelming. The feeling is transcendental, and the expression is mesmerising.
The richly carved and stone inlaid red majestic gateway defines the entry into the Taj Mahal charbagh planted with fruit and flowering trees and a complex network of stone pathways, water channels and fountains. At the centre of the garden and perfectly aligned with the cardinal directions lies a water tank with fountains and marble platform to view the tomb in its sombre and serene garden setting. An elaborate water system was developed for lifting water from the river and transporting it by aqueducts to irrigate the gardens and run fountains, using an intricate system of water channels based on gravitational flow and surface levels. The grand design of the Taj Mahal included Mehtab Bagh situated on the opposite side of the river, said to have been conceived as a moonlight garden with a reflecting pool mirroring the Taj Mahal.

Fig 1: Site Plan of Taj Mahal complex
(Source: SMP 2003)
The Site Management Plan (2003) prepared by the Taj Mahal Conservation Collaborative for the Archaeological Survey of India states, ‘the Taj Mahal is a perfect symmetrical planned building, with an emphasis of bilateral symmetry along a central axis on which the main features are placed.’ The site was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1983 under Criterion (i): ‘Taj Mahal represents the finest architectural and artistic achievement through perfect harmony and excellent craftsmanship in a whole range of Indo-Islamic sepulchral architecture. It is a masterpiece of architectural style in conception, treatment and execution and has unique aesthetic qualities in balance, symmetry and harmonious blending of various elements.’ (UNESCO 2012).

**Conservation and management issues**

The Taj Mahal site is a nationally protected monument under the custodianship of Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), Ministry of Culture, Government of India. The conservation and management of the site is the responsibility of the ASI. In 2001, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between ASI and the Indian Hotels Company Limited to collaborate on various conservation and management activities and also provide financial assistance for some of these. Taj Mahal Conservation Collaborative (TMCC), a group of heritage experts, was set up to conceptualise and develop conservation and management works at the site and to advise ASI on the implementation and monitoring of a few pilot projects. In addition to a national team of experts, an international group of advisors was also set up to assist TMCC and ASI in their joint collaborative works. The author of this paper is a member of the core team of TMCC and has been associated with the Taj Mahal site since 2002.
Some of the key issues which arise in the conservation and management of the site are:

i. Conservation and Management Plans for the site. TMCC had prepared a Site Management Plan in 2003, but it is quite conceptual in nature and scope and needs to be revisited.

ii. Visitor control and management. There is a huge influx of domestic and international tourists at the site, for it is an iconic monument in India, a World Heritage Site and one of the Seven Wonders of the World.

iii. Administrative and professional levels of expertise to manage the site. The range, nature and degree of pressures which operate at this site require a specific kind and level of thinking, decision-making and implementation of solutions. These problems are multiplied when the site is considered in a wider setting of the Agra Fort World Heritage Site, Taj Ganj settlement, River Yamuna and other heritage sites across the river.

Defining the ‘community’

The paper will examine these issues in the context of this conference on community involvement in World Heritage. Let us first understand who could be considered the members of the ‘local community’ around the site: the craftspeople and their families whose forefathers worked at the construction of Taj Mahal, inhabitants of old and new Agra city, people who are engaged with different aspects of a heritage tourism (photographers, guides, travel and tour operators, hotel and accommodation providers), security staff, ASI personnel and so forth. There are clear, though very thin, boundaries between these various services and aspects related to the site. Both males and females are involved in these activities, and at times even children are drawn into some of these jobs. Thus, at the outset, one of the critical questions that emerges is: To whom does Taj Mahal site as ‘heritage’ belong? Does it belong to the local community, to the Indian nation or to the wider humanity (patrimonio mundial)?

Let us identify the other and perhaps larger stakeholders, at a macro level, that are involved in decision making on issues related to planning, development and management of the area around Taj Mahal site. These include: Agra Development Authority (ADA), National and State Departments concerned with the conservation and development of Forest land and the River Yamuna, Tourism departments (Central and State Ministries), and the Civic bodies looking after electricity, water, sewage, roads and other infrastructural facilities. All these agencies play a vital role at local and national level that influences the management of the site, and therefore form a critical mass of ‘civil services (or bureaucratic) community’ associated with the Taj Mahal WHS. The second issue is: To define a clear, effective and coordinated role for this community.

Existing management systems

Having identified the offices and communities associated with the WHS, we will now illustrate the processes of decision making for conserving and maintaining the site. As the site is a ‘nationally protected’ site under the custodianship of ASI, all matters related to the conservation and management is the responsibility of ASI. There are two levels at which ASI functions: Central (Directorate) in New Delhi and Regional/Local Circles. There is an Agra Circle that was established in 1885. ‘There are 397 monuments/sites under the jurisdiction of Agra Circle spreading in 24 districts
of Western Uttar Pradesh including those of three World Heritage Monuments viz. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri, all of the Mughal period and located in district of Agra. The Circle is conserving and managing the monuments and sites through its 08 sub-circle viz. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort, Fatehpur Sikri, Sikandara, Itimad-ud-Daulah, Mathura, Kannauj and Meerut.’ (Agra Circle 2012)

ASI is the nodal Government agency for Taj Mahal site and therefore all decisions related to the conservation and management of the site are coordinated by ASI in consultation with their ASI Central, Circle and Sub-Circle offices. The only other premier agency that needs to be kept informed and appraised about ‘all’ activities within and around the Taj Mahal site is the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon’ble Court has appointed an Amicus Curiae who keeps a vigilant and strong watch on the Taj Mahal site.

The question of interest and concern for this meeting is: *Is there any room for community members to participate in the decision making process? If the answer is yes, how does this process work?*

**Issues of involving communities**

As discussed, there are two distinct categories within which we can consider the notion of ‘community’ operational at the Taj Mahal site. They are all stakeholders at different levels and are either already involved or have a potential to get involved at various levels of the decision-making processes. We will consider the challenges of this participation in relation to the three key issues identified above (i, ii and iii on page no. 6).

i. **a. Conservation planning**

Conservation, repair, restoration and maintenance of buildings and gardens within the Taj Mahal site are the sole responsibility of ASI. There is an internal system by which projects are prepared, sanctioned and implemented employing an in-house team of technical and specialist experts available at ASI. The craftsmen, artisans and workmen are engaged on daily wages to implement the conservation work at site. These include – masons, carvers, inlay-workers, gardeners, helpers and so forth, and work under a close supervision of the ASI staff at site. There is no stage or scope for ‘community involvement’ in the decision-making processes related to conservation issues at site. It is however essential to prepare a comprehensive and detailed Conservation Plan for this site and in consultation with relevant stakeholders and local communities.

b. **Management system**

The management of Taj Mahal WHS is carried out by ASI, and the legal protection of the site and control over the ‘prohibited’ and ‘regulated’ areas around the site is through the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act – 1958 and 2010. There are several State and Local bodies that are involved with the development, management and maintenance of infrastructural facilities around the site. There are two distinct and clearly separate levels at which the jurisdiction of these agencies operates: **Within** the enclosure walls of Taj Mahal complex (ASI) and **outside** the ‘protected’ boundaries (other agencies). The two systems operate fairly independently except for specific interfaces and consultation as and when required depending on the nature and scope of activity.

Within the current mechanism, ASI does encourage and include dialogue with concerned
members of the community or stakeholders in order to address their specific issues and problems. This is done in strict conformity and within the bounds of the legal and administrative provisions of the system. Other agencies might also have a few possibilities of involving the representative members of the local community. However, both the systems provide for rather limited and ad-hoc participation of the local communities.

Taking note of this situation, the TMCC - ASI Site Management Plan of 2003 recommended that a ‘Management Plan Committee’ be set up which will include the following members:

- Director General, ASI
- Directors at ASI headquarters - Science, Conservation, Monuments and World Heritage
- ASI officials at the Agra Circle
- Local authorities – Commissioner of Agra
- Representative of the Local Community
- Representative of the Department of Tourism
- Representatives from Government department and agencies active within the zone, as deemed necessary, from time to time, and
- Professional expertise.

The SMP clearly recommends that representative(s) of the ‘local community’ be included as a member of this special committee on the Management planning for the site.

ii. Visitor control and management.

This is a critical issue for the Taj Mahal site, perhaps the most critical issue. In 2001, it was recorded that the site receives over 2 million visitors (SMP 2003) annually and this figure is only on a rise since then. The pressures and demands due to this influx of visitors pose huge problems from the management, safety and security, interpretation, experience and
conservation points of view. This is one issue which has implications for management both within the ASI protected bounds (the site) and outside the site boundaries. In fact, the impact of cultural tourism needs to be assessed and addressed at local, national and international levels and therefore involves a range of agencies and departments. However, from the point of view of this meeting we will focus on the involvement of local communities.

The SMP 2003, emphasized on the need to involve local communities for ‘activities like the tourist information counters, tourist guides etc. Presently visitors are harassed by unauthorised hawkers, touts and tourist guides who offer to get tourists a good bargain, be it in the purchase of handicrafts, the hiring of transport or tourist guides often making the experience for visitors unpleasant.’ The Plan suggests that it is crucial to draw the local community into the site and its related activities ‘in a positive way to make them feel like partners in the processes of maintaining the site and visiting the complex.’

There could be several ways in which the social, cultural and economic situation of the local community around Taj and the wider Agra city could be enhanced. The initiatives like Bed & Breakfast schemes; authorised local guides; licensed photographers, service providers like vendors, hawkers, ticket sales counters, souvenir shops etc.; public phone services; registered food and snack joints, fair trade and govt. registered handicraft shops and so forth could provide lucrative opportunities for local peoples. The SMP also proposes to prepare a comprehensive Visitor Management and Facilitation Plan that will address the challenges and complexities related to this issue.

Fig 4: Visitors in front of the Eastern Gate
(one of the three gateways leading to the forecourt of the main entrance gate)
(Source: SMP 2003)
iii. Administrative and professional levels of expertise to manage the site.

This is another aspect that needs to be addressed and holds good potential for involving local professionals and staff members. The current administrative structure of ASI is quite ‘centralised’ though there is a dedicated Circle at Agra and Sub-Circle at Taj Mahal. The highest official at site is the Conservation Assistant who is responsible for administrative and technical matters related to the site. All conservation projects; deployment of staff; dealing with other agencies like CISF, ADA etc.; coordination with Circle office, Horticulture office at Agra, local authorities and departments; management of local guides, photographers, vendors, hawkers etc.; and so forth are the responsibility of the CA. In addition, he is also responsible for taking care of visits by important political figures, foreign diplomats and high level Government officials. It is practically impossible for one officer in-charge to be able to address all these tasks which sometimes multiply when more than one of these activities occurs on the same day, which is mostly the case.

The other major issue is that a majority of the professionals engaged with ASI, particularly at the Taj Mahal site, are Archaeologists or Engineers. There is no Conservation Architect employed with ASI Agra Circle or Taj Mahal Sub-Circle to assist in the conservation and management related issues, considering this is the most iconic of nationally protected monuments in India and a UNESCO World Heritage Site. There is an urgent need to engage a conservation architect with knowledge and experience on WH matters, either full-time or on contract basis, who could work in collaboration with other staff members and agencies to be able to develop a much wider perspective on the issues of conservation and management of this WH site.
Both at administrative and technical levels, a mechanism needs to be worked out to involve members of the community – local and bureaucratic, who could participate in decision-making and operational activities at site. For example: skilled craftsmen from Taj Ganj could be given a dignified position and support to be able to continue their craft whilst working at the site where their forefathers worked hundreds of years ago. A whole range of craftspeople could be trained in Agra, continuing the tradition of knowledge and skills transfer from one generation to another by learning and practicing at site, which there are many in this area including three World Heritage Sites.

It might be worth re-structuring the governance system, by focusing on local challenges and potentials and by exploring solutions based on local knowledge and expertise rather than a top-down ‘colonial’ administrative system that ASI still adheres to.

**Potential strategies for community participation**

Having examined the three key aspects in relation to the issue of ‘community involvement’ in the Taj Mahal WH site, the paper will now explore ways in which this strategy could be encouraged and incorporated in the World Heritage in India:

I. **Bureaucratic community** -
   a. The recently established Advisory Committee on World Heritage Matters needs to bring this strategy to the fore,
   b. The existing management system of ASI needs to be re-structured to include and encourage community involvement at various levels of decision making and implementation,
   c. At the moment there is a bottom-up system of ‘providing information and making proposals’ and a top-down system of ‘decision-making and project approvals’. Both these approaches need to be examined in the light of new advancements in the understanding of ‘heritage’, locally; and new strategies adopted by UNESCO, internationally.
   d. It is a rather philosophical and idealistic position, but the higher ‘bureaucratic’ level of management needs to respect and recognize the ‘local’ composition of stakeholders whose daily livelihoods, social structures, cultural backgrounds and economic aspirations are linked with the site. These communities exist outside the ‘protected’ boundaries but co-exist with the pressures and challenges of the site and they are the ones that are most directly and almost immediately affected by any minor or major management decision taken by the governing agencies.
   e. A Site Management Committee for Taj Mahal WH site and a larger WH Sites Management Network need to be set up for effective communication and exchange of experiences at national and international levels.

II. **Local Community** -
   a. There is a thriving community of local populations who could be involved with specific aspects of heritage management – guides, photographers, souvenir shops, food and hospitality, local transport, visitor information and so forth.
   b. Skilled artisans, craftsmen and workmen could be employed on a long term basis with ASI in the conservation and maintenance activities – masonry, chiseling, inlay work, carving, carpentry, gardening etc. Special training programmes could be organized at site for the transfer of traditional building knowledge systems and craft skills.
c. Selected representatives of the local community could be kept informed about the major activities at the site that could potentially impact their interests or existence. As and when required, the concerns of the local community could be represented in the decision-making processes at the Management or Coordinating committees set up from time to time by Central/State Government departments and Local bodies.

d. A more direct, transparent and inclusive link needs to be established between the ‘protected’ limits of heritage sites and the ‘outside’ communities of peoples who built this heritage in the first place and to whom these monuments and sites belong.

e. Finally, the local communities inhabiting the areas around WH sites, or any heritage site for that matter, should take pride and receive incentives to be there rather than being neglected and penalized by a myriad of legal, administrative and management systems.

Conclusion

This paper has illustrated the existing management systems for World Heritage Sites in India by examining the case study of Taj Mahal complex in Agra, Uttar Pradesh. There are several shortcomings and gaps in this system at different levels. We have discussed three critical issues related to the conservation and management of Taj Mahal WH site in the context of this conference theme – World Heritage Involving Communities. Some of the key challenges and complexities of involving communities in the management of this WH site are examined and the potential solutions and strategies are presented at the end of the discussion.

The author would like to emphasise on the need for more collaborative research and analysis of issues and case studies in order to develop an informed, effective and implementable framework for involving communities at various levels of managing a WH site in Asia.
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: Stakeholders and World Heritage
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Abstract

In the protection and management of the world cultural heritage of the West Lake, in which the stakeholders are involved, people’s livelihood and will have been emphasized. In a word, the key of such efforts lies in the focus on the interests of the aboriginals in the heritage site, and the protection and inheritance of the unique cultural traditions and essence of Longjing Tea of the West Lake. The past decade, which has witnessed great endeavors in the world heritage nomination of the West Lake, shows that only by adhering to the concept of ‘people-orientation’ and implementing such people-benefiting policies as ‘returning the lake to the people’ and ‘improving villages within the scope of the landscape’, can ordinary people and tourists from home and abroad participate in and enjoy benefits from the West Lake conservation, can the West Lake culture be better protected and inherited, and can the sustainable development in real sense be realized.

Throughout its history, the West Lake landscape has been protected and built by Hangzhou people and distinguished persons of all generations. It has been an epitome of the ‘harmony between man and nature’ because of the harmonious co-existence between city and lake, between lake and human. The reason why our worthy predecessors have attached so much importance to West Lake conservation has, to a great extent, been people’s livelihood. When Su Dongpo, a literary giant of the Northern Song Dynasty, acted as Magistrate of Hangzhou, he mobilised 200 thousand workers to dredge the West Lake and build the Su Causeway therein with the silt, which runs from north to south and divides the lake into two parts. It is, in fact, the people that have benefited the most from the dredging project, which links the formerly separated north and south banks. To enrich the landscape and build a sightseeing route was a secondary purpose. Bai Juyi, a poet of the Tang Dynasty, dredged the West Lake and built the Bai Causeway to meet people’s need of irrigation.

Early in this century, to resolve the problems hindering the West Lake’s sustainable development and affecting the quality of its environment, such as the abuse of land resources, the imbalance of tourist route distribution and the underdevelopment of infrastructure, Hangzhou Municipal Party Committee and People's Government have actively carried out an effective comprehensive improvement project to better the environment of the West Lake, promote its history and culture, and benefit the communities. On this basis, they began the world heritage nomination of the West Lake Cultural Landscape. In this process, the concepts of ‘public involvement’ and ‘people-
orientation’ have been acted upon. The ‘West Lake mode’ of world heritage conservation and management has distinguished itself mainly in the following aspects:

Listen to the people and take their advice

The public involvement in decision making is important in that it promotes the sustainable development of world heritage. The administrative authorities have asked for Hangzhou citizens’ advice on even the slightest changes of the West Lake landscape. This is one of the highlights of the ‘West Lake mode’.

This policy was developed in the West Lake improvement project in 2002. Since then, any slight change of the landscape has not only been the responsibility of the administrative authorities, but also requires public involvement. That is, the public has considerable say on the condition of informed consent. First, the project must be brought to public notice, usually in Hangzhou Daily, so that citizens may have their voices heard; secondly, the implementation plan of the project must be publicised to solicit public opinions; thirdly, these public opinions, after collected and sorted, must be forwarded to the departments and units concerned; and lastly, people’s reasonable advice must be taken. The departments and units concerned shall urge the plan makers to improve the plan according to the reasonable advice. For advice that is not taken, the plan makers shall give explanations.

In recent years, the West Lake comprehensive improvement projects and the projects launched for the world heritage nomination of the West Lake landscape, whether large or small, particularly those closely related to people’s livelihood, have all been placed under public scrutiny. For example, before the improvement project of the villages within the scope of the West Lake landscape was implemented, the scheme was publicised, and the villagers’ meeting was convened. Only after opinion survey was thoroughly carried out in every family and all different voices were heard, was the household-specific plan finalised. In the process of ‘public notice’, we can not only hear people’s voices but also encourage citizens, the media, tourists and scholars to get themselves involved, give play to their respective professional expertises, and participate in the West Lake conservation.

To some extent, ‘asking for people’s advice’ has played a positive role in regulating the relations between heritage managers and the stakeholders. In this favourable atmosphere, many people who care for and love the West Lake have developed a habit of offering suggestions on the West Lake landscape. This has brought the West Lake conservation and management further along the healthy path. Nowadays, Hangzhou Municipal Advice Solicitation Office receives numerous letters and calls concerning West Lake conservation every year, from native people, warm-hearted non-native tourists, scholars, and ordinary masses. After sorted, these proposals are all forwarded to the functional departments concerned. They have been or are being implemented.

Share the benefits of conservation and return the lake to the people

‘Break the walls, open the area for free, return the lake to the people, and share the benefits’—this has become part of the ‘West Lake mode’, an example widely followed in other places. The main idea is to show people-orientation and humanistic concern, cater to human-centred needs, and stress
harmony. This has not only increased the city’s appeal, but also improved its overall economic benefits; not only showed the humanistic concern, but also accorded with relevant economic laws.

Over the 10 consecutive years of the implementation of the West Lake Comprehensive Conservation Project, 585 thousand square metres of illicit buildings and buildings unpleasant to the eye have been demolished in the surrounding areas of the West Lake, 265 units moved out, 0.9 square kilometres of West Lake waters restored, and more than 1 million square metres of public green land built in the scenic area. The water of the West Lake has been replaced once every month. As a result, the water quality has improved significantly. The original biotic populations, their structure and functions are protected, and the bio-environment is recovered. All the scenic spots and museums around the lake are now open for free. The West Lake without any enclosure and charging no fee for admission has become the ‘reception hall’ of Hangzhou and an appealing public space. In this process, not only have Hangzhou citizens and tourists from home and abroad been benefited, but also considerable economic returns have been received. Hangzhou’s total revenue of tourism was about 24.9 billion yuan in 2001; ten years after the West Lake was open for free, the figure skyrocketed to 102.57 billion yuan. In this way, the economic, biological and social benefits of the public resources of the West Lake have been maximised and optimised. And this is the balance point that has been sought between the conservation & management and development & exploitation of the West Lake landscape.

Safeguard villagers’ interests and benefit the people

Due to the restrictions of landscape resources and heritage protection, compared with other suburban villages, the villages within the scope of the West Lake landscape have many disadvantages: they cannot develop their land, build tall buildings or develop industry. Consequently their production and life have been affected. To resolve the conflict between heritage protection and economic growth, Hangzhou Municipal Government launched relevant supportive policies and incentive measures.

Longjing Tea of the West Lake is an important part of the West Lake Cultural Landscape. So far, there have been eight tea villages within the scope of the heritage site, with villagers totalling about 12 thousand. Since the Song Dynasty, tea farmers of the West Lake have kept the traditions of planting, picking, frying and selling Longjing Tea. To conserve the landscape resources around the tea villages, promote economic growth and achieve the goal of ‘beautiful landscape, prosperous industry and wealthy people’, Hangzhou Municipal Government has invested substantially in the construction and improvement of infrastructure and public utilities of the tea villages. With incentive measures in place of subsidies, it has encouraged villagers to spend small sums on the improvement of their own houses. Those who show initiative may be rewarded by the government. This measure has instantly been well received by tea villagers. Nearly all tea villagers within the scope of the West Lake Scenic Area have taken active part in the improvement. The villages have thus taken on a much better look. At the same time, sewage pipes, power and telecommunications facilities are all moved underground, thereby changing the dirty, messy and heavily polluted environment of the villages within the scope of the landscape and significantly improving the living standards of West Lake aboriginals.

The ‘villages within the scope of the landscape’, after improved, have gradually grown into tourism & recreational zones integrating folk tea houses, farmhouse restaurants, self-service hotels and cultural
creation, with Longjing Tea as the core. This has not only increased the carrying capacity of the property area, but also provided tea farmers with ways of sustainable development. According to statistics, the sales revenue of Longjing Tea in the property area reached 68.32 million yuan, up 127.3% over 2003; there had been no folk tea house in the beginning, but by 2010, 396 farm houses had started business related to tea, tourism and recreation, with a yearly income of 106.54 million yuan. In 2010, tea farmers’ average income was 14,705 yuan, up 46.9% over 2003.

The government has established a benefit-sharing mechanism for residents of the villages within the scope of the West Lake landscape. Take Maojiabu Village for example. In 2003, folk tea houses were started in improved farmhouses. Recreational economy thus originated. In 2011, the collective income of the whole village topped 15 million yuan. After the expenses on activity organisation, cleaning service, security and public affairs were deducted, the remaining 9 million yuan were distributed among 420 shareholders by age. Three shares are distributed to each village aging between 16 and 25; five to each between 25 and 40; and eight to each above 40, with 1,500 yuan per share. Moreover, the share-holding cooperative also dispenses life subsidies on a monthly basis: 500 yuan to each person between 16 and 25, 800 yuan to each between 25 and 40, and 1,000 yuan to each above 40. The retired also receive a 200-yuan allowance each month. Besides, by contract, tea production is carried out separately by individual households. Each villager can get about 400 square metres of tea plantation. The village provides services needed in Longjing Tea production. In addition, it has also offered quite a few service posts, and its villagers are given priority, with a monthly salary of over 2,000 yuan. According to statistics, every Maojiabu villager has an average annual income of over 20 thousand.

The West Lake conservation is not only the responsibility of the administrative authorities, but also of more than 8 million Hangzhou citizens. We should adhere to the concept of ‘people-orientation’ and implement such people-benefiting policies as ‘returning the lake to the people’ and ‘improving the villages within the scope of the landscape’. Only in this way can ordinary people and tourists from home and abroad participate in and enjoy benefit from the West Lake conservation; only in this way can the West Lake culture be better protected and inherited.
In many other Asian countries, traditional cultures are often acknowledged as national treasures and have an indispensable place in daily life even today. Most are intangible cultural treasures, and their forms are various, including local traditional performing arts/skills and traditions that are rich in folklore characteristics. Furthermore, many tangible cultural treasures are needed for these intangible cultural treasures, and while some are gradually being lost, several others are passed down to the present.

Traditional culture in our lives is invariably passed down as part of daily life itself or in ceremonial occasions as well as local celebrations and festivals. How the traditional cultures in our lives are passed down may be seen in varying degrees even within Japan. Although, generally speaking, it is understood that they are passed down by seniors more than by youth, and in rural areas and fishing villages more than in cities, one city—Kyoto—has a uniquely significant amount of traditional culture being passed down. A distinctive characteristic is that major festivals in Kyoto are held and enthusiastically engaged in by children and young people rather than by seniors.

Versatile traditional cultures and mechanisms for passing down tradition

In the traditional cultures of Kyoto, versatile mechanisms are seen: flower arrangement or the tea ceremony is passed down through the Iemoto (grand master) system; traditional performing arts such as Kyo-dance pass down each school in a way similar to the former; and traditional handicraft and specialized skills shown in handiwork by craftsmen is passed down by such practitioners. However, while the mechanisms appear to be solid, it is necessary to revitalize the areas of activities and expand groups that sustain traditional culture as well as popularize it in order to maintain cultural transmission in changing times. At the same time, it is also necessary to give the central position to grand masters who are the successors in their groups.

In an age in which the quality of home education is changing, hanamachi (Geisha districts) are disappearing, and Japanese kimono are worn less and less, the 32 categories of the traditional handicrafts market—such as traditional performing arts like music and dance, textile dyeing, toreutics, and marquetry—is diminishing and, consequently, so are the practitioners. Some schools in the fields of incense burning, waka poetry, and cooking are found difficult to pass down, even
though the grand masters are still active. Even the arts of flower arrangement and tea ceremony, which boast large organizations, have completed quantitative expansion and changed their policy of activities to build a qualitative mature period. In the fields of traditional performing arts and specialized skills, the mechanisms and organizations for transmission are in an actual transition period because of the change in the quality of cultural conveyors. It has been some time since the apprenticeship custom was lost, and nowadays, more young people begin learning traditional performing arts and specialized skills after graduating from universities. Conventional training and learning methods are no longer adequate.

Furthermore, in Kyoto, some traditional culture is practiced as part of religious activities, and other traditional culture is takes the form of events such as local festivals in which ordinary citizens are cultural conveyors, even though the festivals were originally religious. These aspects of traditional culture and their transmission by ordinary citizens are never particularly easy, even in Kyoto, where they are successfully passed down.

At present, while Ura Senke and Omote Senke in tea ceremony, and the Ikenobo School of flower arrangement position their grand masters as well as their families at the center, they have organizations such as incorporated foundations, or they operate universities. Major temples and shrines such as Nishi Honganji, Higashi Honganji, and Chion-In are organized not only as traditional organizations of head temples and shrines but also religious corporations and hold modern management entities including universities. Furthermore, in regard to traditional specialized skills, maiko, geiko, and jikata (shamisen players) belong to associations organized by each hanamachi (Geisha district). Moreover, all associations have one common foundation, providing services for health insurance, pensions, and so on, and strive for organizational transmission despite financial difficulties. In addition, traditional handicrafts, which support the local industrial economy, have already been protected for over half a century through industrial development policies by legislation and regulations designed to promote traditional handicrafts set by government and municipalities.

Many have mechanisms of this type of organizational transmission, and they carry out each activity for the purpose of transmission and maintain a certain number of cultural conveyors. In an age in which the lives of ordinary citizens are changing and traditional culture is disappearing from our daily lives, it may appear as though fewer people try to pass down traditional culture and that the public’s interest is diminishing. However, mechanisms are ready to support such a limited number of young enthusiastic practitioners who deeply feel that the passing down of traditional culture is more significant than ever before.

Meanwhile, large-scale organizations such as Ura Senke have established their roles as supporting leaders of modern culture by developing modern cultural activities such as the publishing business like Tankosha as well as lifelong learning courses, and so on. Many efforts to stimulate the public’s fading interest are seen in situations such as the traditional handicraft industry being engaged in successively developing new products by interacting with designers from other countries such as Italy, traditional performing arts linked to school education, and so on. The cultural industry of Kyoto, which originated from traditional cultures, magnifies its importance of existence increasingly more in modern society. Because tourism is also active in Kyoto, many movements are under way for strengthening its marketability by modernizing traditional cultures in various ways. While maintaining their own organizations as leaders that support Japanese cultures, each organization is capable of planning and executing strategies that sustain the value of traditional cultures.
On the other hand, traditional events, such as festivals in which ordinary citizens and local people get involved, had comparatively lacked financial support and human resources, and for a long time, it was difficult to pass them down organizationally. Without lemotos or head temples, or ateliers or associations for craftsmen, it was difficult to even sustain traditional cultures when local people gathered at meetings such as in neighborhood associations, so it was a very difficult task to pass down the cultural values.

However, in recent years, such gatherings of local citizens have been reorganized and established as legal entities. Most of the yama (floats) and hoko (floats) preservation societies that constitute the Gion Festival’s Yamahoko procession have become corporate entities, and also the Daimonji preservation society—the largest among local neighborhood associations at each mountain-base that constitutes the Great Bonfire of the Five Great Zen Temples—has become an incorporated nonprofit organization. While the Yamahoko Preservation Society possesses common properties such as Choie, a major base for the festival, the Daimonji Preservation Society has incorporated forestland possessed by senior members of local neighborhood associations in sectional ownership as permanent property, in addition to the task of storing the decorated floats. They took on a new form as a modern organization by setting up general meetings, board meetings, services, and so on in their articles of association.

The reason for this is the fact that being acknowledged by the government, prefecture, city, and so on as a recipient of financial support can be one of the purposes. However, that is not the only purpose; it is also to operate organizations with greater openness by clarifying the relationships between individuals and organizations in addition to the mechanisms of decision-making. However, change never happens swiftly. It moves slowly, judging from the time of generational transition by cultural conveyers. It was also an inevitable mechanism for making an easy transmission and expanding cultural activities through slow but open operation. In fact, increasingly more young people now gather at open organizations.

As mentioned above, until recently, each conveyer of traditional cultures continued to modernize and organize. Kyoto’s versatile traditional cultures have been seeking a mechanism for cultural transmission in modern society, continued to change at a moderate pace, and have gathered wisdom so that such activities would be sustained. Tremendous energy is required simply to create such mechanisms, and all effort surely leads to achievements.

The traditional events being passed down

In fact, although revealed in the daily changes of our lives, more local festivals are passed down than are personal ceremonial occasions. In particular, a month before and after the processions of the three major festivals of Kyoto—namely the Aoi Festival (Kamo Festival) in May, the Gion Festival in July, and the Jidai Festival in October—are set as major events, and carried out by the participation of a wide range of city residents. Although the Great Bonfire of the Five Great Zen Temples on August 16 also requires almost a year of preparation due to the traditional burning of a tremendous amount of pine firewood, hundreds of local citizens and citizen volunteers carry out the task.

The Aoi Festival, which is registered as a world cultural heritage and is a regular festival of the Kamomioya Shrine (Shimogamo Shrine) and Kamowakeikazuchi Shrine (Kamogamo Shrine), takes
place on May 15. Anciently, it was called the Kamo Festival and was acknowledged among noblemen in the mid-Heian Period as a festival representing Kyoto. The reason why it began to be called Aoi Festival is because ornamental Aoi (hollyhock) leaves became widely used after the festival was restored in 1694 during the Edo Period (7th year of Genroku). The festival was discontinued in 1869 (2nd year of Meiji), but the procession was restored by the government in 1884 (17th year of Meiji) as an incentive plan of Kyoto and was discontinued again due to the Second World War. In 1953 (28th year of Showa), the Aoi Festival Procession Co-sponsor Association was organized through donations from citizens and corporations to revive the procession. It was in 1956 (31st year of Showa) when women known as Saiohdai, who were selected from the noble families in the city, appeared to be the center of the procession.

The Jidai Festival began in 1895 (28th year of Meiji) as an event celebrating the inauguration of Heian Shrine and the 1,100th anniversary of the Heian-capital-relocation. Heian Shrine was built as part of the integration of various promotional services of Kyoto that had been declining after the Meiji Restoration and started as a symbol of enthusiasm of citizens who contributed to the Shrine. The major detail of the Jidai Festival is that the procession takes place on October 22, the day the capital was relocated. From this procession, one can learn about the capital's history and culture, and no other cities can rival the procession. The procession of the Jidai Festival is conducted by citizen organizations throughout Kyoto, called Heian Kosha (ten corporations in total). Originally, it began on a scale of six rows and 500 people, and now it has expanded to eighteen rows representing seven eras, with five additional hanamachi participating in rotation, leading to a total of 2,000 city residents now participating.

Furthermore, as many as 12,000 furnishings, costumes, and festival paraphernalia are repeatedly checked for historical authenticity to reveal genuine reproduction created by all available traditional craft skills that Kyoto has nurtured as the capital for 1,000 years, and it is like a live historic picture scroll. The significance of this festival is that it was a festive procession of majestic rows accompanying the Shinko Row in which the divine spirits of Emperor Kanmu and Emperor Komei, who were the festival deities of the Heian Shrine, marched through the city to see the lives of city citizens. However, today, the procession is mainly prepared, funded, and participated in based on the city’s municipal joint associations that comprise Heian Kosha, and it has become a costume parade that ordinary citizens can readily enjoy. The costumes have been stored and maintained by Sukeikai, an organization that had been set up at the inauguration of Heian Shrine, and even today, new costumes are being contributed to play a central role in the procession.

The Supporting Association of Aoi Festival Procession and Heian Kosha are voluntary citizen groups that belong to religious corporations. City residents, especially many from the old town area of the city center, participate in the processions of two festivals through these organizations. The Jidai Festival is also an event of neighborhood associations in the Nakagyo, Kamigyo, and Shimogyo wards. It has been some time since these festivals lost their primary role as religious events, and although they have become little more than costume parades, these two festivals have tremendous significance as tools to promote tourism. In that sense, the aspect could be pointed out that these are passed down as tourist events carried out by citizen volunteers. However, it could also be considered that they are becoming more like new modern-day cultural traditions as events of citizen participation, for more than a century in the case of the Jidai Festival, and half a century for the Aoi Festival.
Another Gion Festival, designated as a national significant intangible folk cultural asset, consists of three parts: Yamahoko procession, Shinyotogyo, and Hanagasa procession. The basis of 32 yamahoko and mikoshi (portable shrine) part of the old town area, smaller than a town, and a very closed citizen organization. Because there is a history of making yamahoko on a town basis, anciently, the town citizens have managed floats as their own assets. Even though citizens have moved in and out, rights related to the Gion Festival have never easily prevailed. Each organized preservation association, most of which have been incorporated as mentioned above, operate organizations in a more open form, respectively. Furthermore, all the preservation associations have organized the Gion Festival Yamahoko Association and operate various businesses for one month each year, centered on the Yamahoko procession. Shinyotogyo and the Hanagasa procession take place at about the same time in tandem, and are taken care of by a similar organization of other areas of the city, where events are taking place in parallel.

Exploring new mechanisms of cultural transmission: citizen participation

To respond to the shortage of town citizens who can support the Yamahoko procession, the Kyoto Gion Festival Volunteer 21 has recently been set up, comprising twenty groups, and volunteer participation centered on young people is on the rise. This movement is implemented by the Kyoto Youth Service Promotion Committee, a voluntary organization, as being the primary body, and they have boy and girl scouts, Kyoto Junior Chamber, Inc., corporations such as Shimadzu Corporation, resulting in several hundred children participating in such activities. As seen by the fact that the office of this organization is located at the headquarters of Chado Urasenke Tankokai Inc., coordination is spreading across organizations involved in traditional culture in the city of Kyoto.

Other than this, there are events such as New Year’s visits to shrines, the Bean-scattering Festival with demons, farewell bonfires and Jizo Bon Festival in August, full moon viewing in September, and many other rituals that take place in temples and shrines in various areas within the city. Although when and how such organizations were founded may vary, consequently most financial and human resources are assumed by local communities or local corporations. Rather than saying assumed, it is not an exaggeration to say that these festivals are supported by citizens’ continuous enthusiasm. When we say citizens, it does not mean only certain seniors or people related to religion but also includes ordinary people living in modern society, and during the time that these conveyors participate in daily life, they support such rituals along with a tradition-minded awareness. It is common that organizations and groups continue on-going daily activities even though they are not designated as incorporated foundations or non-profit organizations. Although the entire country shares this common characteristic, Kyoto is particularly so, though may vary slightly from place to place.

Different from Gion Festival, because the preservation association of the Five Great Zen Temples, which assumes responsibility for farewell bonfires in August, functions based on farming and mountain villages around the city of Kyoto, more traditional characteristics are kept in this association. Among the five areas of Daimonji, Myoho, Funagata, Toriimoto, and Hidari Daimonji, the Daimonji Preservation Association was quickly acknowledged as a non-profit organization in 1999 as mentioned above, immediately after the law for the promotion of nonprofit activities was enacted. Many citizen volunteers express desire to also participate in this event. However, only a limited number of volunteers can participate because each household residing in an area or community is
given grates to build up fires, with no plans to increase the number of grates beyond 75, and skilled techniques are required for piling up firewood to create enormous flames that continue burning for 20 minutes, after firing up in chorus within a difference of two seconds, as well as working on hazardous steep slopes. After becoming an incorporated nonprofit organization, the Daimonji Preservation Association embarked on forestry maintenance around Daimonji Mountain and is now promoting volunteer activities such as engaging in tree-thinning services (forestry management).

This enthusiasm enables traditional cultures such as festivals to continue to be passed down to the present. Because of the citizens’ enthusiasm, they develop and change slightly every year, and sometimes transform considerably. The changes meet the needs of modern society, and reform is made to suit the convenience of modern people who are the cultural conveyers. However, whenever changes or reforms are made, very careful discussions are repeatedly held, and agreement among concerned parties will be reached only when the ideas are confirmed to be sufficiently satisfactory to meet the primary requirements for cultural transmission.

Modernization of festivals in Kyoto

Unlike the Aoi Festival, which was revived in the middle of the Meiji Period, and the Jidai Festival, which began in 1894 in celebration of the 1,100th anniversary of capital’s relocation, most of the festivals in Kyoto—as many as 600, including the Gion Festival and Soul Festival—are events mainly carried out by temples and shrines, most of which originate from before the Edo Period. Due to the strategy of Unity of Religion and Politics set by the Meiji government ahead of modernization, temples and shrines, which are the center of festivals, were affected by the policy of Separation of Shintoism and Buddhism in early Meiji Period. It goes without saying that festivals that are centered on shrines linked to state-sanctioned Shinto have survived to the present time from Buddhist persecution movements that have occurred incrementally since then. However, in Kyoto, where many head temples are kept as the center of Buddhism, many festivals related to Buddhist temples still remain.

Obviously, the Separation of Shintoism and Buddhism, a political intervention by government into religion, not only physically made a tremendous impact on religious people involved in temples and shrines but also threw the majority of the nation into psychological chaos. Nevertheless, as a result, the relationship between the people and temples or shrines has become considerably modernized, or in other words, it is assumed that psychological independence from religion was promoted. The significance of festivals, rituals that are a critical part of religion, has changed. We can imagine that immense change has occurred in festivals that have been sustained until the present time.

In the same way, or through more important modernization, changes happened in Kyoto. They include the collapse of the feudal system, absence of the emperor because of the emperor’s relocation to Tokyo, and accompanying-shifting of political power including court nobles to Tokyo. Changes in the class system and land-tax reform by the Meiji Restoration have brought tremendous changes to ordinary citizens whose lives are centered on temples and shrines. In particular, many citizens who had maintained relationships with temples and shrines as Buddhist parishioners or shrine parishioners moved out of the city, and temples and shrines had to re-establish a relationship with local neighborhood people, who consistently moved, for many years to come. It is assumed that enormous efforts were also required to sustain citizens’ organizations in support of festivals.
While some citizens of Kyoto claim that the city is still the capital, because of the unprecedented lack of an imperial edict for capital relocation, the absence of the emperor for 140 years made a huge change in Kyoto’s social structure on the other hand. While imperial families and shogunate families were long gone, and the new government did not become a strong patron, commercial and industrial enterprises that were left in the deteriorating Kyoto began to support festivals. In that respect, the fact that the Gion Festival, for which the townspeople were the original conveyers, and recovered swiftly from the great fire in the first year of Ganji in the late Edo Period (1868), has much do with this issue of cultural conveyers. However, many festivals besides the Gion are reviving in changing forms through the efforts of Kyoto citizens.

The next major change that Kyoto’s festivals have gone through was the influence of democratization after the Second World War. This was an immediate revolution in major areas of modernization that the Meiji Restoration was not capable of completing. Establishment of the separation of politics and religion according to the new constitution, and revolution of the family system through the new civil law, brought dramatic changes to Kyoto, even though Kyoto may have undergone moderate changes compared to other cities. At the same time, the postwar economic chaos had debilitating effects on business operators who had been supporting the Gion Festival on a town basis and created mobilization of human resources that had been involved in the festivals around them. The town of Yamahoko of the Gion Festival is a town where kimono wholesalers and textile companies, that constitute the Kyoto Textile Wholesalers’ Association, gather centering on Muromachi Boulevard. Fortunately, companies in Muromachi quickly recovered due to the postwar high economic growth and supported postwar development of the Gion Festival. Because of this development, the face of traditional streets transformed to office buildings, and many citizens who had constituted the town have moved out to suburban areas. That constituted the loss of practitioners of festivals. From then until the present, the sluggish textile business for many years, deterioration of the kimono business, and the collapse of the bubble economy brought changes such as the presidency of Yamahoko Association to be taken over by a scholar who is from the same area.

The owners of kimono wholesalers and related companies in Kyoto who have mainly been involved in the Gion Festival left the central roles. At the same time, because citizens moved away, hollowing out the urban core, corporations rather than families or citizens in the community began to get involved in festivals. As such, going through the postwar chaotic period, development of the social economy through high economic growth and the collapse of the bubble economy affected Kyoto tremendously. Although the face of streets has transformed into office buildings, central members of every preservation association carry out activities as proactively as towns’ people would do where tradesmen’s houses still exist, and even some of these hurriedly come from distant areas.

Local children also participate in the Gion Festival. When the number of citizens and birthrates are in decline, there will be a lack of boys and girls within the town—boys in charge of music, and girls who sell chimaki (sticky rice wraps). On the other hand, now, in areas where the buildings of companies bankrupted by the sluggish economy have been converted into condominiums, the number of families and children who do not have longstanding links with the area has been rising. In such cases, we have seen instances such as the town of Taishiyama, where the preservation association has allowed citizens living in such condominiums join the association. It is now a common practice to allow children in new elementary schools, which were integrated due to the declining number of students, participate in festivals as part of their class study. Consequently, some are disappointed
because detailed characteristics of each town or preservation association, such as what type of flowers should be placed on the altar or sentimental tunes of songs by chimaki-selling girls, and so on have been lost. Certainly, children living in these condominiums do not speak the Kyoto dialect and thus sell chimaki in the standard national dialect. However, the enjoyable participation of these cultural conveyors in local communities at the heart of the radically changing city of Kyoto is welcomed by many citizens.

**People involved in festivals, their families, and the local community**

On the other hand, areas around Jisho (Ginkaku)-ji in Jodo-ji Village, located at the northeast corner of the city of Kyoto did not receive such influence. The local agricultural community was left in tact. Therefore, until incorporated nonprofit organizations were established, local organizations, based on a limited number of houses, had been in charge of local events. Cultural values were also maintained and remained comparatively vital.

The Gion Festival in feudal society was a procession in which people called kamochi, who had exclusive right to own (ownership of) land and building, gathered together on the basis of the town community, prepared yamahoko, and paraded together. Whether they were members of the same families, or they lived in the same town, they were not the constituent members of festivals. Although they were mobilized to do the work, they were considered not the main body. Just like assets, the qualification of a constituent member was ruled by the primogeniture system.

The family system in the Meiji Period was more of one in which the feudalistic primogeniture system, based on households, was strengthened. Inheriting households that were limited to only high society, such as the warrior class, were expanded to encompass commercial and industrial business people in the town, and it is assumed that households in charge of festivals were more immobilized and stable than during the Edo Period. However, in the family system according to the new civil law set forth after the Second World War, households lost their substantial meaning, and local communities, constituted by households, as well as the festivals practiced by such communities, were forced to undergo massive change.

Such changes have now become distinctive after half a century. In some Yamahoko preservation associations of the Gion Festival, female constituent members are permitted on the executive board. Furthermore, the Daimonji Preservation Association, in which the primogeniture system has been the fundamental principle, finally had to change this rule, recently. Areas supporting Daimonji recognize that these changes in recent years are part of a greater problem.

That is, if constituent families do not have males in direct lineage, spouses of female cultural conveyors are now accepted. In such cases, the surnames of female cultural conveyors and their spouses are not necessarily passed down. They do not have to be residents of the former Jodo-ji Village at the foot of Daimonji Mountain. However, participation in various preparatory work throughout the year is left as the only mandatory condition.

It is assumed that participating volunteers from outside will be more important when such members with territorial connections are lost. As for the Gion Festival, corporations and their employees as well as citizen volunteers are gradually taking central positions, and eventually, the Daimonji
Preservation Association, now an incorporated nonprofit organization, will have an increasing number of outside members. However, the accumulated movement of organizing and incorporating are mechanisms to respectively guarantee the sustainability of constituent members. Activities that are more open are being developed by new corporate bodies to encourage such mechanisms.

At present, when everybody is talking about environmental issues, the fact that pine trees that decorate the top of the yama (mountain) of Gion Festival, Minami Kannon yama, and Kita Kannon yama were cut from the Shigaraki forest in Shiga Prefecture, and that firewood used for farewell bonfires were sent from Tottori Prefecture, was seen as a problem last year. At that time, Kyoto Prefecture was implementing Cultural Forest conservation services to continue to pass down Kyoto’s unique cultural heritage and traditional cultures, as part of the Green Public Projects to protect deteriorating forests. For that purpose, in collaboration with forest owners, forestry cooperatives, and so on, the Forestry Unit of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries Department of Kyoto Prefecture, acting as leader, began to obtain pine trees from within the city and prefecture. They were able to find pine trees but could not wastefully dispose of them afterward. Then, a new mechanism in which the floats of the Gion Festival would be burnt at Daimonji was established.

Aspects of traditional culture in life are passed down as part of daily living. Because they are closer to daily life, they tend to be influenced by changes in families and local communities. The reason why celebrations and festivals in the community never cease is that families and people in the community today are enjoying these events in their daily lives. In Kyoto, where youth are more enthusiastic than seniors in participating in festivals, traditional culture is widely accepted as something to live for, whether or not they are aware of the tradition and its value. In this respect, I believe that the very distinctive characteristics of the traditional culture of Kyoto lies here.
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Introduction

On July 31, 2010, Yangdong Historic Village in Gyeongju was inscribed on the World Heritage List (Number 1,324), along with Hahoe Historic Village, (Korea’s Historic Villages: Hahoe and Yangdong). This is very significant in that Korea’s living heritage was chosen as one of the World Heritage sites for the first time in the Korean history.

Unlike general cultural assets, Yangdong Historic Village is a rural village where residents currently reside, making it a site of living heritage. However, since the introduction of a national management system (Important Historic Cultural Property #189) in 1984, work in the village that had naturally changed over time has stopped, causing changes in lifestyle and production modes. Its inclusion in the World Heritage list in 2010 has induced unprecedented changes in the village, with a sharp rise in the number of visitors leading the village to face diverse issues and problems.

A rising number of visitors brought about splits in the rural community and the collapse of the way of life and production system in the village, leading it to degenerate into a tourism-oriented historic village. An increasing number of visitors directly link to tourism, making it hard to exclude the
possibility that the village’s heritage may be in peril, a phenomenon that has been widely witnessed among living heritage sites throughout the world. Fortunately, residents in the village and the local government (Gyeongju city) have recognized the seriousness of the issue, devising plans to overcome obstacles.

This presentation came from the recognition of such circumstantial changes. The in-depth observation of the village over two years after its inscription on the list allowed us to diagnose and classify circumstantial changes therein in order to identify underlying conflict structures. The ultimate purpose of this paper is to formulate the principles and plans of the residents’ self-conservation system designed to actively respond to such circumstances. 

Analysis of Changes in the Village after Inscription

Trends and Contents of Changes

What should be noted the most in terms of changes in the village after its inscription on the World Heritage List is the new establishment of the historic village management system and the formulation of the village ordinance. The issue over the permanent stationing of public servants that has been demanded since 1984, when the village as a whole was designated as a cultural property, was resolved, with the village ordinance (Yangdong Village Preservation and Operation Ordinance) for devising specific ways for village support helping identify new channels for village preservation. However, most of the changes in the village caused by the city of Gyeongju were designed to cope with civil complaints from visitors, giving rise to another issue in terms of the authenticity of the village.

Changes in the residents have actively come about since the Yangdong Historic Village Operation Committee (hereinafter, ‘the Operation Committee’) was launched on April 2, 2011, into which various village committees (preservation committee, women’s committee, young adult committee, senior member committee) were integrated. The Operation Committee led by grandsons of the head family serves as a venue where different village issues are discussed, making efforts to promote the residents’ self-conservation system.

In relation to outsiders, some worried about the possibility of tour agents advancing into the village, but focus was made instead on the impact of positive changes. This can be understood in the context of the official launch of the Operation Committee representing the village.

First of all, in terms of ‘space/environmental arrangement’, different types of support for infrastructure were provided to ensure the convenience of visitors and the safety of residents.

---

1 The residents’ self-conservation system differs from a ‘resident-oriented’ structure where the position and convenience of residents are fully accepted under a state-run system, referring to the resident-centered concept where an achievement is made by residents themselves. Namely, the residents’ self-conservation system signifies community activities with self-supporting economic feasibility, supported by a self-reliant system where residents themselves recognize the issue. Therefore, a specific organization led by local residents is required for the seamless activation of the system. The organization refers to a quasi-public village consultation system that can settle conflicts that may be incurred in the process of implementing systematized preservation agreements or regulations. It is also responsible for setting up village infrastructure on a mid-to-long term basis, promoting/supporting diverse preservation projects, protecting/managing the environment and landscape of the village, and identifying/operating soft programs related to village activation.
Second, in terms of ‘the activation of visiting programs’, changes for ensuring convenience in the experiences of visitors were made, featuring a variety of traditional events held by local residents. However, such events were operated as short-term solutions, rather than as a mid-to-long term roadmap, failing to fully deliver the real intention of the village to tourists.

Third, the most significant development in ‘community reinforcement and support’ was the preparation of a venue for mutual communication among residents. The Operation Committee has functioned as a medium for community cooperation and vitality reinforcement, discussing various issues and conducting diverse volunteer activities. In particular, the village seminars (6 times)\(^2\) held in cooperation with outside experts between September 2011 and January 2012 served as opportunities to discuss various issues for the residents’ self-conservation system. Another development that should be mentioned is that Yangdong Elementary School, which was at risk of being closed down, has been revived as an alternative school.

Table 1. Changes in the Village after its Inscription on the World Heritage List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Entity</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Government (Gyeongju) Support</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Outsider (Expert) Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit/Communication Promotion</td>
<td>A rise in the number of group visitors; A rise in the number of short-term visitors; A rise in the number of family visitors; A rise in the number of long-term visitors; A rise in the number of foreign visitors; A rise in the number of visitors who wish to experience traditional culture; The concentration of visitors at the village entrance; The appearance of large-sized tour buses</td>
<td>New establishment of a historic village management club; Support for holding traditional wedding (twice); Support for holding a Korean wrestling contest for foreigners; Support for holding the main family (SeoBaekDang) food festival; Conclusion of an MOU with KHNP; Designation as Hyangdan Luxury Old House (#1); Village tour agents (5 persons/day); Installation of temporary parking lots/ Allocation of parking guides; Construction of heritage exhibition center; Buses traveling between New Gyeongju Station and Yangdong Village; Installation of convenience</td>
<td>Installation of joint marketing site for women’s committee; A rise in the number of individual salesmen among residents; A rise in the number of restaurants and private rental rooms;</td>
<td>A rise in the number of volunteers (Pohang Young-il High School; one keeper per cultural asset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Support</td>
<td>New establishment of a historic village management club; Support for holding traditional wedding (twice); Support for holding a Korean wrestling contest for foreigners; Support for holding the main family (SeoBaekDang) food festival; Conclusion of an MOU with KHNP; Designation as Hyangdan Luxury Old House (#1); Village tour agents (5 persons/day);</td>
<td>Launch of Yangdong Village Operation Committee (April 2, 2011); Revision and announcement of Yangdong Village Regulations (January 16, 2012); Volunteer activities of young adult/ women’s committee; Village Newspaper (Ginkgo) distribution and management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication of Village Newspaper (Ginkgo); Holding village seminars (6); Establishment of Yangdong Village Research Institute (UIDUK University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The village seminar was held a total of six times from November 2010, to January 2012 (Venue: Yangdong Church). 1st: Systematic Maintenance of Yangdong Village (Nov. 20, 2010); 2nd: Establishment and Operation of Village Companies (Sept. 17, 2011); 3rd: Enhancing the Quality of Village Tour (Oct. 01, 2011); 4th: Village Tour and Creative Village Marketing (Nov. 26, 2011); 5th: Sustainable Village Environment and Production (Dec. 03, 2011); 6th: Village Company Implementation Process and Methodology (Jan. 07, 2012)
Results of Circumstances for Visitors

- Public facilities for visitors (chairs, public rest rooms, drinking water fountain; installation of facilities for safety and convenience of residents; (CCTV; village road; road pavement; community hall front yard construction); transfer of community hall (in the heritage exhibition center).

- A rise in the number of weekend stores; installation of indoor vending machines; flowing of underground water into Yangdong stream; identification and renovation of old paths (3); installation of path signposts (25).

- VCUV - related obstacles; landscape damage from non-traditional well (6) renovation.

- Activities of head family grandsons; closing of the doors of Hyangdan and Simsujeong; a rise in food prices; conversion of rice fields into lotus fields; a rise in the number of new enrolled students in Yangdong Elementary School (2011).

Continuous newspaper publication

Category-based Trend Analysis

Analyzing more than 50 types of circumstantial changes that occurred in the village after its inscription on the World Heritage List, three kinds of trends can be identified.

First, changes in the solidarity of the community were identified. The village was expected to face serious difficulties due to ‘confusion in the production system’ and ‘outside visits exceeding village capacity’ resulting from the advancement of the tourism industry in the village. Of course, such phenomena plunged the village into confusion, which it is still trying to clear. However, the Operation Committee that was launched to cope with and respond to such issues by the grandsons of head families served as an important opportunity to strengthen the unity of the community. The existing concept that grandsons of head families are symbolic beings was totally converted. Controversies between residents and those who left their homes were significantly incurred, but the forward-looking idea of the grandsons of main families who wished to protect their village was deemed to overcome such conflicts.

Second, changes in the position of the public sector to recognize a bottom-up approach can also be mentioned. The Act for Protecting Cultural Properties is a strong means for regulation. Over the past 25 years or so, due to the above Act, residents have resided in old/worn-out houses (especially thatched houses), in an outdated living environment (use of squat toilets, prohibition of use of stand-up kitchens) and in a poor production environment (prohibition of animal husbandry and cultivation of special crops), not equipped with the minimum requirements for a modern life. This rose from the fact that the village as a whole in which people were still living was designated as a cultural property. However, the biggest culprit was the top-down policy of the government that has turned a blind eye to the reality facing the residents.
The inclusion of the village in the World Heritage List provided room to change the existing system. The establishment of a historic village management club for onsite support and the formulation of village ordinances enabling the direct support of the city of Gyeongju have led the government to listen to and respond to the voices of the residents.

The third trend is related to the misconception of visitors about the village. They tend to regard Yangdong Village as a fossilized historic village. Of course, the source of such misunderstanding is that the village has been designated as an important historic cultural property and historic village in accordance with National Law. As a result, visitors tend to mistake residents for tour agents, regarding houses and paddy fields as exhibition facilities. This has led to and exacerbated some conflicts between residents and visitors, or between residents and the public sector.

In response, visitor training, viewing restrictions (open house system, etc.), and collection of visiting fees have been discussed and promoted, which should be preceded by changes in the attitude of visitors toward Yangdong village.

In other words, not only local residents but also visitors should recognize that what should be observed in the village is its spiritual aspects based on Confucianism and the mood of the village as a whole, rather than its infrastructure.

**Conflicts from Changes in the Village**

Considering the types of changes comprehensively, four kinds of conflicts can be identified. They can be mainly classified into ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ types.

The direct type can be categorized into conflicts between residents and the public sector (Gyeongju city), between residents and visitors, and between residents and other residents (general residents vs. commercial employees; existing commercial employees vs. new commercial employees), while the indirect type can be classified into those between residents (village) and the public sector (the government) and between residents/the government and people who departed from their homes.

![Figure 1. Conflicts from Changes in the Village](image)
The conflicts between residents and Gyeongju city have significantly improved, but the biggest source thereof is inflexible & customary administration (budget, etc.) and the position of the city government that tends to side with visitors to deal with civil complaints. Residents want the local government to cope with issues for the village, but the city government has yet to fully meet the demand (Direct 1).

The second conflict comes from the issue over visitors’ invasion of residents’ privacy. Noise, forced entry into houses, unauthorized use of toilets, crop damage, etc. make it impossible for residents to enjoy their lives comfortably. They cannot wear comfortable clothes on a hot day and take time out to rest even in their own homes. Farming machines moving toward Yangdong fields and visitors often mix together due to limited traffic lines, especially on weekends.

Likewise, residents’ vehicles that can freely move in and out of the village can also make visitors feel uncomfortable, causing some conflicts (Direct 2).

The third conflict occurs between residents and other residents, represented by conflicts between existing commercial employees and new commercial employees (Direct 3-1) and between general residents and commercial employees (Indirect 3-2). The former is related to a decline in the quality of local products (Korean rice taffy, oil-and-honey pastry, traditional cookies, refined rice wine, etc.) and sanitation. This should be dealt with through joint branding and consolidated management. The latter, a core issue facing the village, should be resolved through the systematic sharing and distribution of profits from the inclusion of the village in the World Heritage List.

The fourth type refers to the conflict between residents (the village) and the public sector (the government). Residents consider the World Heritage Site a national honor, emphasizing that the government should take responsibility for all of the related matters. However, to date, the government has determined that the local government (Gyeongju City) should control all the matters while the city of Gyeongju has concentrated all of its systems on managing cultural properties belonging to the Silla Cultural Belt. In regard to this, the responsibilities of the government should be more clearly and urgently formulated in order to narrow differences in judgment between the two entities (residents and the government) (Indirect 4).

The last type signifies the conflicts between residents and those who have left their hometown (Indirect 5-1) as well as between the government and those who have departed from their homes (Indirect 5-2), which should be reasonably considered as differences in position, rather than as conflicts. In accordance with related research, most (66.3%) of those who departed from their homes wanted the original form of the village to be restored or maintained while 95% wished the village to be renovated through the active engagement of the public sector. Those who left their homes are also observed to enjoy as much emotional benefit (honor, pride, etc.) as residents through the inscription of the village on the list. Therefore, they are deemed to actively take part in the future scheme for preserving the village, directly or indirectly requesting the public sector, especially the government, to support the village in diverse contexts. Against this backdrop, it is necessary to develop a system that can lead their interest and intention to participate to directly link to various activities in the village.

---

Responses to Changes in the Village

Sources of the Issue and Resulting Circumstances
Generally speaking, Yangdong Historic Village is currently experiencing confusion due to the impact of its inclusion in the World Heritage List. The main causes thereof can be summarized as follows.

First, changes in the village management system occurred before and after the village was inscribed on the list. Before this, the village was thoroughly controlled by National Law (the Cultural Properties Protection Act), so the village had been preserved under an inflexible management system. After the inscription of the village on the list, the Operation Committee was set up pursuant to the ordinance, with the village being managed by the city of Gyeongju and the Operation Committee. Likewise, the preservation system was converted into a village-centered structure but because an autonomous management system based on residents has yet to be stabilized, diverse types of issues were raised.

Second, confusion came from differences in concept between ‘Cultural Properties’ and ‘World Heritage’. In accordance with the Cultural Properties Protection Act, Yangdong Historic Village is regarded as not only an important historic cultural property but also a Living World Heritage (cultural landscape). Due to differences between the approach focusing on the restoration of the village as an important historic cultural property (since the year 1984) and a living heritage-centered approach where changes in life are recognized based on the authenticity and integrity of the village, various issues came to light.

Conclusively, as of now, Yangdong Historic Village is showing three types of new changes, differentiated from the circumstance before its inscription on the World Heritage List. First, due to a rapidly rising interest in the village following its inscription on the list, the demand for different experiences [historic village (traditional experiences) vs. World Heritage (recognition of historicity)] has expanded.

Second, the local government (Gyeongju city)’s active involvement in village preservation produced confrontation between ‘a historic theme park (tourism complex)’ and ‘a living rural village (village life)’. Third, based on the recognition and attitude of residents, conflicts between ‘the pursuit of tourism-related economic feasibility (tourism agents)’ and ‘the preservation of the value of the village (local residents)’ have been incurred.

Unlike the autonomous changes (before 1984) of a rural village and the inflexible changes (1984~2010) under the Cultural Property Protection Act, such circumstances show that the village is experiencing confusion due to the lack of understanding of and adaptation to the status of living heritage.

Conflict-resolving Methods for Residents
Recognizing that changes in the village occurring after the inscription of the village on the list may lead to the collapse of the community that has been maintained through a social/cultural network, the Operation Committee and residents chose ‘sharing’ as a conceptual means to overcome the difficulties. This can be defined as a concept that was expanded from Hyangyak, Dure, and Gye, traditional cooperative groups for the community. In relation to this, residents have tried to solve
conflicts among related entities through a scheme based on concepts such as ‘economic sharing’, ‘value-oriented tourism’, and ‘responsible tourism’.

The objective of economic sharing is to establish a village economy system based on equality by securing a common economic framework based on public interests (in terms of World Heritage) and breaking away from the economic structure concentrated on tourism agents. To this end, a specific control system should be developed, which is equipped with strong authority and clout to control the expanding tourism-oriented structure.

Residents think that the visit to the village should be designed not to make use of leisure time based on historic lore experiences but to understand the comprehensive value of the village centering on the authenticity (history, Confucianism, manners, nature, landscape, etc) of Yangdong Historic Village. In other words, it should be a value-oriented tourism. To this end, innovative improvements in tourist attractions, techniques, programs and operation/management are required to respond to the demand for tourism. A specific entity is also required to identify and expand the value of the village in diverse perspectives and to deliver it to tourists.

In addition, residents are requesting that the basic attitude and recognition of visitors should be reestablished based on the concept of ‘responsible tourism’. This refers to a type of tourism that helps visitors experience local culture in the process of delivering tourism benefits to regional communities to the maximum. Based on the moral obligations and responsibilities of visitors, socio-economic benefits should be given to residents, with environmental resources being preserved. This is designed to minimize the side-effects of tourism, which must be applied in Yangdong Historic Village, which is very sensitive to the impact of tourism.

Such methods were devised because residents are interested in controlling the capacity of the village environment in order to maintain the dignity of the village as a Confucian community. Specifically, residents (including the public sector) are planning to control the number of visitors by collecting entrance fees. Furthermore, flexibility in village preservation can also be secured by restricting the freedom of visits to a certain degree.

The first type of visit restriction is to lead tourists to visit only specific spaces and venues by designating visit routes (multiple). Of course, through mutual agreement, the designated routes should be recognized as core courses for the value-oriented tourism promoted by Yangdong Historic Village. The second type is to restrict the timing and venues of the visits. For example, by introducing a specific season system (a rice-planting season, a harvest season, etc.) and a sabbatical year (year/month/date), the tourist visits can be controlled. An open house system where only specific houses can be visited or an advance reservation system for large-sized tourist buses can also be considered.

**The Basic Principles of Residents’ Self-conservation**

Through several village seminars and dozens of Operation Committee meetings held, residents chose ‘economic sharing’, ‘value-oriented tourism’, and ‘responsible tourism’ as the main concepts for residents’ self-preservation. Along this vein, conflict-resolving methods that the village should promote were also mentioned and discussed. These are designed to secure ‘sustainability’ (life and
production) and ‘flexibility in change’ that the village must be equipped with as a Living World Heritage Site. When the three concepts are pursued, the following basic principles should be applied.

First, the roles of residents as creative producers should be cultivated. In order to induce ‘responsible tourism’ and pursue ‘economic sharing’, residents’ passive attitude should be changed. Breaking away from the existing system (top-down) where residents rely on the unilateral support of the public sector will provide the basic framework for residents’ self-preservation and rehabilitation that Yangdong Historic Village has pursued. In particular, through the constructive development of the Operation Committee, this will serve as an opportunity for residents to share tourism benefits.

Second, the purpose of the visit to the village should be reformulated. Currently, visits to the village are mostly designed to study its history or make use of leisure time. In the process, residents, especially tourism agents, fail to veer away from the commercial concept, ‘selling’, with tourists not being welcomed and even regarded as irksome. Residents and tourists need to change their attitudes: The former should convert their position from ‘selling’ to ‘informing’, ‘welcoming’, and ‘treating’, while the latter should also change their position from ‘seeing’ to ‘learning’, ‘respecting’ and ‘realizing’. As a result, both residents and tourists will be able to benefit from their common goal, ‘sharing’.

Third, the visit to the village should be induced in comprehensive perspectives. Yangdong Historic Village exists because of clan rules based on Confucianism, the filial duties/manners of descendants complying therewith, the production system that has not changed over more than 500 years, the well-preserved physical environment, and the natural environment that has long been intertwined with the lives of ancestors.

Visits to the village should be approached with comprehensive perspectives, including economy/production (content), history/life (culture), and the present life/future vision (time), veering away from temporal perspectives relying on the past. Such an approach will provide an opportunity to identify the features inherent in the village and to strengthen its real value.

Figure 2. Comprehensive Perspectives Regarding the Value of the Village
Observation of the 51st Village Operation Committee Meeting

I was able to observe the 51st Village Operation Committee Meeting held on August 23. The Committee Meeting was organized as a small democracy in itself. That was my first impression of the meeting. The new conference room was equipped with the basic system for discussions among members and the chairman. The meeting took place three and a half hours, with participants eating Gimbap, and future-oriented changes in the village were continuously discussed. The agenda of the day was as follows:

1> Installation of a permanent Korean wrestling center: Participants opposed the permanent installation thereof.
2> Collection of entrance fees: The Gyeongju city ordinance is expected to be legislated in September. The plan for the collection thereof is under discussion.
3> Operation of a snack bar in the culture center: If the bar is directly managed by the village, this may incur conflicts. The issue should be solved through cooperation with Gangdong Agricultural Cooperative.
4> Operation of a restaurant in the culture center: Village residents as a whole should be able to share the profits. Specific plans were discussed.
5> Construction of a senior resident center: The plan should be quickly implemented. Plans to use the existing center (former village hall) as a supermarket were discussed.
6> Distribution of garbage bags: The bags should be systematically distributed and collected under the control of Saemaeul Leaders.
7> Renovation of a village forest: The village landscape should be restored by removing scrub. The process should be completed before the autumn.
8> Operation of a traditional culture experience program: A third round of the program was completed. The program is scheduled to be operated a total of 16 times. Various plans are being tested.
9> Renovation of Yangdong Stream: Yangdong stream management plans (including the removal of weeds) were identified.
10> Electricity saving: Discussions were made to turn on street lamps alternately and install sensor lamps in public toilets.
11> Management of public toilets: More efforts are required for systematic management.

The Operation Committee Meeting focused on garbage management, an economic community in the village, resident welfare, village environment, software identification/management, energy saving, and public facility management. Most of them were future-oriented topics pursued by modern cities or villages, rather than by a historic village with more than 600 years of history.

Complaints and conflicts from cities and villages under the control of regulations were not witnessed. Rather than negative and passive attitudes toward the public sector (Gyeongju city and the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea), productive/creative discussions and proposals were made.

Some members volunteered to offer services by issue, with others considering and delivering the position of others. They made assertions, raising their voices, but did not condemn or blame others for various issues.

---

4 The 51st Operation Committee Meeting was held at the village hall conference room on August 23 (18:00~21:30) 2012. The impression thereof is introduced.
Holding the meetings a total of 51 times over the past 1.5 years, the chairman and members have been united in continuously developing the village, respecting each other’s opinions and promoting co-prosperity. They have shared the principles of co-existence and co-prosperity.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, historic villages have regressed due to socio-economic and cultural reasons, rather than physical ones. Therefore, the existing infrastructure-based preservation process can delay the degeneration physically but has its limits in restoring and maintaining the authenticity and integrity of a historic village. In order to avoid such circumstances, the recognition of a historic village should be fundamentally changed, which must start from promoting changes in the attitude of entities directly related to the village and abandoning fixed ideas thereof.

Yangdong Historic Village was inscribed on the World Heritage List not due to its traditional exterior but because of the continuity of the production system based on the life of residents and Yangdong fields. In other words, maintaining and cultivating the value of the village as a living heritage are key to its preservation.

The inclusion of the village in the list requires not only the existing function of the main family but also a new concept-based entity that can correspond to current times and lead the village. In response, by setting up the Yangdong Historic Village Operation Committee, residents have worked hard to promote the functions of site-based and flexible ordinances and to establish a residents’ self-conservation system with the motto of ‘economy sharing’, ‘value-oriented tourism’, and ‘responsible tourism’.

Against this backdrop, from the viewpoint of an observer or participant, three items are essentially required. First, dedicated, full-time workers should be hired. A village committee cannot be operated only by residents with their own jobs. Full-time workers with expertise should be employed as coordinator and programmer.

Second, fixed assets should be secured. This works as a basic framework for the residents’ self-conservation system and is also the most efficient way to overcome inflexibility in public financing. The required funds can be secured through the donations and contributions of village-related entities (those who left their homes, etc.), common profits from marketing in economy sharing, and the collection of visiting fees (discussions are under way). Furthermore, the fund should be built not through a one-time event but by using a continuous collection system to which the concept of the National Trust Movement applies.

Third, residents themselves should be equipped with their own philosophy and principles. This will lead not only to keeping the spiritual idea of the leader group that will promote the residents’ self-conservation system but also to protecting the pride and dignity of the historic village with more than 500 years of history as a World Heritage Site. The philosophy and principles should be formed through sympathy, sharing and co-existence based on rationality, rather than on arbitrary features that may appear in the residents’ self-conservation system.
References


03. Discussion Memo

Discussion Memo
[Discussion Memo]

Discussion Memo

There were three discussion sessions. The Key contents of those sessions a as follows.

Moderator of session one was Ms. Hyosang Jo. The discussion consisted of 4 thematic presentations and 4 case studies that were presented on the first day. Questions were collected from the floor and were directed to the presenters. Most of the questions were on the specific case studies such as tension between communities and tourists, boundary perimeters, methodology of involving communities. Recalling that the aim of the conference was to institutionalize community involvement in the World Heritage Convention, a framework (checklist) was formulated. The checklist provides guidance on tasks needed at each stage of World Heritage Convention starting from nomination to after inscription. The framework was provided to the participants in order to channel the discussions foreseen the next day.

Session two was moderated by Mr. Giovanni Boccardi. There were 4 designated discussants from various sectors of the Korean community such as representative of the central government, local government, ICOMOS Korea (NGO), and the Korean National Trust for Cultural Heritage. Comments focused on the practical mechanisms needed in the Korean context to involve the local communities and ways to integrate it with the existing administrative systems. After the designated discussants spoke, the session continued as an open discussion. From this session, key themes were identified. Those include defining communities, conservation of OUV and other values, capacity building, pursuing sustainable development, materializing boundaries of heritage, accommodating traditional conservation systems, positively directing the driving force for world heritage nominations.

Before the start of session three a working group was formed to draft the outcomes of the discussions. During session 3 the participants reviewed the drafted outcomes of the discussion and tentatively agreed upon the contents. The working group decided to continuously improve the outcomes and provide it to the World Heritage Community to be utilized as a resource for future statutory document revisions.

A transcript of the discussion sessions are attached.
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Outcome of the BUYEO Conference

Preamble

This meeting focused on cultural heritage.

The aim was to explore the issue of community involvement within the Asian context. This is characterised by major trends that have a considerable impact on the way community issues are perceived and dealt with. These trends include an exceptionally fast development, combined with increasing inequalities, within and across countries; a rapidly growing tourism sector (industries); inter- and intra- massive migrations; the encounter of old traditions with economic and cultural globalization, leading to quick socio-economic changes in society; the progressively important role played by the civil society in governance, with respect to existing systems that were heavily centralized and top- down. However participants recognize that there is a paradigm shift in the field of heritage conservation which is to engage communities within the state sector run heritage activities.

Of the various methods needed to be taken in order to protect the heritage laid out in article 5 of the World Heritage Convention, States Parties should adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes. Outcomes from previous discussions and papers on the role of Communities such as the inclusion of Communities as the 5th C in the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Convention in 2007 (WHC-07/31.COM/13B) up to the recent Røros Meeting held in Norway (May 2012), it is emphasized that heritage should play a role in the life of the communities.

1. Who are "communities"?

- According to the definition provided in the context of the adoption of the Fifth C, Communities should be understood as all forms of non-State actors. They are the partners (existing, potential, should be) of State institutions, at all levels, in the context of governance of the conservation and management of heritage.

- It is challenging to locate groups within established definitions and categories. It is appropriate to refer to interest groups, which may impact on the heritage or be impacted on by decisions taken for the heritage.

- Consideration should be given to all interest groups, whether they live within a listed property or outside, whether they played a role in "making" the heritage and/ or use it on a regular basis or not. However, for the purpose of management, particular consideration should be given to addressing the concerns of those who will be the most impacted by decisions taken at the site, or to those who have or may have the most influence on what happens at the heritage property.
2. The Concept of Outstanding Universal Value, Sustainable Development and Other Values Impacting World and Heritage Properties and Its Communities

- A range of cultural values inform properties that are inscribed on the World Heritage List. These inform the drafting of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) in the inscription process of the property. The local values may or may not be integrated with the concept of OUV. They are often connected with spiritual beliefs and practices that are deeply rooted in the way of life of the people.

- World Heritage should deliberately pursue Sustainable Development in addition to maintaining OUV.

- The notion of social and economic well-being associated with development and progress, and the need for improving quality of life for communities, as well as the sustainability of the values of the environment have emerged as key issues that concern and affect World Heritage properties and their communities.

- Taking into consideration the dynamic pace of development happening in the region, the idea of disassociating heritage from development is not practical. Sustainable development as a concept has therefore emerged as a relevant approach that is applicable both to World Heritage and other sites.

- The need for communities to derive benefits from heritage through sustainable development as well as communities benefiting from sustainable development has been recognised. Vis a vis this is the question of the degree by which economic development and its many manifestations is allowed to permeate heritage areas so that a balance is created between such and the conservation or sustainability of the environment, its heritage and other important aspects.

- At what point shall development be allowed to come into a heritage site so that it does not impact on the values by which the site has been recognized as a World Heritage property? The answer to this is the point by which sustainable development is achieved at its optimum, whereby communities are able to enjoy the environmental and heritage values of the site, at the same time benefit from the values of economic development.

- Although for the inscription of the heritage on the World Heritage List the Outstanding Universal Value needs to be portrayed, for the purposes of management all values embedded in the site need to be considered.
3. Boundaries

- World Heritage requires the definition of boundaries that contain all or most of the attributes that express the OUV of the property. An added layer of protection is possibly required through a buffer zone. These tools required for management of the heritage might create divisions within the large spheres of communities. However, the traditional links, wherever they exist, between the communities and heritage sites should be retained. The interaction and impact between the communities and the heritage (which can be positive or negative and in either direction) can spread out spatially from being in the immediate vicinity to the surroundings region and in certain respects even cross the globe.

- The definition of “spatial realm of influence” might be required for administrative purposes, however in reality the influences of and impacts on the heritage are not spatially defined. Mechanisms of assessing in the qualitative and quantitative influences and impacts are needed that are independent of location. The introduction of fully developed form of heritage impact assessment (assess impact on people and heritage, mitigation measures) would be means of assessment beyond artificial boundaries.

4. Harnessing commitment to World Heritage for conservation and Sustainable Development

- Interests in World Heritage and World Heritage inscription have increased greatly in Asian countries. The enthusiasm and efforts for inscription should be well guided within in order to reach a consensus on what the purposes of inscription would be amongst the involved municipalities and local communities before the entire process begins.

- These high interests in World Heritage and World Heritage Inscription need to be constructively connected to the efforts of sustainable development, which should evenly spread out from the very first step of nomination preparation to the post-inscription stages of conservation and management.

5. Reconciling local traditions with the governance system

- The methods to include communities are very limited in the current government dominated system of heritage conservation and management. The relevant government authorities and experts make the decision while the local communities are informed of those decisions through limited channels such as official gazettes or official hearings. There is a need to diversify the methods to include communities in the decision making process and to recognize the already existing traditional systems of protection, which should be acknowledged by the already established government system.

- After identifying the heritage, efforts should be made to identify the direct community that ensures the continuity of the tradition, the composition of this community, the relationship that the community has with the heritage, and the mechanisms that this community works on, from the beginning.

- The ownership and rights of the communities to maintain their traditional knowledge systems must be recognized by the government authorities and be reflected in the
management plans of the heritage that is produced and implemented by the government, with the participation and consent of the communities in the process.

- Methods of communicating to the local communities must be diversified, utilizing both conventional methods but also employing new methods that would be addressing the characteristics of the specific community.

7. Capacity Building

- As a current leader, the World Heritage process has embraced the concept of engaging communities in the field of heritage conservation and encourages engaging communities in all its activities.

- The concept of engaging communities is however new and therefore the challenges are primarily to evolve necessary knowledge, clarify relevant issues and tools (includes learning from communities and other sectors) and to transfer/share this knowledge at appropriate levels in the heritage sector.

- As has been identified in the World Heritage Capacities Building strategy, State Parties are encouraged to develop programmes aimed at three main audiences namely, practitioners, policy and decision makers and communities & networks as appropriate and suiting the context. Also it is encouraged to share the experience among the State Parties and between the sites.

- Such programmes should aim strengthening the ability of relevant audiences,
  - to propagate the idea among the heritage community;
  - to forge changes required at different levels of the existing management systems;
  - to get the communities involved at the all appropriate levels.

Conclusion

Participants at the meeting acknowledged the need to incorporate a more concrete form of guidelines outlining community participation in the World Heritage process in the current Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention. The participants also recognized the need to take into consideration the fast evolving NGO culture in Asia as a component of the Communities.

Processes involved with World Heritage are often very long and have long lasting impacts on both the heritage and the Communities. The need to start the communication with the communities from the beginning, starting from Tentative Listing has to be emphasized to the responsible entities involved. References to these communications on heritage and sustainable development should be made in the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention within the relevant chapters.

To assist in drawing out the conclusions of this meeting, a table laying out issues needed to be addressed at each stage of the inscription process of the heritage was formulated based on the
contents of the presentations made. The stages and contents in the table could provide some detailed contents to the future text to be incorporated into the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention. (Annex 1)

Annex 1: Local Community Involvement Checklist, A Framework
05. Conference Results

- Conclusion
- Kyoto Presentation
- Script of Kyoto Presentation
Celebrating the 40th anniversary of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, the Buyeo Conference was organized by the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration and the ICOMOS-Korea. It was funded by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre’s Korea Fund in Trust as well as by the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration.

The goals of the Buyeo Conference were 1) to clarify the roles of local communities in heritage conservation for more sustainable development; 2) to resolve certain gaps between the international principles and the local practices of World Heritage conservation, especially in Asia. It is to pursue better understandings and better practices of local community involvement in World Heritage conservation. Furthermore, the Conference aims for 1) articulation of community involvement issues by each step of World Heritage nomination processes and by related stakeholders and players; 2) institutionalization of local community involvement in the World Heritage Convention, such as putting it into the Operational Guidelines and the Resources Manuals in the long run. Ultimately, it is to come up with practical guidelines and tools for better community involvements.

The background of the Buyeo Conference can be summarized as the Chart I, listed in the page 12 of the Conference Proceeding. In the domestic context, we, in Korea, have been working on formulating the Korean Heritage Conservation Principles, which corresponds both to the international standards and to the unique local practices. Tentatively we call it “Korea Document.” While preparing the “Korea Document” many community-related issues emerged for further discussions. In the international context, on the other hand, Korea had a Periodic Reporting cycle last year, for which many Asia-Pacific countries gathered in Suwon, Korea, sharing similar local community issues in world heritage conservation and management. These domestic and international events drove the Buyeo Conference to focus on the topic of community involvement in World Heritage conservation, exploring its concepts and actions in Asia.

As for the research backgrounds, the preparation committee of the Buyeo conference reviewed the existing publications and document about the similar topic. There were many reference publications that we needed to analyze to prepare for the Buyeo Conference, which include the World Heritage Committee official documents, such as WHC.-10/35.COM-12D, 12E, and the Operational Guidelines, as well as various local Charters. These references were very helpful to conceptualize community involvement discussions. While there existed respectful references, it was obvious that more in-depth discussions about community involvement for better world heritage conservation were
needed for more practical implementations, in Asia, as well as other regions.

With these kinds of backgrounds, the Buyeo Conference invited 6 thematic presentations from the various World Heritage institutions, such as the UNESCO Centre and ICCROM, as well as 7 Asian cases, which constitute the main contents of the Conference. The 7 Asian cases, invited for the Conference, are the Kathmandu Valley of Nepal; the West Lake Cultural Landscape of China; the Historic Monuments of Ancient Kyoto of Japan; the Historic Villages, Hahoe and Yangdong of Korea; the Rice Terrace of the Philippines; the Taj Mahal of India; and the Champasak Cultural Landscape of Laos. It was meaningful to discuss about them during the Conference sessions.

Analyzing the 7 Asian cases, we found common characteristics of local community involvement in world heritage conservation. We also draw certain unique issues of community involvement which need careful discussions. Those include traditional community roles, OUV and other local value conflicts, benefit sharing, transmission of traditions, enthusiasm for World Heritage inscription, tourist control, climate change, ownership, local leadership, butter zone conflicts, capacity building, and integrated management, among others. The full Draft Outcomes is included in the final report, and its major keywords are as seen in the Chart II.

The Draft Outcomes of the Buyeo Conference consist of two parts. First is about the Definition Discussions. As most conferences experience, we, in Buyeo, also confronted difficulties in using certain terms and needed for word clarifications. So, we came up with draft definitions for certain keywords, which are to be revised continuously in coming years among participants. Those keywords include Community, OUV and other values, Boundaries, Sustainable Development, Local Tradition and Governance Systems, and Capacity Building, among others.

While the first part of the Conference outcomes is a Definition Discussion, the second part is a draft
framework for community involvement checklist, which is articulated by World Heritage nomination steps and by related stakeholders. By each step, it means that the action of community involvement starts from the preparation step of the world heritage nomination and continues to the inscription step and to the post-inscription step. By each stakeholder, it means that not only residents and visitors, both local and global, but also public officers, NGOs, and various professionals, all have legitimate stakes in each step. With the two variables of each step and of each stakeholder, a framework of checklist for community involvement in World Heritage conservation is proposed. The Chart III below represents the framework of checklist.

The final conclusion of the Buyeo Conference is as follows. 1) The two parts of the draft outcomes, one of which is the keyword definition and the other of which is the checklist framework, are to be continuously revised and upgraded by the participants. 2) In order to institutionalize the community involvement actions in the World Heritage Convention, the addition of the draft outcomes to the Resource Manual and the Operational Guidelines is to be pursued consistently in coming years. 3) In the practice of community involvement, both tangible and intangible heritage values are to be closely integrated. For these, collaborations among Asian counties are going to be continued, and the Republic of Korea and the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration would be happy to a modest facilitator for continuous discussions. Model projects and capacity building efforts are to be the next agenda. Therefore, the conclusion of the Buyeo Conference is more like a future plan than like an ending manifesto. The comments and advices for the Conference are welcome for our next tasks.

Chart II. Definition Discussions
Partial List of References:

Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 2011

Operational Guidelines 97:
“...All properties inscribed on the World Heritage List must have adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional protection and management to ensure their safeguarding....”

Operational Guidelines 110:
“....Management systems may vary according to different cultural perspectives... they may incorporate traditional practices, existing urban or regional planning instruments, and other planning control mechanisms, both formal and informal.”

WHC-07/31.COM/13B
WHC-10/35.COM/12D
WHC-10/35.COM/12E

UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)
Venice Charter (1964)
Washington Charter (1987)
Nara Document (1999)

Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia (2009)
Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter, 1999)
Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China (China Principles, 2000)

Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, World Heritage Nomination Dossier, Historic Villages of Korea: Hahoe and Yangdong (2009)
Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation

Concepts and Actions in Asia

International Conference in Celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention
September 10 (Mon)-12 (Wed), 2012, Buyeo, Chungcheongnam-do, Republic of Korea

Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, ICOMOS Korea
Presented By Sohyun Park (Seoul National University)

Aims & Goals

- Roles of local communities in heritage conservation practices for more sustainable development
- International principles and local practices of world heritage conservation, especially in Asia

Better understanding and better practice of local community involvement in world heritage conservation
Articulation of community involvement issues by each step of world heritage nomination processes and by related stakeholders or players

Institutionalization of local community involvement in world heritage convention (Operational Guidelines, Resource Manuals, etc)

Practical Guidelines for better community involvement in world heritage properties
Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation: Concepts and Actions in Asia

**Background**

- WHC Operational Guidelines (97, 108, 110)
- Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia (Regionally-Specific Protocols)
- 35th session Decisions of the World Heritage Committee (Involvement of local and indigenous communities)

**UNESCO World Heritage Papers**

- Papers 13: Linking Universal & Local Values
- Papers 31: Community Development through World Heritage

**IUCN, World Heritage & Evaluation Processes Related to Communities and Rights**

- June, 2012

---

Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation: Concepts and Actions in Asia

**Conference Contents**

- **6 Thematic Presentation**
- **7 Asian Cases Study**
- **3 Discussions**

World Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development: the Challenges Ahead, Giovanni Boccardi, Norway
Finalizing a New, Holistic World Heritage Policy, Ingvar Kristiansen, Norway
Engaging Communities: Approaches to Capacity Building, Carmel Wijeyaratne, Sri Lanka
The Role and Involvement of Communities in the Sustainable Development of World Heritage Sites in East Asia, Beatrice Kaldum, World Heritage: Benefits Beyond Borders, Ameneh Gaffa World Heritage Conservation and the Role of Local Communities: Focusing on Historic Villages and Cities, Kathmandu Valley World Heritage Property Conservation and Community, Kai Welker, The Role of the Urban Communities in the Conservation and Management of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordillera World Heritage Property, Joyce P. Aavey, Vo, and Associated Barrio Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape, Bounlay Keokhongkhol, Challenges and Potentials for World Heritage Involving Communities: Case Study, Tai Nahe, Ninh Phuoc, West Lake Cultural Landscape: Stakeholders and World Heritage, Shenjian Ren, Involving Communities for Sustainable Structure and Efforts with regard to the Revival of Traditional Cultures in Korea, the city of World Cultural Heritage, Yoshifuji Munei, Development of Residents’ Self-conservation System for Yangung Historic Village, a WH Site-Persistent in 2 Years after the Village was Inscribed on the WH List, Dongmin Kang
### Asian Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu Valley</td>
<td>West Lake Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Historic Monuments of Ancient Kyoto</td>
<td>Historic Village s Hahoe &amp; Yangdong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Terraces Philippine Cordilleras</td>
<td>Taj Mahal</td>
<td>Champasak Cultural Landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Asian Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Traditional Community Roles</td>
<td>• Benefit Sharing</td>
<td>• Transmission of Traditions</td>
<td>• Enthusiasm for WH Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Values &amp; OUV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate Change Ownership</td>
<td>• Buffer Zone Conflicts</td>
<td>• Integrated Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Leadership</td>
<td>• Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Philippine | India | Laos |
Draft Outcome of Buyeo Meeting

Sep, 2012

Definition Discussions

- Community
- OUV and Other Values
- Boundaries
- Sustainable Development
- Local Traditions and Governance Systems
- Capacity Building

---

Community
- All Interest Groups
  - Live within property or outside
  - Play a role in making heritage and/or use it

OUV & Other Values
- Pursue Sustainable Development in addition to maintaining OUV
  - Need for improving quality of life for communities
  - Relevant approach both to World Heritage and other sites

Boundaries
- Spread Out Spatially the interaction and impact between the communities and the heritage
  - Spatial realm of influence, both by qualitative and quantitative aspects
**Draft Outcome**

**Sustainable Development**
- Use the concept of World Heritage as a vehicle for community development
- High Interests in World Heritage Inscription especially in Asia
- Connect Inscription Enthusiasm to Sustainable Development

**Local Traditions & Governance System**
- Ensure the continuity of the tradition
- Need to diversify the methods to include communities in the decision making process
- Recognize the already existing traditional protection and governance systems

**Capacity Building**
- Strengthen the ability of relevant audiences
- Propagate the idea among the heritage community
- Forge changes required at different levels of the existing management systems
- get the communities involved at the all appropriate levels
Local Community Involvement Checklist

By Steps
- Preparation to be World Heritage
- World Heritage Inscription Process
- Afterwards
- Review Mechanism

By Stakeholders
- Residents
- Authorities
- Other Interest Groups
- Visitors

- 07. Local Community Involvement Checklist -

Local Community Involvement Checklist (Draft)

Steps & Considering Issues

Stakeholders

Fill with reflecting Asian Cases
Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation Concepts and Actions in Asia

Local Community Involvement Checklist (Draft)

- Preparation to be World Heritage
- World Heritage Inscription Process
- Afterwards

Conclusion

- Roles of local communities in World Heritage conservation and management:
  - Revision of the outcome draft
  - Addition to the Resource Manual and Operational Guidelines in future
  - Pursuit of Tangible and Intangible Heritage Integration

- Collaborations in Asia

- Plans of the Republic of Korea and the Cultural Heritage Administration
  - Facilitator of continuous discussions on community involvement in Asia
  - Model Projects and Capacity Building Efforts

- 08. Conclusion -
Good afternoon. My name is Sohyun Park. I am a professor of Architecture Department at the Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea and an Executive Committee member of the ICOMOS-Korea. It is my pleasure and honour to report the outcomes of the Buyeo Conference, held last September in Korea, celebrating the 40th anniversary of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. The Buyeo Conference is about “involving communities in World Heritage Conservation: Concepts and Actions in Asia.” The Conference was organized by the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration and the ICOMOS-Korea. For this presentation, Mr. Kyunghoon Yi, the Director of the International Affairs Division at the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration is here with us, and Professor Hae Un Rii, the President of the ICOMOS-Korea is present, too. And, for the development and organization of the conference, Mr. Giovanni Boccardi of UNESCO and Ms. Hyosang Jo of the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration were very helpful, to whom we are grateful. The Buyeo Conference was funded by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre’s Korea Fund in Trust as well as by the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration. (PPT Slide #1)

The goals of the Conference were 1) to clarify the roles of local communities in heritage conservation for more sustainable development; 2) to resolve certain gaps between the international principles and the local practices of World Heritage conservation, especially in Asia. It is to pursue better understandings and better practices of local community involvement in World Heritage conservation. Furthermore, the Conference aims for 1) articulation of community involvement issues by each step of World Heritage nomination processes and by related stakeholders and players; 2) institutionalization of local community involvement in the World Heritage Convention, such as putting it into the Operational Guidelines and the Resources Manuals in the long run. Ultimately, it is to come up with practical guidelines and tools for better community involvements. (PPT slides # 2 and #3)

The background of the Buyeo Conference can be summarized as the Chart I (of this PPT presentation). In the domestic context, we, in Korea, have been working on formulating the Korean Heritage
Conservation Principles, which correspond both to the international standards and to the unique local practices. Tentatively we call it “Korea Document.” While preparing the “Korea Document” many community related issues emerged for further discussions. In the international context, on the other hand, we had the Periodic Reporting cycle last year, for which many Asia-Pacific countries gathered in Suwon, Korea and shared similar local community issues in world heritage conservation and management. These domestic and international events drove the Buyeo Conference to focus on the topic of community involvement concepts and actions in Asia. (PPT slide #4)

The research backgrounds for the Buyeo Conference are as follows (PPT slide #5). There were many reference publications that we needed to analyze to prepare the Buyeo Conference and they were very helpful to conceptualize community involvement discussions. I realise many of the authors of these publications are in the audience. I am very thankful to them.

With these kinds of backgrounds, the Buyeo Conference invited 6 thematic presentations from the various World Heritage institutions, such as the UNESCO Centre and ICCROM, as well as 7 Asian cases, which constitute the main contents of the Conference (PPT slide #6).

The 7 Asian cases, invited for the Conference, are the Kathmandu Valley of Nepal; the West Lake Cultural Landscape of China; the Historic Monuments of Ancient Kyoto of Japan; the Historic Villages, Hahoe and Yangdong of Korea; the Rice Terrace of the Philippines; the Taj Mahal of India; and the Champasak Cultural Landscape of Laos. (PPT Slide #7)

Analyzing the 7 Asian cases, we found common characteristics of local community involvement in world heritage conservation. We also draw certain unique issues of community involvement which need careful discussions. Those include traditional community roles, OUV and other local value conflicts, benefit sharing, transmission of traditions, enthusiasm for World Heritage inscription, tourist control, climate change, ownership, local leadership, butter zone conflicts, capacity building, and integrated management, among others. (PPT slide #8)

The draft outcomes of the Buyeo Conference consist of two parts. First is about the Definition Discussions. As most conferences experience, we, in Buyeo, also confronted difficulties in using certain terms and needed for word clarifications. So, we came up with draft definitions for certain keywords, which are to be revised continuously in coming years among participants. Those keywords include Community, OUV and other values, Boundaries, Sustainable Development, Local Tradition and Governance Systems, and Capacity Building, among others. (PPT slides #9 and #10, 11, 12)

While the first part of the Conference outcomes is a Definition Discussion, the second part is a draft framework for community involvement checklist, which is articulated by World Heritage nomination steps and by related stakeholders. By each step, it means that the action of community involvement starts from the preparation step of the world heritage nomination and continues to the inscription step and to the post-inscription step. By each stakeholder, it means that not only residents and visitors, both local and global, but also public officers, NGOs, and various professionals, all have legitimate stakes in each step. With the two variables of each step and of each stakeholder, a framework of checklist for community involvement in World Heritage conservation is proposed. (PPT slides #13 and #14, 15)

The conclusion of the Buyeo Conference is as follows. 1) The two parts of the draft outcomes, one of
which is the keyword definition and the other of which is the checklist framework, are to be continuously revised and upgraded by the participants. 2) In order to institutionalize the community involvement actions in the World Heritage Convention, the addition of the draft outcomes to the Resource Manual and the Operational Guidelines is to be pursued consistently in coming years. 3) In the practice of community involvement, both tangible and intangible heritage values are to be closely integrated. For these, collaborations among Asian counties are going to be continued, and the Republic of Korea and the Korea Cultural Heritage Administration would be happy to a modest facilitator for continuous discussions. Model projects and capacity building efforts are to be the next agenda. Therefore, the conclusion of the Buyeo Conference is more like a future plan than like an ending manifesto. The comments and advices for the Conference are welcome for our next tasks.

(PPT slide #16)

Thank you.
06. Appendix

■ Discussion Note
Moderator: Hyosang Jo, Cultural Heritage Administration, Korea

- Hyosang Jo (00:00:00-00:01:30)
  Good afternoon. I am Jo Hyosang from the International Affairs Division at the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, where I’m in charge of World Heritage.

  Actually, I’m not in a position to preside over the discussion, but I’m here to let you know that we at the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea are looking for ways to communicate with local communities and also to listen to your opinions. For smooth progress of the discussion and to help participation by foreign participants here, I will switch between English and Korean from time to time. We basically pursue inclusion of the local community within the structure of the World Heritage Convention, and I may be required to speak English more in this part.

- Hyosang Jo (00:01:31-00:04:20)
  I am sitting on behalf of Cultural Heritage Administration and we want to expend a role of enhancing the participation of the local communities into the arena of World Heritage. We eventually hope the opportunity of implementing within our own environment that issue of involving the communities in more diverse frameworks of protecting not only world heritage but also the national heritages as well.

  We have on the screen in front of you the actual table that professor Solhyun Park introduced in her talk. This, although with small letters, we will try to print it out and circulate the frame works to you. I just wanted to go over a few points before we actually go for the comments. I think it’s important today that we stick to frame work of the convention. Of course involving communities can happen in very diverse layers, very different layers and different contexts, but we want to focus a little bit more specifically into operational guidelines, the actual implementing mechanisms of the convention.

  So we let the audience know of the question boxes, and I actually have some questions here, maybe if we could start with the questions collected from the floor forth first then, we will be able to, I think it will give us a good start. We have actually a lot of questions for the Rice Terraces of Philippines, India Taj-Mahal, and a couple to Laos and Norway. Actually let’s start with Norway as the question is in Korean.

  “I think it’s interesting that the local communities have a purpose in order to register for the World Heritage. Could I ask whether the poll was aimed for all people in the community or only for the certain communities/heads of communities? How did you come up with the way to accumulate the opinions? Also I’ve been told about the online website management in a way of collecting people’s ideas, but I think this kind of communication wouldn’t be so much feasible for us since the elderly in rural area may feel uncomfortable using Internet. I want to know if there are anything special trials to collect numerous ideas.”

- Ingunn Kvisterød (00:04:21-00:06:33)
  Well, what we do was in the process of developing the policy, right? What we did was to invite all the local communities, all the world heritage local communities through the counselors, world heritage counselors that have been established. And they have the networks and in habitants in the local community that they may discuss with. But it’s not an easy work to do and take part in discussions that are on the web, it’s true. But then I’m really talking about people on 1970, 1980 years old, up to 70-75 most people are on the net and they use the web and they participate as well. So we have some advanced anyhow that they participate in the process. But it’s really up to the local counsel and local communities that they provide information about the processes and contact the local communities. We also have the organizations, NGO’s, etc. that roles invited. ICOMOS for example, or other organizations in Norway, they also have members that are all at a certain age, so they could also participate. But in general, it’s true that young people are much more active, but all organizations, all institutions, all interested groups that were communicated to us administrate received the invitation. So we tried to reach them through the invitation to through the formal post, etc, as well, formal mail system. I don’t know. Is that covering more or less the question?

- Hyosang Jo (00:06:34-00:18:14)
  Yes, you mentioned the mail system, actual conventional methods of involving the communities and also new methods of evolving communities through internet as well. Yes, the internet may apply to younger generation a little bit more, but also you didn’t dispose of the traditional methods, which are often forgotten nowadays, a little bit. We also actually have quite a lot of questions to Taj-Mahal, these mostly I think related to the tourism issues as well. The question, it says, “If there are any tensions between the local community and the visitors that took a coming to the sight itself. And if there are tensions or collisions between the visitors and the local community, what kind of methods are there that you have applied to solve those, and also another one is about the property zone and buffer zone. You mentioned that it was based on actual length of a hundred meters, two hundred meters. You already mentioned that these were not the basis that might have been a little bit wrong from the beginning, but if there were any communications between the local community and the actual this government of coming to an agreement to that perimeter for the property and the buffer zone.”

- Navin Piplani (00:08:15-00:11:24)
  Thank you, I will take the first question. There is no apparent tension between local people and visitors, because local people understand that their livelihoods are attached to the tourism that is flourishing at the heritage sites. Many tourists from other countries come to the sight, Taj-Mahal. So they are on their own way to facilitate the visitors as much as possible. And to share with you a little bit more, until 1980’s, the local people and vendors, shop people, were part of the main four court aile where I assure where all the three gates that are open spaces. There were shops, local people just could go from one gate and come out through the other. It was only Supreme Court ruling that shops were taken out of the sights. So I don’t think local people and visitors have any tension except for one day, which is Friday, when Taj-Mahal is closed for weekly maintenance, and cleaning. But the local Muslim community, Muslims, are allowed to enter the Taj-Mahal, to offer prayers, free of cost, no tickets. Otherwise it is off limits monuments for everyone. Only on Friday afternoon, local Muslim community can go and offer prayers. That is the tension point because sometimes, people try to take advantage of this poor land. They can rest as Muslims and pretend to do say ‘we are going and offering prayers’ and just go and visit Taj-Mahal and this is the best advantage because there’s nobody else, so almost entire Taj-Mahal is for your own personal consumption. And that creates a tension because local community can make out that he is not local person ‘why is he going in? I have only come to conflict on that particularly. Second question related to the buffer. The buffer was made in 1983 as for the World Heritage Convention, called also buffer zone. But a hundred meters, two hundred meters, is Indian national regulation, the history behind that it is not specific to the Taj-Mahal, but specific to all nationally protected
sights. All the sights that are protected by the archaeological survey in India, they have this funny rule of a hundred meter nothing doing, two hundred meters you can do things, but you have to take permission, which came about some years back, when they was indiscriminate, demolition of the historic property and building the new in a different part of the country. So the government erupted the rule and then it was applied as a blanket to all the sites. So a hundred meters, two hundred meters is different from the World Heritage Buffer.

- **Hyosang Jo (00:11:25-00:12:06)**
  There's actually a followed question to the property and the buffer zone. But there's a different regulation for the people inside one hundred meters and there is a different applying to ones in two hundred meters in the buffer zone. And the two hundred meter zone is a little bit more flexible. So it's in a way punishment to people inside one hundred meters, so how are the two coordinated between, I mean, the actual local community within the one hundred meters buffer zone would have a lot of anguish and a lot of discontent compared to the people in two hundred meters' zone. Are there any problems arising from that kind of differences?

- **Navin Piplani (00:12:07-00:14:07)**
  Yes, lots of problems, I think we think all of us, local community, intellectual fellows, profession working in this field, all of us consider that this absorbed imaginary boundary how you came up to figure out one hundred meter, or two hundred meters, or how it was that all the properties zone whatever significance, they only have their influence own up to two hundred meters and up to two hundred meters, as different telling me is this afternoon, different properties need to have printed different regulatory zone and Taj-Mahal might be different from some other protective sites which are not of that consequence.

  Firstly, local people are even people that were not consulted. The people in India were not consulted when this rule but was passed by the ministry, government of India and then it articulates down. The difference between someone who's living within a hundred meters, then his family or friends living outside in two hundred meters comes later. Even if I as a single owner, have a property whose front lawn is one hundred meters, and back lawn is two hundred meters, I can probably have an extraordinary building in the back lawn but can't be owned changing my rule in the front lawn. The single owner can also, because they will draw this blind circle, it's a circle. I can show you has a rectangular sites but the law states a hundred meters as a circle.

  And we have several examples when people are angry that how it can be that their front of the house is in a hundred meters back house in two hundred meters. So what the government is now doing is they have commission in that Indian National Trust of World Culture Heritage. To develop specific guidelines on monument, by monument cases to see how a hundred meters, two hundred meters thing works.

- **Hyosang Jo (00:14:08-00:15:04)**
  Thank you. There is a question to Kai Weise, Mr. Kai, about the Kathmandu Valleys. The question asks that now there are a lot of different ethnic groups coming into some of the partial region and that the components of the ethnicity is changing, and do you see any complex between those kinds of changing ethnicity from the past and even, within this kind of diversity do this Gathi's of Newar people, do they still have their grasp of, and control of the local community, do they have the same stature of the pass-down, same of which they would have had in the same ethnic group?

- **Kai Weise (00:15:05-00:17:22)**
  So due to the change, it’s very throughout coming to the Kathmandu valleys, each of the monument zone you have different amount of change is going on. For example, the main center of Kathmandu is one of the main centers of where the most are changed, because of its capital city. And there, very clearly it becomes a commercial area, which means other people are coming and set up their shops. And for them, if there's any restoration work being done, the people who live around the monument, there aren't the community that's linked to the monument. So very clearly, you can say it’s easier for the government to do the restoration work which is disconnected from the community, so one hand is the community itself doesn’t take responsibility but then the government can do it with less. So yes, there is a big change. On the other hand, there is like more than one of the stupas, where we have suddenly sixteen different communities who want to get involved in the management and you have a lot of not Tibetans, it’s Tibetan Buddhism. You also have a lot of Tibetans but also various Tamang’s to share personal. They all want to go and live around Budhah, so it’s the fastest developing area within Kathmandu Valleys, the fastest urbanizing area. So again, there is a conflict even between the various groups, on who controls the main monument. So yes, it varies, but in most cases, it does create conflicts and connections with whose monuments are these when it gets down to decision-making.

- **Hyosang Jo (00:17:23-00:19:06)**
  Thank you. I'm just trying to pick out the comment questions each directly each for World Heritage. Now we have one for the Rice Terraces for the Philippines – Cordilleras. The audience asked that the heritage itself has a very strong natural aspect to it. And it's very vulnerable to natural disasters, climate change and you mentioned a lot of problems arising from those kinds of problems. And fully understand that the local communities are trying to resolve those problems with the communications with the local government and also from help outside as well. But considering that it is natural heritage that has been there for quite a very long span of time they would have gone through the whole process of trying to maintain the heritage in adapting to kind of the natural contexts, the natural background which has been going through the process of change through a long span of time. But the question poses that maybe it was the system that actually broke down, because of the help from the outside maybe it was actually the World Heritage status or, perhaps too much help from the outside that might have proposed a little bit of problem for the actual ability of the local community that would have been able to manage the heritage itself.

- **Joycelyn Mananghaya (00:19:07-00:21:12)**
  Thank you for the question. Actually even before the inscription of the site of the World Heritage list, we have experienced a lot of problems and a lot of help and support came into the Rice Terraces. But we have to think of the way, the life of the people before there were jobs available for them. Everybody had full time and efforts towards the Rice Terraces before but, now the people have eight-hour jobs, and that's Monday to Friday job the only time for the rest is during the weekends, but there are local communities living at the Rice Terraces and these were the people that are maintaining the Rice Terraces on their day to day basis.

  But, there are major collapse happening right now and because of these very huge collapses it's really difficulty for the community, a certain group of settlement to undertake the world. That's why government has to come into support work. And for small repaired areas, they do it amongst themselves; they have the Barangahy people working together. As I have mentioned, the cooperative system serves to very much intact, we have the Ubbu, Baddang, and Dang-a. All of these are being used in the present time but there has been a system that has been devised by the government to undertake major collapse areas. And the collapse areas have recently been very predominant. Especially, there was a strong typhoon in 2009 that hit the site in the middle of summer and it was really the first time that we experienced at the Rice Terraces. In the middle of summer, we never expect typhoons to happen. But, it destroyed a lot of areas. More than 100 sites have been affected. So we needed help at that time and thankfully the
international community came in and gave us support.

- Hyesang Jo (00:21:13-00:22:19)
  Thank you very much. One last question is to Laos of the Champasak Cultural Landscape at the Vat Phou temple. The presentation mentioned a lot of layers of legislation, national, local and regional and of the management plans that are implemented for the protection of the heritage. But one of the audience was curious if there was specific case where a conflict of the local community came up with the regulations of the legislation happening within such as ethnic area of heritage because most of cases that you mentioned were very positive cases. So they were wondering if you have any conflicts arising from these kinds of regulations within the heritage area.

- Bounlap Keokangna (00:22:20-00:26:25)
  Yes, thank you everyone for asking this question. You see, Champasak Cultural Landscape is very big area and it is not only the particular monument area but agricultural area. At the time, there were not enough facilities at least for the local people. They want to improve their lives and the economics. So, perhaps the laws such as rules to protect the area, but the people want to improve the life. So they only asked the government to facilitate local community, the needs like the road, the water supply and also they need to extend release to the houses for the young people. So we now try to show this problem by setting a committee in different level to the province, district and the village level also release live out to look after this, like ask them to at least at the beginning to propose what they need, what they want to do in our office, then we can go further impact assessment us the government to allow them to do such things based on the impact assessment. If in control, the impact assessment is referred in that area such as they want to build their house, they want to make a road like this, we have to do the impact assessment first, then if we can’t see anything around, we say something underground the constructor may affect to some properties you advise them how to move, how to have another joy like this, it is covering of the question. Thank you.

- Hyesang Jo (00:26:26-00:30:44)
  Thank you. You mentioned the cooperative counsel that consists of that is very different members of level of the government of the local community where they communicate if they want to make any changes within the property areas, so that they can apply for them impact assessments and whether or not, they can apply that change in the heritage area. Is this right? Ok. And this is done on a little bit questions because they’re bound together on same grounds. I just wanted to comment a little bit if I may on the presentations so far. We had mostly policy-oriented presentations in the morning and then four case studies in the afternoon. And just a few points that I think we can draw out as the common points of these case studies. Well, Norway wasn’t as such a case study but it gave us a new view because Norway’s new legislation poses, I think, another dimension of putting the procedures into the actual formal system and I can relate to it very much because most of the activities that you have mentioned being implemented within the legislation and actually that kind of things that we already had employees as very methods of communicate with the community. But just not in a legal frame work, so I guess this poses questions whether or not, we actually pull the involving communities as projects pull into the legislation. I think it would be an interesting point to discuss. And another repetitive issue, I think, rising from the case studies is that from all case studies, actually, its rights and the roles of local communities that have existed within and around the heritage before it was actually heritage because of the top-down governmental administrative system very prevalent in Asia. It collates very much with traditional and indigenous systems that have been worked for several hundred years, even before legislation for cultural heritage protection wasn’t acted. And these two systems often clashed with this scope of Asia. I think it’s to find a way in between trying to maneuver between those two systems and trying to connect those two systems would be something very important rising from these cases. And there was another point issue raised by all of the participants once again was the issue of dividing the tangible and intangible which came up very much. And tangible and intangible is very much inter-connected and we can’t really divide it. Especially East Asia most the architecture were wooden architecture, the actual skills to repair it to re-maintain in the buildings itself is the part of the actual tangible heritage and to continue the one of the knowledgeable tangible heritage. But in fact, right now in UNESCO is covered by completely different convention of safeguarding of the intangible heritage for humanity. So again, as Mr. Giovanni expanded in his presentation ‘where do we put this scope to the World Heritage Convention’ can apply to this aspect as well. So if I may, could I ask if anybody else has some views on these issues raised so far, any expansions on the questions raised, some of the points that I made also, trying to sum up the day of the presentations. Please we’ll welcome to any intervention from the floor, from the participants, from the speakers, anybody else? Yes, Gamini, Please.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (00:30:45-00:32:11)
  Just clarification before we start the debate. You mentioned that we will stick to the World Heritage. It’s good but I am not sure how we can do that. Because according to the World Heritage, it’s satisfied with what has been done for Taj-Mahal, the whole boundary, it’s protective. We also talked about defining the heritage and we have talked about a lot of things so, one can limit our discussion to World Heritage, also the debate was with the World Heritage Convention. It’s really going on early conservational heritage or conservational of this particular’s sight. This is something we need to keep in mind. Also I want to ask the other question I’ll be only talking about local communities. Or we are talking about communities because everyone is trying to define ‘Communities’. And local community is something different. I don’t know what other is amended is from, it is amended for ask to work talk only about local communities, or the whole communities, Thank you.

- Hyesang Jo (00:32:12-00:32:15)
  That was very valuable questions, Mr. Giovanni, you want to expand?

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:32:16-00:32:55)
  I want to make another clarification before I always before me begin discussing. At least in my presentation, when I said that, we need to overcome this instinct to isolate heritage. I wasn’t preparing to the separation between the tangible and intangible. That is of course also very important issue. I was preparing more in general to the artificial separation between the heritage and the rest. All others are concerned; the problem is larger than that.

- Hyesang Jo (00:32:56-00:34:45)
  So, the question of ‘how do we limit ourselves within the scope of the World Heritage Convention’ can be a very big issue, I think, and one which I don’t think we will be able to finish the discussion within one or two days. And it might not be very fruitful at the end of the day. So as we mentioned before, what we are trying to do is that we try to dissect these phases of trying to nominate a heritage for World Heritage, trying to go through the inscription process and then what kind of mechanisms can actually pull the activities for involving communities even after inscription of the World Heritage because normally inscription provides the greatest motivation for local community involvement and then right after inscription, many of these kinds of
activities fade out a little bit. So, that is why we have the charge in front of us. What we wanted to discuss a little bit more in detail was that what kind of mechanisms we could insert in, into the preparation's stages of World Heritage nomination that way we might be able to stick to the World Heritage Convention, and not expend a little, too much into the areas of general heritage conservation. If we stick to World Heritage, I think we need to stick a little bit more to local communities, local community right now is what we are basically aiming for right now. In my point of view, so, if anybody has anything else, please. Yes, Kai!

- Kai Weise (00:34:46-00:37:02)

So, if we're going to talk about the process, I guess it starts with potential World Heritage sites, which means the whole process of preparing the tentative lists and who participates there. But what I wanted to mention was that Nepal is in the process of inscribing a site, which is 'Lo Manthang', which is right in the north, not easily accessible. So a team from the department of archaeology went up there recently, and so more or less they wanted to talk to the community. And they had a big discussion; they weren't really prepared in the end the community more or less they weren't quite sure whether they really wanted to do this. So they came down and now they are not quite sure what to do next. And we have been advising them to say 'Look, if the community isn't involved, there's no way you will be able to conserve that place because it's too far away for anyone to go and observe in winter not even any, the whole government moves down south. So there's anyone there half of the year. In this process, it's critical that the community is involved right from the beginning without them being fully involved. It's starting process there very often. I mean, this is very extreme situation, that's why we can insist on it, but I think it should be a similar process if it's more accessible place, because I don't think the authorities should be forcing too much upon those especially when if there are in habitant area within which you're actually making the boundaries. I mean, monuments we can just discuss in a different way but let's living cultural heritage, I think, they really have to get involved from the beginning. So that's just the example. Thank you.

- Sohyun Park (00:37:04-00:41:05)

I think that today's conference discussion is a great opportunity of learning for us. Changes are being made to our definition of heritage and search for new approaches to heritage based on these presentations and discussions, and I think that it is very helpful for us to see overseas experts starting discussions with definite clarifications. As explained in the case of Nepal, which has just been presented, in preparing for the designation of World Heritage, we have not been much interested in the opinions of the local community, or people who live in or near the heritage sites until recently. We have tried for designation of World Heritage based on which heritage experts or related authorities, such as the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, consider valuable. However, now we are coming to the realization that this is not the right way. In addition, Korea is one of the most energetic Asian countries in terms of designation of World Heritage these days, along with China. Considering the dynamics at present, I think that it is time for us to ponder on how to learn about our heritage and how to communicate in the process of preparing for the designation of World Heritage. This morning, a Norwegian case was mentioned in which they decided not to apply for designation of World Heritage because local residents were against it. In the case of Nepal, also, the question is what can be done if the residents don't want their heritage site to be designated as World Heritage. Korea is heading toward the same direction, and if we are asked a question like this, some people are sure to answer that, of course, they won't apply for the designation if people were against it. I think that such a discussion will lead to deeper understanding of our heritage and broader consideration of the local community, and that is an occasion in which we can talk about which issues can be discussed in this development process. So, I hope we will start discussing freely about what can be done to improve the situation. There is no correct answer to this question, and we don't know how the concept of community involvement will work out in the future. As was mentioned earlier, we can think about what will happen if we do as local residents want, if all existing regulations are to be removed. We can also discuss if community involvement will solve the current problems of infringement of property rights. I hope that we will be able to discuss such basic questions as well as Mr. Giovanni's highly philosophical questions here.

- Stefano De Caro (00:41:16-00:46:29)

I am a student here and I don’t know very well. But I have the impression that we are speaking of things on two different levels at least on the legal frame. In sense that the national legislation for the protection of area, those who set the rules are different by state. So, in Italy there is something maybe similar to India in the buffer zone as defined by the UNESCO, is something that is not really legal commitment. There is a procedure to do in order to transform buffer zone as defined by the UNESCO inscription. It can be also absorbed into something that is legally imperative committing for the individual owners for property and so on. And to answer the definition of the community of stakeholders of individuals, society, association of interests is completely different from the UNESCO cultural perspective to the national legal perspective. A community of scientists is interested in UNESCO because it’s bringing something to the definition of Outstanding Universal Values, but is completely inefficient under the legal point of view. There are cultural communities but they do not exist, if they are not how they are something into sides. I think the religious society completely ruled in different ways, in different countries. I think that the idea of communities and the rights of the communities needs to be assessed in order to see what the community is really under the legal point of view. It exists culturally. But in Norway, it has a legal right to exercise democratic power of voting. In Italy, that does not exist by local community. You must have a certain standard. There must be a law regulating call. And you can’t appeal against the law. And state can’t appeal against the law.

So I think if we want to progress, we need to define state by state and heritage site by heritage site I don’t know if it’s very useful to work only on the level of the World Heritage sites because there are a lot of important heritages that we hadn’t characterized. I’ve read somewhere in the text about lighthouses of all the heritages. And this is very important concepts because what we want to do for heritage sites and in some ways, something important for the definition of the protection idea for all the heritages. So, I think that if we want to move forward we have to access the legal frame in order that this is after effective. Otherwise, when my colleague speaks of Taj-Mahal in the city of Agra, he is speaking of something like how many millions of people have community. I don’t know but it’s quite the matter of interior politics. It’s just not about the people living around. Instead this is a very local community. So, we need to define better the idea of communities.

- Hyosang Jo (00:46:30-00:46:32)

Thank you. Ingunn, please you asked for the floor.

- Ingunn Kvisterøy (00:46:33-00:51:08)

Yes, thank you. Now, so many questions have been raised now that I’m a little bit unsure where to start, the Stefano, Let me start there because it also then Jo the policy that we are developing will not be a law, but it explores the possibility of the law, it formalizes ways of working that we have started a long time ago. So it will be formalized, it will be a way that, we will follow it up for the future. I have gone into the laws in Norway because that makes me even more complex. We have three major laws that concern World Heritage. One of the laws gives the local communities, understood as municipalities the power, it gives the power, and the responsibility to the local communities as municipalities so we have many municipalities in Norway so they’re quite small. And what I would say about the communities because I was talking about local communities, the policy that we are developing concerning all communities
that has to do with World Heritage. Let me just pin point to one another community. The government I feel that all we see the government as one of the communities that are responsible for the World Heritage, right? Now the communities are at governmental level at least ten different ministries. And the differences between the ministries are just as big as differences between communities locally.

So, one of the other things that we are doing in the policy is to establish and inter-ministerial form. All of the ministries have to meet once a year to discuss questions of common concern, so that we can find the solution to the implementations of the convention. That we know really don’t, have a forward to discuss and where we have one ministry that has sometimes difficulty to in getting through to other more powerful ministries that environmental ministry, not the most powerful. The OIL is, the finance is very important; meaning that the environment, it's important but not in a competition with certain of the ministries in the country. So this form for the ministries, I think, it is maybe the most important in the whole policy that we are developing.

One more thing that I have been talking about is the NGO systems that we have in Norway; we have lots of NGOs. And the NGOs are strong, we have NGOs for almost every World Heritage site that is powerful as well. But it's difficult for us to say government to talk to all of these NGOs, what we did is administration to go out and talk and to say 'why don’t you' gather yourself into one NGO and try to speak to the government with one voice because if you do that you manage to go together to speak one voice you will be much stronger. And it is much easier to persuade to government to listen to you, to try to assist you. So they did this. So there is a World Heritage site NGO in Norway that gathers all parties in Norway. And young and old, professionals and non-professionals, just to pursue, whatever they are. Anybody with an interest in the world heritage sites or property, may be a member, it’s an open membership. They speak with one tongue, with one voice to the government. So this is also another way that maybe makes more easy to involve so the local community. We also have ICOMOS-Norway. Of course it’s also strong. And ICOMOS-Norway is following the government quite closely. And they have their own seminars, professional discussions, letters, and their opinions to the government so we also listen to them at least try to listen to them. So, there are other ways in addition to what I presented this morning that might be an idea for you to follow-up.

- Hyesang Jo (00:51:09-00:51:12)
Thank you, Amareswar?

- Amareswar Galla (00:51:13-01:04:07)
Thank you all for very stimulating case studies. I was not going to say anything until tomorrow morning because I’ve just finished proving the World Heritage’s benefits beyond the borders. This is joint UNESCO - Cambridge University Press publications for the 40th anniversary with 26 case studies. But I want to make intervention within the context of what’s happening now. Thank you so much Mr. Stefano. You are the first one today to mention Outstanding Universal Value. In the guidance, Kishore Rao, the director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, is so on the top of things. The one thing that he said is to remember the OUV. Ultimately it’s the most critical one in safeguarding the World Heritages. You are safeguarding the OUV. But once you take the OUV approach as Joy and Johannson from Norway, who have contribution here, ask all the states, to focus on OUV then we didn’t have to talk in terms of defining the community because I’m an old time anarchist. Defining is containing time containing defining us containing. The communities are dynamic, they are not frozen in time. They are continuously changing.

Something very well recognized by the 2003 convention. Once you have focused on the OUV and take the approach like all the twenty-six out of stairs. Then it becomes the shared value because the outcome is that you want it as a shared value. Most people don’t understand what OUV is, even the targets of the OUV of the World Heritage managers just don’t understand what OUV is. And I think the education; awareness rising is for everybody not so called ‘communityism’ them, the awareness across abroad.

Second thing that I want to mention is holding a buffer zone like such case of India. You know what we’re talking about, Kai. I was brought into the rescue job on a Darjeeling Himalayan railway by the UNESCO. And when I read the documentation I nearly fell off my chair because the ICOMOS consultant recommended the buffer zone as two feet on the either side of the railway track. You know how long it took convincing the railway board because this is different, because it’s Indian railway for EHR not for like other sites. It took a long time and finally forming a partnership with French parks and Darjeeling valley. So we managed to transform two feet into Darjeeling Himalayan Park, the whole valley with where railway is. But the buffer zone comes up very much because the buffer zone is not about delineating this or that if you really think of OUV. The buffer zone is strategy to minimize the negative impacts on the core value, the OUV. That’s what it’s about. And Stefano raised the legal side of things. I think that was a very important point, because you take a place like Vanuatu. Ninety percentage of indigenous people chief role model domains is not equal contribution in here. Because indigenous is what has been introduced during colonial times, and after colonial times, with investment, but traditionally, the individual knowledge systems which are something that Joycein deals with in her case study. So I just wanted to say that you’ve got to get away from the boundaries of them, when you talk about the communities, but focused on the OUV, how we actually assist in these processes.

Lastly, I just want to make two comments. One is, I totally agree with you, Ingunn, about the way you get NGOs to talk, and that’s fantastic. I have a contribution here and have a lot of interesting facts. Everybody talks about Nara document and think of Nara, Japan. But they forget that it’s ICOMOS-Norway, who actually published the whole thing. I was the youngest person in contributing World Heritage to the volume at that time.

(00:56:28) So it’s great that you’re doing it. But try to do that in the country like in India with NGOs or in Italy, because of tremendously culturally linguistic diversity. For World Heritage or any formal standard setting system instrument, we want to promote cultural diversity. And it’s impossible to get all of them so, that becomes an issue. But lastly, I think Giovanni mentioned it briefly, what’s really critical is what’s happening in Rio, June, this year. I’m sorry to say but this is really critical. And I think DG of UNESCO, has been like, nor the DG of the UNESCO advocating every forum about the importance of locating culture and development.

If you look at Rio, 1992, even though everybody came together they forgot about the cultures. So it became ESD, environmental ministry. The OIL is, the finance is very important; meaning that the environment, it’s important but not in a competition with certain of the ministries in the country. So this form for the ministries, I think, it is maybe the most important in the whole policy that we are developing.

If you look at Rio, 1992, even though everybody came together they forgot about the cultures. So it became ESD, environmental ministry. The OIL is, the finance is very important; meaning that the environment, it’s important but not in a competition with certain of the ministries in the country. So this form for the ministries, I think, it is maybe the most important in the whole policy that we are developing.
These days, this is the way of the world is, globalization you can't oppose it. And you can't play the old time pull-me-back kind of attitude. You have to deal with it. So in this volume, there’re exemplary two case studies, one from Norway. Statistically how you measure the community engagement and you deal with sustainable development. And the other one from Hoi an, excellent! So one thing that we really push is ‘Can you measure the quality or the quantity of the community engagement? If you don’t do that, you can’t say better ‘what do you mean by better from what? What’s the baseline when you say better? I just wanted to raise some of the issues and what is practical. A lot of things, there’s a whole section dealing with indigenous knowledge integrated in local area and planning in this volume. There, you actually look at the practical guidelines, the real challenge is because when you actually talk about the sustainable development, I mean the reason why if the rice terraces could put them off, on your list, they strongly recognize of really respecting not as involving communities but ownership but communities taking that responsibility really working to what’s paradigm to shift of. It’s not easy, it’s not something that you can’t measure and say that you achieved it, it’ll take time, but at least, the framework is there to take the ownership like there is with World Heritage the in the Vega Archipelago. But it’s much harder in poorer countries. You’ve got to remember, you can establish very good standard and you are taking this as this standard. But this tremendous culture diversity in the world and the UNESCO is committed to this to the culture diversity, and World Heritage Centre is coming to this cultural diversity. And the different approaches, different the ways of doing things different phases which you can do things and this becomes very critical in the way we talked about what the practical guideline is, practical guidelines for rich countries? Practical guidelines for countries that have low economic indicated? So I think that this is really great. You’ve got a framework to start working an outcome documents, I think we’ve got to keep on critically and struggling what we mean by the community involvement. But OUV, once we focus on, that became the critical focus. We didn’t have to define because I’ve been there a long time in 1984, Kakadu World Heritage area. I trained the first average people there. There are not average people ever that in World Heritage site, in fact, being remodeled in Australia. And it’s always being an issue what we mean by the community involvement and what we always went back to the same rhetorical cultural democracy, but giving that stakeholder participation way the local communities actually involve benefits is the one thing that difference and this is something that I work with a wonderful person from Norway, the dean professor from Sesame parliament, from Philippines, a number of people helped to say that you really got to, not talk about the community has assumed them but we are part of the community too. And how are we measure the participation, how do we measure benefits, how do we measure the way we move forward? Whose values are we using in measuring these things? So culturally economic is totally different dimension. Thank you.

- Hyosang Jo (01:04:08-01:04:30)
Thank you. That is very important point. One reason why we wanted to focus on the possibility on the operational guidelines is therefore we can focus ourselves with the OUV, and try not to forget the frame work. But I can’t agree with you more about the quantity and quality of the measurements that we need within the cultural heritage area. Joyce, you want to speak?

- Joycelyn Mananghaya (01:04:31-01:06:33)
I’d like to accord, Amareswar just did before his talk. I was about to share with you about what happened in the Rice Terraces. I think it’s very important for us, World Heritage community at local levels to understand expectations and to define what we mean. In fact, during the last joint monitoring mission of last year at the Rice Terraces, We were asked to define the contribution guidelines because this is one of things that were required from us to move the sites from the World Heritage. I was a part of the process by which, I worked with local community in defining what we mean by contribution guidelines so I helped them draft what it was all about, what we are trying to conserve and it was all about OUV. In the process that we were defining contribution guidelines which we submitted to the UNESCO authority, so we went to the site. We realized that this conservation guideline is actually the things they do on an everyday on a basis. So it is a matter of just redlining, rewriting them in a document so that we could submit it to the UNESCO. But the truth is that the work is actually happening in the sites already; there is a conservation there is a management at the site. So I think we have to define with a clear understanding of conservation. Perhaps there’s a difference between expectations that perhaps the international level. We think that nothing is really happening but actually there is something happening at the site with people themselves, doing the work. But it is a matter of communicating. So I think the communication is the key between ‘what is happening at the site by people themselves’ and ‘what are the expectations at the national level and the international level’. And through communication, we can understand each other. Thank you.

- Amareswar Gall (01:06:34-01:07:03)
I want to make just one small clarification, I am actually from originally India, Australian citizen, and but now coming from Denmark and I’m living in Denmark. I just want to clarify that whatever I’m saying doesn’t reflect, this is a disclaimer, that’s all. These are my opinions somebody who has been involved in World Heritages’ areas for 31 years.

- Hyosang Jo (01:07:04-01:08:22)
The actual method you’re related to, reminds me a little bit of our case and nominating the historic villages. We had similar case where when we are asking for monitoring records from the local villages. People were saying ‘Monitoring? No, we don’t do have anything called monitoring.’ And then they try to find the right documents, fitting official styles with everything. In fact, they were already doing at the local level every day, day by day, and hour by hour; they are checking the status of the house and villages, of gas, the fire, risks. They were doing it already a while ago. One thing that we need within the cultural heritage area. What we were talking at World Heritage level can be important. Yes, Giovanni?

- Giovanni Boccan (01:08:23-01:09:55)
I wanted to clarify that the World Heritage Convention. There is out of negotiation process among all countries of the world. They have to agree on the terminology. So they decided the monitoring was a good word to describe that kind of thing which it’s called in different ways and everywhere. And the same goes buffer zone. You call it buffer zone, super zone, respect zones, etc., but at the end of the day it’s served on that purpose. What the World Heritage Convention is trying to do is to protect this Outstanding Universal Value and it says a number of principles. But then of course the expectation is that these become real in the local context rule that legal institutional administrative frame work that exists there. So it’s not enough to do just present drawing to the World Heritage Committee to admit that this is my buffer zone if this does not correspond. In reality, to some form of land use and controls that are ruled in the local legal system, it would be absorbed. So just to clarify that, I don’t see the major connection, just they are two different levels but related.

- Gami Wijesuriya (01:09:56-01:12:13)
I think you are explaining it very clearly. These sites are how legal system is held and this site is institutional system and so on. They will be managed but imposed these ideas of Outstanding Universal Value. The first time I heard to you Professor Rii but I would contest one of the things. We have to go by Outstanding Universal Value. Yes, of course. Then, that’s all. We can even stop and go home. But until 2005, in operational guidelines we didn’t have the
definition of the outstanding universal value. 2007, last meeting says OUV is being evolved. So there is still an opportunity still to be added to OUV terminology to better systemize something. That’s why I had the same question. I some groups of the heritage we tried to classify having Outstanding Universal Value but group like this can’t contribute. This is how things have evolved. I have told you in the morning. In 1981, we wrote the tentative lists in 10 minutes, but now you can’t do that because you had to have a statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Until ICCROM carried out research project in 2007, there was no definition or format for the statement of the Outstanding Universal Value. It’s only after that we propagated that Therefore, I think that any contribution. Even in the committee, there’s a group who will argue about Outstanding Universal Value. And we only talked about that. This is still in the debate. Thank you.

- Hysong Jo (01:12:14-01:12:17)
  Sorry, but Navin wants to propose. You’re waiting for..

- Navin Piplani (01:12:18-01:12:54)
  I’m just going to play a role of school teacher. And I want to say that it was very interesting discussion. Very interesting ideas has been floating around. But if there’s any immediate outcome that is expected out of this meeting. You’ve got these experts all over the world in very short time. If there can have a clear structure of discussion on what is expected out of us. Our comments will fall into places and we will have something in hand by the end of tomorrow. Otherwise we can discuss for a whole month.

- Hysong Jo (01:12:55-01:12:59)
  Would you like to finish your comment, first?

- Amareswar Galla (01:13:00-01:15:38)
  G magnetic in the community. That’s exactly why we dealt with for OUVs. The idea is to promote the OUV as shared value. You are absolutely right when it came into use. The engagement of the local communities is the central element in terms of stakeholders’ benefit analysis. You may be primary stakeholders, secondary stakeholders or thirdly stakeholders. So in fact, we are not disagreeing. We are agreeing with Gammri. I’ll give you another example about what we did. I have a lot of fantastic people advising me. I was only like the servant if you’re like doing this work. I think the most important thing is how you actually build your accountability to stakeholders’ communities. You are the primary stakeholders for the communities locally. How do you build the accountability? This is a set of criteria based on the case of people, every state party even Singapore joined in 1990s. Everybody was asked to nominate what they taught was a good practice. There was advisory three committee went through the whole process. IUCN and ICOMOS also were advising. What came out was OUV is still critical because it’s World Heritages. But as Gammri rightly pointed out it’s not until recent that this was even understood. Now a lot of people don’t even understand. I know many people going for World Heritage nomination or going for tourism to promote tourism in countries. That’s the main motivation, not OUV. What we did was we went through the process. And we said many times how the OUV can be a shared value. That’s the main thing. I just wanted to make the comment that I’m totally in agreement with Gammri. Now we actually measure these benefits and community engagement, what qualitative and quantitative becomes critical. Not national ideas are consulted? Thank you.

- Hysong Jo (01:15:39-01:15:47)
  Thank you. I just wanted to hand over to professor Sohyun Park’s. She will be able to answer Navin’s comments.

- Sohyun Park (01:15:48-01:17:56)
  As a school teacher, I will answer the question as a student. Perhaps, your next book, I hope you can publish a book about measuring OUV perhaps. I don’t know. I think here none of us will deny the importance of OUV. So I think we are on the same page for that matter. We plan this specific Buyeo Conference with three specific plenary debate sessions. Perhaps, this first plenary session, I think we open up our basic questions, and perhaps the key word for today might be as Giovanni and Gammri mentioned, the clarification might be the key word in the plenary session. Of course we don’t have any clear answer yet but at least we start, and open up our discussions, and the main our discussion would be tomorrow the plenary session 2 where Giovanni kindly agree with facilitator. And perhaps, our small goal for this Buyeo conference would be at least we can come up with something that we can use as a reference when we are preparing for the world heritage nomination in terms of community involvement issues. I bet better than before, that’s what we mean by better. I know it’s vague but at the same time, I think that’s in a way, in a safe way to approach or safe for a way to approach to this one. So we don’t have that much grade goal for this one. We would like to aim at small but practical goal that we can at least come up with something out of this kind of discussions with all the experts from all over the world. For that kind of thing, we this kind of basic steps and considering some of the stakeholders what can we come up with some practical guidelines might be our modest goals here. Thank you.

- Amareswar Galla (01:17:56-01:17:59)
  That’s the main thing. I just wanted to make the comment that I’m totally in agreement with Gammri. How we actually measure these benefits and community engagement, what qualitative and quantitative becomes critical. Not national ideas are consulted? Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:17:57-01:19:17)
  Because I have agreed to be a moderator at second discussion, I am completely aware of the fact that I would have come up to the structure with some specific points. We have come up with something good for tomorrow. But I think we already have a strong guidance from the organizers because when they have presented with this slide and the way they said that these were the major steps within the World Heritage Convention, first identify property then you nominated and you managed and monitored it then at each of the stages, there would be roles of the community concerns that the regard the community which exactly are those what are the implications, where we want to fit this into the operational guidelines. So that’s more or less that the job that we have to do but then exactly how we structure. I think it is more or less that the clarification might be the key word of the plenary session. Of course we don’t have any clear answer yet but at least we start, and open up our discussions, and the main our discussion would be tomorrow the plenary session 2 where Giovanni kindly agree with facilitator. And perhaps, our small goal for this Buyeo conference would be at least we can come up with something that we can use as a reference when we are preparing for the world heritage nomination in terms of community involvement issues. I bet better than before, that’s what we mean by better. I know it’s vague but at the same time, I think that’s in a way, in a safe way to approach or safe for a way to approach to this one. So we don’t have that much grade goal for this one. We would like to aim at small but practical goal that we can at least come up with something out of this kind of discussions with all the experts from all over the world. For that kind of thing, we this kind of basic steps and considering some of the stakeholders what can we come up with some practical guidelines might be our modest goals here. Thank you.

- Hysong Jo (01:19:17-01:19:19)
  Because I have agreed to be a moderator at second discussion, I am completely aware of the fact that I would have come up to the structure with some specific points. We have come up with something good for tomorrow. But I think we already have a strong guidance from the organizers because when they have presented with this slide and the way they said that these were the major steps within the World Heritage Convention, first identify property then you nominated and you managed and monitored it then at each of the stages, there would be roles of the community concerns that the regard the community which exactly are those what are the implications, where we want to fit this into the operational guidelines. So that’s more or less that the job that we have to do but then exactly how we structure. I think it is more or less that the clarification might be the key word of the plenary session. Of course we don’t have any clear answer yet but at least we start, and open up our discussions, and the main our discussion would be tomorrow the plenary session 2 where Giovanni kindly agree with facilitator. And perhaps, our small goal for this Buyeo conference would be at least we can come up with something that we can use as a reference when we are preparing for the world heritage nomination in terms of community involvement issues. I bet better than before, that’s what we mean by better. I know it’s vague but at the same time, I think that’s in a way, in a safe way to approach or safe for a way to approach to this one. So we don’t have that much grade goal for this one. We would like to aim at small but practical goal that we can at least come up with something out of this kind of discussions with all the experts from all over the world. For that kind of thing, we this kind of basic steps and considering some of the stakeholders what can we come up with some practical guidelines might be our modest goals here. Thank you.

- Hysong Jo (01:19:18-01:21:44)
  In fact, what we are proceeding tomorrow is that we are going to circulate some of the documents that are already discussing community involvement. We are going to circulate a copy, some copies of the operational guidelines just to pinpoint where about in the guidelines the community involvement is mentioned, and whereabouts where the gaps are just so that we can relate. We also have passed discussions and papers. There’s a 2007 paper where the fifth C, the community was introduced into the strategic objective of World Heritage Convention, so we are going to pass around the papers as well. Also in 2003 the world heritage paper, which was the outcome of the conference that was held in Netherlands, talking about the local communities, so we will circulate the recommendations from that. We have the conference in Norway that was held in May this year. And they also set up principles and guidelines. I think this will be a practical starting point because that’s where we have agreed on in Norway. And I think this covered most of common grounds that we have already discussed this session. We’ll circulate those documents around this evening so that we may all start on the basic ground that we share. I also wanted to share with you a paper published from IUCN, June this year, which Tim Badman, who couldn’t attend this conference because of WCC going on Jeju Island. He also pointed out to my knowledge that IUCN also charge an individual, outside independence study on
involving local communities, and I think the natural heritage has a point of view is valued point in coming into this kind of dimensions. So these documents, we will try to print out just the essence of it so that you don’t have a whole package of them. Just two or three pages the most important parts so that you will be able to refer to them tomorrow and perhaps we might not go into the whole debate of redefining all terminology first. Thank you. Our last comment is made by Professor Pilwon Han.

- Pil-won Han (1:21:45~1:25:30)
I think we need to define the relationship between community and heritage rather than to define the concept of community. While the concept of community can be defined differently according to the situations in various places and cultures, as mentioned earlier, I think that the relationship between community and heritage can be defined in one or two aspects. Although this issue has not been discussed much today, I think that we need to pay attention to by whom and through which process the heritage was created. Here, I think that we don’t need to restrict the community to people who live in or near the heritage. Rather, we need to examine how the community was related to the creation of the heritage. Then, as was told earlier, a community keeps on changing, and it is not fixed in urban areas, especially in Asia. Therefore, when we define a community, we need to see if a certain heritage is used in people’s lives in the community and divide it into several different types before getting into discussion. What I will talk about tomorrow is the kind of role a community can play in relation to a heritage that fits both these categories. Thank you.

- Hyosang Jo (01:25:30-01:25:56)
Dinner starts immediately right after the end of the session. So if you just move to the next room we will be serving you nice Korean food to fill your stuffs and try to work you a little bit more during the night. Thank you very much for everybody!
Moderator: Giovanni Boccardi, UNESCO World Heritage Centre
Penalists: Hae Un Rii, ICOMOS-Korea/Dongguk University, Korea
Hee-tae Kim, Jeollanam-do Province, Korea
Im San Kang, The National Trust for Culture Heritage, Korea
Kyungwhan Kang, Cultural Heritage Administration, Korea

- In-ho Song (00:00:00~00:04:00)
Now, we will discuss two topics and three cases that have been presented today for about one and a half hours. All of us will then have a general discussion on the issue of community involvement in the afternoon. The afternoon discussion will be chaired by Mr. Giovanni Boccardi from the UNESCO World Heritage Center, who has just arrived. First, we will have a panel discussion, and I will introduce four panelists. Here are Mr. Kyungwhan Kang from Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea, Mr. Im San Kang, The National Trust for Culture Heritage of Korea, Mr. Hee-tae Kim, member of the Jeollanam-do Cultural Properties Committee, and Professor Hae-un Rii of ICOMOS Korea, who is also a professor at Dongguk University.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:04:07-00:12:03)
I'm honored to be able to moderate in this discussion. I'm also very much looking forward to hearing from four of the panelists, just before giving them the floor, however, I think it might be helpful if I tried to summarize the key question in my view have been emerging from this debate yesterday and today from case studies and thematic presentation so as to give us some structure and guidelines to discussion suggested just yesterday by Indian colleague. So if you allow me, I will take three minutes to go through the key points. I think we need to be addressed by the panelists, but also by the larger group of participants in this meeting.
I think the first question that has been discussed and mentioned that almost all of the presentations is 'how do we define a community' with particular regard to Asian context. Who are the communities, we're just talking about the local communities or all communities or who is not a member of a community, other new communities that just arrived at the not-connected to the heritage and cultural terms, the problem of balancing the expectations of communities and the rises of the individuals and so on. So I'd like to steer views on this issue from all of you.
The second question that I think was mentioned extensively was the issue of Outstanding Universal Value, which is at the foundation of the World Heritage Convention and how to balance this with all other kinds of values that local people attach to the heritage, but also other needs and aspirations from communities in terms of economic and social development, whereas the balances precisely what compromises can be made, and then there was the importance of contribution from a Mahar about how to measure the benefits, which is essentially for everyone to want to do anything about. There was also the problem of balancing respectful cultural diversity and traditions at the same time, acknowledging the rise of the individuals and pursuing sustainable development because sometimes, we don't coincide.
The third main theme, which I identified together with some colleagues yesterday after the dinner, we had informal gathering; the third main theme was that of the boundaries. We acknowledge that communities go beyond the boundaries of the inscribed property. There are people that may care about the heritage property on the other side of the planet. In yet, world heritage system, we manage the property using boundaries with management plans. We have buffer zone but it is usually rather limited so, how to address this issue and how to manage problems that affect or depend from the communities that are outside of these boundaries.
Particularly in the Asian contexts, which is developing very fast, so suggestion remain throughout in two days including national established impact assessment process as the standard of mechanism within the convention. I think the book by Amareswar Gallia maybe provides a lot of the insights there.
The fourth question that was raised was again, we're particular relevant in the Asian contexts, the very strong pushing for inscription, which is a characteristics in the region. Local community's mayors but also the people, I suppose, want to be on the world heritage list. They have a normal expectation, there is a tremendous energy for a certain, amount of time, then after the inscription usually this pushes is slow down, the commitment begins to diminish and the question there is a how to make the best use of the enthusiasm and energy to promote the conservation at the same time secure, sustainable development benefits to the community, how to engage with this energy in a positive way.
The fifth problem is 'how to do it', 'how to do it in practice'; 'what are the methods of techniques, what's the practice that we can introduce in the world heritage convention particularly with regard to the capacity building. I think that Gamini he just came from ICOMOS can also later on like suggestions what would be the specific recommendations from this group. That could be the mainstream into the world heritage convention.

- Hae-un Rii (00:12:04~00:42:40)
Thank you. I will speak in Korean. For two days, we listened to six thematic presentations and seven case presentations, and I felt that there were differences in concepts and methods between theory and practice and among different countries, based on different cultural traditions or national identities. I also think that we have the responsibility to protect and preserve World Heritage regardless of the type of the heritage and whether it is living heritage or not. As others told earlier, we need to preserve these properties after they are designated as World Heritage, for a better environment and better life. Concerning who should be involved in the preservation, I think that all related parties including the country, local residents and local government should be involved in it. I think that the roles may differ according to national identities, as you have heard from presentations of yesterday and today. For example, there are places where the government has stronger control, others where the local community has a bigger voice, and still others where the two parties have almost equal power. In addition, considering the participation of the local community, there is the top-down method in which the government makes decisions for the community, and the bottom-up method in which the local residents give their opinions to the government.
I would also like to talk about the term ‘indigenous people,’ which is often mentioned when we discuss World Heritage. However, for Koreans – and I
think that this may be the same for the Japanese or Chinese – the term ‘indigenous people’ feels quite unfamiliar to us. Koreans have lived here for thousands of years, so I wonder if the term is necessary to us. For example, I took part in events celebrating the 600th anniversary of Seoul as Korea’s capital that were organized by the city, and as part of them, we looked for native Seoulites. I belong to the category of native Seoulites, and I’m actually registered as one. Now, from the Western perspective, I am one of the indigenous people of Seoul. I am certainly a native of Seoul, but I don’t feel that I belong to the category of indigenous people, and I just say that I have lived in Seoul since I was born. Then, does it mean that I belong to the local community? Seoul is a very big city, and I live in the Gangnam-gu district, where Joseon’s royal tombs of Seonjeongneung and Heoninneung are located. I actually live quite near to Seonjeongneung, and I wonder, as a member of the local community, whether I am involved in the protection and preservation of the royal tomb, and whether I’m involved in the protection of Heoninneung, which is rather far from my house. It makes me think over the meaning of local community, and then the meaning of community that we are discussing. Notably, in the case of living heritage, we heard the story of Yangdong Village earlier today, and I think the residents there must consider themselves as protectors of the village because they live there, rather than perceiving themselves as members of the local community. In other cases, people living near a World Heritage site may also become a community. In addition, I think that protection and preservation of World Heritage aren’t solely the responsibility of the members of the local community, but it should be done by people all over the world. Then, for example, considering a World Heritage site in Kathmandu, Nepal, as I’m a member of the global community, I have the duty to protect and preserve it, too. Professor Han Pil-won said earlier today that the shortcut to becoming a global citizen is through the medium of World Heritage. He said that this is because World Heritage belongs to people of the entire world. In this sense, the concept of community can change according to our way of thinking, and people may have different thoughts about it. We have to consider what they think, where they live, how large the scope of the heritage is, and how much they’re involved with it. In other words, it differs according to the size of the heritage, the scope of the region, involvement or contribution to the region, and the level of participation. So, I think that the concept of community should not be fixed, but differ according to the involvement with relevant heritage in various countries, and I saw that there were differences among the cases of Southeast Asia and South Asia delivered yesterday and the cases of East Asia presented today. I think that we’d better first decide today how to define community differently from Europe, the United States or Africa. Rather than giving my answer, I would like to present this question to you. Thank you.

-Giovanni Boccardi (00:18:41-00:19:02)

Thank you very much, Prof. Rii for insights seeing from Korea particularly. Now I would like to give the floor to Mr. Kim Hee-tae from Jellanan-do Province. You have to floor, Sir.

- Hee-tae Kim (00:19:09-00:25:10)

Good afternoon. I’m Hee-tae Kim from the Jeollanam-do Provincial Government. I’m honored to be here and have an opportunity to learn more about World Heritage, and I would like to thank all those involved in the event. I gave you handouts about today’s discussion, but they are rather long, so I would like to summarize them briefly. They are about the role of local community. The concept of local community may be defined in various ways, so I would like to restrict it to three aspects, including the perspective of the residents, the perspective of guidance and promotion, and the perspective of repair related to maintenance of its outstanding universal value and preservation. First, concerning the residents - many people mentioned this issue over the last two days – as designation of World Heritage is related to things like prevention, limitation and restriction, there seems to have been quite a lot of conflict over it. However, we have to consider the aspect of recommendation more than that of prevention or restriction. In our province, Naganeupseong Fortress is included in the tentative list of World Heritage sites, and we have legislated for the use of 40% of the entrance fee here by the residents for cultural property management cost, scholarship, etc. Also, we have set certain standards, and if they violate the standards – for example, if they spoil the view by putting up a steel gate or an antenna outside their house – we keep them in check and cut their allowance the following year. So, they try hard to keep these principles, and by keeping them they can get support for their living and their children’s tuition. I think that this is a good way, and hope that these kinds of measures can be adopted for all World Heritage sites in Korea, if not for all our cultural properties. We have a law called the Cultural Heritage Protection Fund Act, and the subjects of this act should be people who live in World Heritage sites, but it is not stipulated in the act. So, I have been thinking that the act should include stipulations on the residents and recommendations.

Also, while this is intended as recommendation, I think restriction is sometimes necessary. For example, if the World Heritage site is large, there may be cars driving there, and we permit vehicles owned by the residents and those used for filming, cleaning or delivery of daily necessities. In this case, I think we need to limit the time and scope of car operation, for the sake of heritage management, landscape and noise control. Second, I would like to talk about promotion and tour guidance. Concerning tour guidance, although there are tour guide training courses that give certifications to people who complete them, actual residents of the local community know more about their heritage. Thus, I think that we may develop a system that can give certifications to the residents, so I wrote about it in my article. In the middle of the third page, I wrote that we might include World Heritage in the basic school curriculum to enhance understanding of it, if it is difficult to set up an official certification program for World Heritage guides, and I think that this can be expanded not just as a program of an individual country but also an official educational program of the UNESCO or something similar to that. Next, I would like to talk about the technical staff for dealing with cultural properties. In Korea, we have the Act on the Repair of Cultural Properties, etc., and the repair of cultural properties by professional technicians is clearly quite different from those done by local residents, such as walls that residents had built themselves. We sometimes joke that all walls around the country are becoming alike, and to improve this situation, I think that we need to develop a special educational program for these technicians and require certain qualifications for people who bid for the repair of World Heritage sites. Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:25:20-00:25:36)

Thank you very much. Now we are going to listen to Mr. Kang, Imsan from National Trust of Cultural Heritage of Korea.

- Im-san Kang (00:25:36-00:32:25)

Thank you. I’m glad to be here. To me, today and yesterday’s sessions on topics including the process of designation as World Heritage, management after designation and utilization ascertained the fact that the roles of local community and local residents are important in these processes once again. As a person who first got involved in the civic movement for cultural heritage back in 1997, I have felt that proper attention has not been given on the role of activists in cultural properties including World Heritage sites. However, looking back, I think that the roles of activists who mobilize local residents and organize overall movements are as important as those of professors, researchers, experts, and local and central government agencies to the sustainable management of cultural heritage and promotion of its value. In this regard, I highly welcome the UNESCO’s attention to these issues as well as its attempt to reestablish the roles of these people and to consider these aspects in designating World Heritage sites. Now, I want to review some of the cases we heard about yesterday and today.

I would like to make a few comments about some cases that I found impressive. I think that the case of the Philippines is the same as in Korea. I was deeply interested in the case because living heritage in the Philippines including rice farming is quite similar to that of Korea. Notably, we share the same problem with the people in the Philippines in seeking various solutions for the dissolution of farming communities. Also, it was nice to learn
about things like the response of local community to climate change around the world, which I hadn’t thought about in the past. The case of Taj Mahal seems to be a good example showing how the interests of local residents can be adjusted and how the relationship between them can be formed. The case of Hangzhou in China seems to be highly well organized. Listening to the superbly organized, thoroughly managed case, I thought that local residents might be better persuaded by looking at specific evidence of changes that happened to the community provided through quantitative analysis. Kyoto’s case was impressive as one effectively demonstrating the roles of managers, which are clearly divided and efficiently organized. As it is a very famous case, I think that it is a perfect model for benchmarking that may be repeatedly examined and referred to. The case of Yangdong Village seems to be the first case of local community involvement in Korea. It is a case carried out by a coagent or observer who became engaged in participatory observation of the local community as in anthropological research, and I am very curious about the reason behind the observation. I completely agree with the presenter on the necessity of experts or expert activists. In fact, these cases are very important for sustainable management and promotion of the value of World Heritage, and I think that this is a critical issue. Considering World Heritage, or cultural heritage in general, social and cultural relations surrounding the heritage have changed due to the changes in economic and materialistic conditions. The society is not what it used to be 100 or 200 years ago. However, cultural heritage is maintained and managed while modern values and beliefs are being newly introduced. Externally, these aspects remain the same as in the past, but the social relations differ from those in the past, and the culture being formed internally may also differ accordingly. Here, I think that the issue of authenticity may be brought up. Of course, we also need to consider the definition of authenticity, but I would like to listen to the opinion of Professor Yoshifumi Muneta, who presented the case of Kyoto in Japan, on whether we should accept this as contemporary acculturation that occurs inevitably due to social changes. We can’t avoid change, and changes in economic bases naturally lead to social and cultural changes. Nevertheless, there is a dilemma over how to understand these aspects from the perspective of authenticity, and I am personally confused about this at present. I want to know how this issue has been settled in Japan’s case.

- Giovanni Boccari (00:32:26-00;33:08)

Thank you very much, Mr. Kang. I think you raised the issue of including the experts, among the stakeholders of the community that’s precise on the purpose of the first point. At least a large debate of defining of who are communities and who are not communities’ that we are going to be concerned. Maybe later on, I will give the floor to Prof. Muneta to respond to them. Now we listen to our fourth and last panelist for another comment, Kyunghwan Kang from Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea.

- Kyunghwan Kang (00:33:09-00:42:40)

Forty years have passed since the World Heritage Convention was concluded, and I think that it is highly meaningful to promote the roles of local community in the process of the convention. Establishment of the World Heritage Convention and systematic preservation and management of heritage, which used to be taken care of by individual countries, based on global standards and the concept of the outstanding universal value (OUV), have great significance in the global protection of heritage. Despite such contribution, the fact that protection of World Heritage largely leaned toward the protection of physical structures has resulted in the emergence of the concept of sustainability. I think that the recent stress on the intangible values of World Heritage is creating a momentum for the conventional Western concept of preservation to expand and develop further. In relation to this, I think that it is necessary to send local society and community, which should be the main agents of the preservation and management of heritage, back to their original status, and I would like to make some suggestions on this. I think that changes are being made in local communities where the residents need to make decisions as passive agents while they can play the role of active agents in the preservation and management of cultural properties around them through promotion of civic consciousness and regional autonomy. Therefore, I think that the role of the local community will become much more important in the protection of heritage, and that we should develop systematic measures under which they can participate in the process, not as passive subjects but as actual leaders.

So, local community is an important keyword for sustainable development. For sustainable management of heritage and for local community to play an appropriate role, two-way communication rather than unilateral instructions by the central or local government should be promoted, and a mechanism that allows benefits from the management and preservation of heritage to be returned to the community should be developed. Concerning the decision making process, I think that it should not be based on hierarchical power structure, but the local community should be given more authority to make decisions themselves. We need to establish and develop the functions and roles of local community relative to this. Especially in countries like Korea that has a strong central government, the system for people’s participation should be designed in great detail. In our case, people’s participation has usually been made through one-sided education or mobilization orders, and it is time for measures that enable local residents to realize and understand the value of their heritage on their own to be introduced. In this process, people should be made to realize the value of participation and the fact that they are active agents who can bring about change.

Recently, the Law on Preservation of Ancient Capitals was newly enacted, under which ancient Korean capitals including Buyeo, Gongju, Iksan and Gyeongju are protected. In these cities, local residents have voluntarily started ancient capital forums in these cities, and notably in the case of Iksan, people there maintain programs through which they meet and discuss the values of their heritage sites and come up with new activities and businesses designed for the development of their heritage. I think these voluntary meetings and research activities should be promoted further, and in cities such as Buyeo, Gongju and Iksan, they are separately working on inclusion of their heritage on the World Heritage list, and voluntary activities of residents including the ancient capital forum may contribute to this process. In many cases, the role of local community is stressed in the process of designation of World Heritage. Thus, if your heritage is on the tentative list or you’re preparing for the designation of World Heritage, you should think of ways to encourage and institutionalize resident participation ahead of time. Until now, resident participation has mostly been limited to passive actions such as resident mobilization and response to damage to cultural properties, so more active ways of resident participation should be developed. As you know, there are management frames for World Heritage currently being developed, and they usually formalize resident participation. However, they are mostly developed under the leadership of the central and local governments, in a top-down way, and we should think about bottom-up ways in which residents can actually take part in the planning process. Designation of World Heritage leads to increase in tourism, as seen in the examples of Hahoe and Yangdong villages and Jeju-do, and voluntary efforts are required to establish desirable forms and methods of tourism. As Mr. Kim Hui-tae said earlier, it would be good to build a system in which residents can become tour guides, and this can result in a virtuous cycle where new jobs are created through preservation and management of heritage. This will be the only way to prevent local residents from leaving the World Heritage area. We need to develop a system with which residents can protect World Heritage on their own as well as share and pass on its values. Recently in Gyeongju, designation of the city as an ancient capital protection area is leading to an increase in the housing and land price in some parts of it. As it involves things like new resident support programs, there are certainly benefits, and designation as a World Heritage site or ancient capital area itself is meaningful and valuable. However, it can bring about other problems. Local residents may be forced to leave the area if the housing price rises and the rich move in. This phenomenon is called gentrification, and we need to think about how such problems can be controlled and mediated along with the roles of local community. Also, when they develop design guidelines, central or local government usually leads the process. They just hold a hearing for local residents and give them announcements a few times. However, if a system is developed through which residents can autonomously deal with things like signboards, windows or minor repairs and feel that by doing so they can get benefits, this will help promote more active and desirable roles for the local community. In conclusion, in the Korean case, the Law on Preservation of Ancient Capital has been enacted, thereby institutionalizing
resident participation and resident support to a certain extent, and a special law on World Heritage has been proposed at the National Assembly. When the law is passed, it will increase support in this field, and I think that these moves are quite worthwhile. The authenticity of World Heritage is not limited to physical aspects. I think that the key point is to hand down both tangible and intangible values of heritage, and that the role of local community is essential for maintaining the authenticity. The Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Convention on the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents were already established, and while the global standards of World Heritage is highly important, I hope that issues such as regional diversity, which can help the promotion and development of traditional and individual ways of heritage protection and the roles of local community, will be discussed further by the UNESCO.

(00:42:41-00:44:03) Thank you very much, Mr. Kang again for your contribution.
Plenary Debate 2 (Sept. 11)
Moderator: Giovanni Boccardi, UNESCO World Heritage Centre

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:42:47-00:44:03)
Now I would like to open up the debate if you wish following the structure and the path that I suggested at the beginning. However I’m also being given some questions that were asked by the audience and I would like to take one minute to answer them. First, there was a question from Mr. Kang about the issue of the authenticity. This is the major question, so we’ll risk opening up another long debate. There is the Nara document authenticity within the World Heritage Convention that very clearly sets out what we mean by it and how to deal with the changes in the physical fabric. However, I would like to still give Mr. Muneta the opportunity to respond and at the same time, professor Muneta, if you could also address another series of specific questions on the Machiya, the questions were “how many were there, are they designated cultural properties, and...”

- Yoshifumi Muneta (00:44:04-00:44:08)
Some of them are yes.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:44:09-00:44:49)
Wait a second, because there are plenty. “What was their original use? Is there government support?” Then, there is another question for you about the very advanced level of community involvement that seems to be going on in Kyoto, which must have been the result of the consultation and must have met problems. It must have been difficult to bring life back to the traditional shops. I would like to ask you to make a miracle and respond to all of these questions in one minute.

- Yoshifumi Muneta (00:44:50-00:48:41)
Thank you very much. So I’ll try to answer with the first questions, authenticity. Do you know the reason that Japanese government organized conference in Nara for authenticity? The convention about Cultural Heritage started in 1972. And Japanese government joined it in 1992 because of the way of restoration on wooden building that consider the way of Venetian charter said. So we have to discuss, what is authenticity of conservation, what is authenticity of heritage joining in World Heritage Convention. I also was the member of the conference in Nara, so I know what the definition of authenticity in material in techniques is. It’s quite difficult to define authenticity of community or authenticity of person. So debate on this authenticity discussion of society, we proposed intangible Cultural Heritage during Matsuura Goichiro secretariat period in UNESCO. So now we discuss physical heritage and intangible and so on. We have to remember the vita brevis. The life of life is very short but art, in this case we have to say Cultural Heritage, World Cultural Heritage, is eternal.

So why is the Cultural Heritage eternal? It’s very simple. We continue to create new generation to do the same thing in a different society because in the traditional period, they have to conserve everything because that is tradition. But now we abandon the tradition. We modernize society because we’re living in a democracy and we’re living in the prosperity of freedom. So in this case, we have to create new generation to take care of Cultural Heritage for eternity. This kind of discussion is based on community participation. So in this case, we don’t expect authenticity in human things. Machiya is the same discussion. Because one family cannot keep Machiya for eternity because there can be a lot of problems such as bankruptcy or else. So why not put a new person, inside of Machiya, new types of businesses into Machiya to keep eternity of this building. Machiya is not a designated cultural property in Japanese law but that is the bottom of approach. The residents of community or citizens of Kyoto, more that 80% of citizens of Kyoto wishes to conserve it. So we are now preparing the new legislature system to protect Machiya. Now we’ve just finished establishing the town escape control by law and now we’re preparing some salvage city system to assist at. So we have to continue to put effort through everyday changing society.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:48:41-00:49:31)
Thank you so much professor, also for cutting short your answer. It was a very interesting topic. There’s one last question to our colleague from China, Ms. Shaoqian. The question is “what sort of position or conflict emerged as a result of the decision by the authority to demolish buildings and relocate the community?” If there are any, can you briefly elaborate on this question? Because you said that some buildings were demolished and obviously someone must have been concerned. Was there any conflict that was raised in that context? Can you briefly elaborate? Thank you.

- Shaoqian Ruan (00:49:32-00:51:36)
Yes. It really was a conflict and it was not a small conflict. Actually it was a big conflict between the villagers and the authority. Because at the first time, the authority had a big plan in mind and they wanted to restore the houses because at that time, the fundamental facilities were so messy. And the environments including the hygienic conditions were so bad. So the authorities wanted to improve those and they tried their best to persuade the villagers. But the authorities at that time just had no idea about that. So at the first time the authorities encouraged some of the villagers to do the renovation of the houses and tried to get their agreement on doing it. And some of the villagers were persuaded and they did the renovation but at the same time most of the other villagers greatly raised an objection about it and they protested against it by the way of writing something to the government. They just refused to do that. But some of the villagers who did the renovation got some benefits from it because authorities paid for all of the renovations and they could open their tea houses and travelers loved to come to enjoy. And later the rest of villagers found out that it’s really a good way to change their lives to improve. So as time went by, all the conflicts were resolved. That’s my answer.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:51:39-00:52:58)
Thank you. It was the questions from the audience so I hope that the person submitted this question was satisfied. It was an anonymous question. Alright, now I would like to invite the contribution from the rest of the participants preferably on the questions that I have set out at the beginning, starting from how we define community for the purpose of particular meeting in Byueo. The meeting in Norway focused on local communities. The title of that conference was ‘Living with World Heritage’. Our title is ‘Involving Communities’ and we have seen that, in Asian context, there can be connections between sites and people who live far apart from the sites. So is there any comment from the audience who wants to speak? Is there anyone who wishes to intervene?

- Gamini Wijesuriya (00:52:58-00:57:10)
I have a little comment to break the ice. To put forward the idea that in many of the speeches of this morning and yesterday, there is the question of the conservation issue. But in the conservation, sometimes there is something that spring out of new things. For instance, a new festival invented in some moments, the expertise is evident that, when my Chinese colleagues spoke about reasonable, it’s proposed by the people. There’s an evaluation that it
consent is from the people, is it reasonable or not? And I suppose that the judgment about reasonability is made by experts. So I wanted to say that there is the evidence that the community of experts who can act both as a judge and proposer of something new to be added to the tradition. It's literally a new festival and an event. When you have a village like this one which is based on the confusion tradition or the philosophical tradition, evidently you can also propose not necessarily by local community but also by people from university, academy, or foreign community.

Culture is in evolution and not necessarily closed to the idea that we have about tradition. When you think about Ravello, Ravello is a landscape but there is now a request of auditorium because Wagner was working in Ravello and there is a tradition for classical music but the auditorium by Oscar Niemeyer is a new one. Who does put forward the proposal for the new auditorium which modifies the traditional landscape? Evidently, it's the community which is not only local. So in a sense, there must be a link between the tradition and the way of living of the norm of the community according to the local rules and procedures and it inevitably changes. But changes must be governed. So there is the need to decide who is a balance between the local involvement in the decisions and something which came from outside and bring new perspectives, and new needs in terms of literature culture, modern technology. So I would advocate for the new.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:57:14-00:57:15)
  Please, professor.

- Yoshifumi Muneta (00:57:15-00:58:02)
  During the conference of authenticity, a famous professor talked about the aristocracy of conservation. According to my understanding, the change should be governed by the community, not by the expert, or not by the international conservation organization in general. The community decides everything according to my understanding. So we experts need to join them to discuss through continuous discussions and communication. We need to convince them to move toward the conservation. That is the process of the development of conservation and democracy.

- Stefano De Caro (00:58:06-00:58:08)
  But they can also be reasonable.

- Yoshifumi Muneta (00:58:10-00:58:20)
  Reasonable? Yes. For this reason we create the rational theory of conservation. We study for this.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:58:21-00:58:32)
  Thank you. Now I see Amareswar and Gamini want to speak. Amareswar, you may speak please. Let's make a short intervention so we can all have a chance.

- Amareswar Galla (00:58:37-01:02:15)
  Thanks, chairperson. By the way it's good to know that two of us were there at the meeting because I was also there, and I was wondering if anyone else was there. I'm just want to make some comments based on my experience of dealing with the tension and the youth living and working in Darjeeling, Ha Long Bay and Hoi An. First of all, there's no such thing as community. I mean it's an imagine community depending on your criteria. So what we're dealing in Hoi An, Darjeeling and Ha Long Bay is that we map the community and we call them primly, secondly, thirdly stakeholders. Then we deal with stakeholder participation framework and stakeholder participation right. Everybody had right but they also had responsibilities. So we need to take the pluralistic approach but we need get away from the side where the problem is. We think 'we' and then 'community' but we're also stakeholders. Lastly I think Stefano had a precise point. Because of the notion of tentative listed city, there are still some people who think that culture is frozen in time. I don't see any European male here in the hotel and European women in corsets. I come from the hill tribe in India, but I'm not wearing a line clothes carrying a boned arrow. Culture is dynamic and it's changing rapidly. And the biggest challenge is how to deal with this. How do you actually create a framework of empowerment for local primly stakeholder community to participate effectively? So it's about participatory democracy in active citizenship. And I want to finish by saying that one of the key things in Hoi An that we did, and I think Beatrice knows this, was to form homeowner association. Every homeowner came together in an association. All the shop owners formed an association because that city of fabric of houses was critical. The homeowner met every month and it was very critical. I just want to ask you. Can anybody guess when they had the first meeting and they debated for three and half hours, what was the number one priority in relation to consolation of World Heritage area in Hoi An? Well, the water level of Thubon river is very high. Every year when it rains, water table goes up. And your biggest problem is what comes out from the toilet in the house comes back. So the homeowner's association once had the power to participate in the decision-making. And their number one priority was to fix the sewage and the toilet system in the World Heritage area. These are serious issues. But we have to learn to listen. None of the university teaches the skill and components of listening. And I think that's really critical thing.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:02:17-01:02:21)
  Gamini, would you like to say something?

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:02:22-01:07:05)
  To very briefly respond to your question about communities, I think probably a diagram is something that I would like to take up and proceed. In fact, in my presentation, I said there are degrees of engagement. So that is something that has to be taken in. I presented the work of five years in three slides. The idea is contrary to democracy. These core communities who are living and who are the owners of houses or those who are the owners of religious places have more rights in a decision making process. So therefore they are the core communities and then there are also peripheral communities. So it's degree of influence and involvement. This is something that we can go by. Terminology can be different.
  The second question is about Outstanding Universal Value. Even in the living heritage approach, we try not to divide whether it's tangible or intangible or mobile, natural, cultural, including skills and material. So it's a package but if we're talking about Outstanding Universal Value, our advisory body, our committee members will not like this. They will only talk about Outstanding Universal Value intangible. There was a meeting to discuss these criteria 6, which are the closest. They argued about the dome inscribed in Hiroshima, I asked what was the purpose of looking at authenticity of this dome because this is the event of universal significance and how can you limit that event into this? It was because they don't want to talk about intangible thing. But we cannot separate this. If for the purpose of management, we're talking about communities, we cannot separate these things. So this is the message that this group can send to the Japan meeting. At least, we need to look at all these things for the purpose of management.
  The last point is about the issue of change. This is another thing that we highlighted in the living heritage approach because there's a core community who constantly changes things. They add change and stop rituals. And they add physical spaces. They want to expand. Society has been expanded. So, it's a question of how much changes are being allowed. And later, there are traditional means of doing that. So we have to respect that in terms of
conservation. In relation to capacity building, which is what I was trying to highlight? What is important is to pass down this knowledge to all three levels. As Professor Muneta also mentioned, we are not going to teach communities, we are going to learn from communities. But at the same time, we need to strengthen the ability to engage by empowering participation. Thank you. That’s all I want to say.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:07:08-01:07:15)
Thank you very much, Gaminii. It’s very useful comments and suggestions.

- Navin Piplani (01:07:17-01:07:50)
Thank you, Gaminii and everyone who’s given good comments. I’m just going to go very slow and come back to the question number one. When you say how to define community, are we looking at the conceptual and structural question in terms of composition of this community or the way our approach to define these different levels of communities? What is the message that we are going to give at the end of this conference? Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:07:54-01:10:50)
The same issue has been come out from the presentations and discussions. In the case study of Kathmandu, there was new types of communities who just arrived to a site and there was no immediate or apparent cultural link to the heritage. At the same time, you had a very strong attachment to the sites because of the characteristics of Asian context. For instance, the community that lives thousand kilometers away from Lumbini has strong attachment. So the question was whether the notion of local community intended as residents, owners, villagers is comprehensive enough and whether we want to better articulate this definition to reflect the reality of the context. That was the question and the answer is up to you. There is also another dimension to this question that we have heard about very important role of communities is in shaping their own heritage and adding new layers to cultural meaning. It’s creating, innovating, and basically producing the heritage of the future that they would like to transmit to the future generations. So emphasis’s on the continuity, which is very important in Asia. The new community could play a role which is equally important to the old community in that sense because they could make changes, adopt and reinterpret the place where they lived for 50 years. In Kathmandu we’ll begin to see the new feature, architecture and shrine as we already saw in many European cities. The new communities are starting to build new things that are going to be heritages. So do all of these issues they deserve to be reflected in our definition of the communities from this meeting? That was the question. Do you want to further elaborate or shall I give the floor?

- Navin Piplani (01:10:53-01:11:55)
No, the question is clear but I was just wondering if we are going to come out with the structural framework to say that the World Heritage Convention is to take account of the local communities and then do we define, understand, study, analyze and assess the ground realities of the local communities. Do we go that broad or are we going to the wider framework of how to understand and define these communities? Was that one level of the question. And the second was once we have understood that we needed to define the community, are we also sit down and define the different levels at which these communities might be found? So one approach is to give a structural conceptual notion of what we should define and leave it. And another is to give parameters to find out what we can work and what level it would be?

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:11:56-01:12:55)
I was looking at the outcome of the Norway meeting. There’s an initial introductory paragraph then there’s another six or ten lines, defining what local communities are. I was thinking that maybe this meeting could have a similar structure but maybe further enrich the definition by adding something on this consideration. Without going in too many details because we simply don’t have time, but I think ‘how’ is maybe less interesting at this stage of discussion. I think there are lots of techniques for identifying communities, processes, and methodologies but I don’t think we have enough time to going to that at this stage. Is there anyone else who wants to make a comment? Amareswar?

- Amareswar Gall (01:12:55-01:16:21)
Thank you, Chair. I think one of the things we always talk about is a negative and positive impact. Amnesia is the biggest problem regarding heritage conservation. Because all these questions and discussions have these conversation issues if you look at the world commission on culture development, all these things we are talking about are now new is not so many international debates and discussions. First of all, I’m somebody totally opposed to defining a community. Defining is containing. You’re freezing in time. Community is dynamic and living so you can’t define them. So what we agree with the world commission for cultural development is interest group. And since you’re dealing with World Heritage, that would be your interest group. But if somebody is dealing with primary school education, he is talking about community too. Somebody else is dealing with HIV, there is another interest group. So community is plural. And the second thing is we shouldn’t confuse community with interest groups. Interest group can be delineated but community cannot be delineated because it’s plural. There are many layers. For example, my first language is Chenchu so I belong with the Chenchu hill tribe in India when I’m there. But then my language as schooling is Telugu. So when I’m in Andhra Pradesh, I’m with Telugu. But when I’m in Delhi, I can speak Hindi which is a different language. Also I’m an Australian citizen but also I live in Denmark. So I belong to the multiple communities and I have multiple identities. But defining like you got one identity and one community; it’s very old modernist idea. And I think we got to get past that. And the last comment I want to make is, Stefano have said, about these layers. I think Giovanni also talked about that we are continually creating new meanings. So in this dynamism, the transformation of how they’re defining themselves or how they’re delineating themselves is taking place in the society like Hangzhou. The sense of place and identity are something constantly changing. So I think we got to be very careful thinking of defining because that’s very modernist idea of containing and defining aren’t they. We got to get away from this position. Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:16:25-01:17:11)
Thank you very much. I’ll have just few other comments because I’m told that it’s one o clock and we have to go to lunch. I think I’ll also use this opportunity to inform you that we have rearranged the program because we have realized that we didn’t have enough time to discuss. So we’re going to have another discussion later on at 3:45 instead of 4:30, the visit to school will be slightly short. So there will be more time for discussion. I think I see Inguun want to speak? Sorry, Professor Park first, sorry didn’t see you, and then we’ll move to Inguun.

- Sohyun Park (01:17:11-01:18:46)
Giovanni, you gave us about 6 points which are very helpful for us to engage in summarizing what we have discussed so far. But defining something doesn’t necessarily mean that we are freezing ourselves into a very boxed way. It’s more of defining our approaches to understand these community issues so I wish we can understand it as a more flexible and more inclusive way, which is slightly different from the previous approaches of compartmenting in certain concepts into certain ways. So I wish we can approach in a bit more flexible way. That’s my comment and there might be some differences that we can claim for this Byeo conference compared to other conferences’ definitions on community issue. I would like to suggest more practical and flexible way rather than academically strict way. And for the matter of Gaminii mentioned about the degrees and Giovanni
mentioned about not to divide, might be helpful to start with. And that’s my comment.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:18:47-01:18:48)
Thank you. Ingunn?

- Ingunn Kvisterøy (01:18:49-01:21:28)
Thank you. I just thought maybe we should go back to the time when the World Heritage Committee decided that it was necessary to look at the communities and why it was this necessary. The communities concerned regarding World Heritage earlier were the state parties and the representatives of the state parties, which was the community of World Heritage before. And it seemed that this was not sufficient to work only by the representatives of the state parties because a lot of people were affected by the decisions by the World Heritage Committee. The need was actually just to see how all of these people affected by the decisions of the committee, are included in our strategies of decisions and make part of decisions and have say in decisions. And I think it’s easy in a way. Maybe we don’t have to define it more strictly. Just the people that are affected by the decisions of the World Heritage Committee have to have or be given the possibility to have something to say, and to have a voice. I think being affected is very important. And just to say, even we have about 15 Sami languages in Norway, even though we’re a small country, the way we define this Sami in Norway is by association. They are given the possibility or the opportunity to say if they feel like they are semi or not. If they feel and see themselves as Sami people by association, they are allowed to, be some people by the law and they can vote for the Sami parliament. So that’s maybe also one way to think about community, I think we need to go back to the original purpose of talking about community. Thank you.

Thank you so much. Stefano, do you have another comment?

- Stefano De Caro (01:21:32-01:23:10)
In principle, ideally, I would agree with that defining is losing the idea of the community as they are complexity. But this means that the strongest or the most numbered has more power. It wins. Citizens who are the majority, the fifth layer of Mr. Muneta, will prevail over the fifth one. So it’s true that maybe a monk can be also a citizen and a multi-layer but you have to define. You can change in the time. It’s the right of every level. Otherwise the less numbered has no power. The monks are evidently less numeral but they live there and preserve the tradition so in a way they make it genetic. And genetic corresponds to the rights of the layers of the custodians. It must not be so strict. You have to have a way to negotiate among labels, and custodians but if you want to have a right to speaking, you have to define. She’s right.

Thank you I think we’re talking about the same thing because he’s talking about interest groups who must be identified and you’re talking about communities. But at the end of the day we’ll talk about what the interest of those are. I think we have to have lunch now. I’m sorry to tell you. And then we’ll resume this very interesting discussion at 3:45. Thank you so much.

- In-ho Song (01:24:44~end)
I will give you a few notes. We’re now almost finished. Please stay seated for a moment. A lot of experts gave us great presentations and many dignified guests and audience members listened to them until the end. I would like to introduce a few of them. Here we have Professor Choi Jeong-pil, Honorary Chairman of ICOM-Korea; Chairman Choi Wan-gyu of the Committee for Designation of Iksan Historic Sites as World Heritage; and other experts on the history of Baekje. Also, those from ICOMOS Korea including Mr. Kim Gwang-sik are here with us, and Mr. Yoshida from Niigata and other guests who visited from overseas to attend the symposium have made it a global event. So, I, as an emcee, suggest that the speakers clap their hands for the audience, in an expression of gratitude for listening to their presentations. Now, I suggest that the audience clap their hands to thank the speakers. Thank you
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- Hyosang Jo (00:07:11-00:07:38)
  We took some time to sort out our discussion, and right now it is being typed in a Word document. It will take some more time, so please wait for a few minutes. Thank you.
  We had a small working group meeting trying to draft the present discussion that we had. And we are in the middle of typing it up so if you could wait another few minutes, we would be very grateful. Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:07:39-00:08:04)
  Ok ladies and gentlemen, can we try to resume our meeting? Thank you so much.
  I hope you enjoyed the visit to the school. In the meantime, a group of volunteers have helped in putting together very draft text which tried to capture some of the ideas expressed in various presentations and exchanges throughout today and yesterday. We typed quickly with lots of mistakes, formatting errors etc. and put on the screen to stimulate discussion, so we hope that you’ll be able to read, react, improve and add to it if there are major issues missing. Although we really didn’t yet develop an outcome, you can see already on the screen in front of you, there is something called draft outcome of the Bueyo Meeting. We thought that an outcome document perhaps could have a preamble which includes two points. One was a clarification that this meeting although it’s in the context of the World Heritage Convention, mostly focused on Cultural Heritage. We had Cultural Heritage case studies and Cultural Heritage organization, not IUCN. So I think it’s appropriate to mention this.
  And the second, which is the paragraph below, is an introduction as a context to this meeting, to clarify that we are in Asia and therefore we are exploring the implications for communities within the Asian context. And we have tried to identify some of the key characteristics of the Asian contexts that are relevant for a discussion on communities. You’ll see, in the text, an exceptionally fast-development combined with increasing inequalities, within and across countries, a rapidly growing tourism sector, massive migrations, the encounter of old traditions with economic and cultural globalization, leading to quick socio-economic changes in society; the progressively important role played by the civic society in governance, with respect to traditional systems that were heavily centralized and top-down.
  This is just the first idea that came out when we tried to describe what this Asian context is. But, again, it’s open to contributions and comments from the floor. Now, I’ll just quickly go through it, then we will start from the beginning again. There are some six issues of questions to reflect what I had proposed at the beginning of our discussion at 11:30 this morning. In bullet point form, there are some initial possible answers that reflect some of the ideas that were expressed. If you are looking at the second bullet point there, saying who are communities. I tried to capture what Amareswar Galla said about the fact that defining people within categories is difficult and maybe inappropriate and so on.
  And the second question is about outstanding universal value and other values and objectives of communities and how to strike a balance. Then there’s the third point, which is something on capacity building. It is about how to put this and practice implication for the World Heritage system. And then there was a discussion on boundaries, the psych levels and larger context and what this suggests. There was a discussion on how to bring all these energies and push for World Heritage to a good use. And then the last section is on reconciling local traditions with the governance system. So what I would like to do is to start from the beginning, from the preamble and then scroll down and I’ll stop at each stage and ask people for their views.
  So let’s talk about preamble. Do you agree that there should be a preamble and do you agree that this is what should be in the preamble? Do you have anything else that we should say at this stage and is there anything for the outcome document from this meeting? I would like to ask especially the Asians in the room please.

- Hyosang Jo (00:08:05-00:08:11)
  I just wanted to make a point about the traditional here that I've highlighted. This might be little bit confusing with a traditional systems that is refer to in the later part of the document of the historic traditional systems. So could we perhaps change it to ‘government system that were heavily’ or perhaps differentiate the word?

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:08:12-00:09:12)
  Sure, I forgot to mention that the drafting is so rough and preliminary. All of these will clearly have to be polished. We are now looking at the ideas mostly so let’s not discuss style, form and grammar. So, inconsistencies between words will be captured. Gamini?

- Gaminyi Wijesuriya (00:09:05-00:09:11)
  I think heritage characterized by continuity. (Inaudible)

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:09:38-00:10:14)
  Can you add another bullet point there? Or maybe you can just continue from where you are now saying heritage characterized by continuity. Of course this is open to anyone in the room, please.

- Floor (00:09:23-00:09:37)
  So would you possibly say something like the purpose of World Heritage in general, with connection to communities?

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:10:18-00:10:21)
  This is what they’re suggesting, all right.
- Floor (00:10:22-00:10:33)
  It is because particular thinking about educative role of World Heritage to its provider, wider community.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:10:34-00:11:15)
  So do you have any suggestion apart from what we know? It’s written in the convention that we have to protect outstanding universal values and make sure that heritage plays a role in the life of communities. Do we want to articulate this further or shall we just refer to that? All right, so then maybe you can refer to purpose of the convention and article 5, which precisely says that heritage should play a role in the life of the convention. Please.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (00:11:16-00:11:35)
  At this point, just to build upon this. Perhaps you could also include the fact, one of the C is the community participation and this meeting is aiming on further to what happen in Norway and its series of building. It’s not a final.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:11:36-00:12:12)
  Sure, I think what both of you are saying is to establish a baseline where we’re starting from. And there is the convention with its prohibition, and there are other major policies that already exist in the context of the convention like this, such as the five Cs for community. So maybe we can add that and include the comment about the good previous meeting and this meeting tries to build on the knowledge from the previous meetings. Please.

- Amareswar Galla (00:12:16-00:12:29)
  I just want to point out that there are number of university students here. They might not know what five Cs that you mentioned. Do you want to explain very briefly? I think it’ll be only fair to them.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:12:30-00:13:47)
  I guess only two hundred people in the world know what five C mean, I guess. But, for the benefit of the other 7 billion, the World Heritage Committee had decided that there should be four strategic objectives in World Heritage. One is credibility, ensuring a balance in credible list with other parts of representation of all cultural and natural phenomena. Second one is conservation, conserving the heritage. The third was capacity building, which is self-explanatory. And the forth was communication, as I mean of sharing information. At then the fifth C for community was added to the forth at the initiative in New Zealand, when the committee meeting was held in Christchurch in 2007. So now we have five Cs, five-strategic objectives.

- Amareswar Galla (00:13:48-00:14:28)
  Let’s get back to the text, I think it’s ‘heavily growing tourism industry’ because we say cultural industry tourism. It’s not a sector anymore in a sense of the word. And also, with what World Population Organization always talk about massive migration is the matter of intra-enter. Within the countries like China and India, there’s migration within but also across. And also it’s the common usage, ‘civil society’ not ‘civic society’ in governance.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:14:29-00:16:24)
  Good, thank you so much. This is useful. So if that’s ok, can we scroll down then, which will be now polished? The first question was how we define community. I put that in bracket and I will introduce this because I contributed to drafting of this preliminary text. And then I’ll ask my friends who stayed here during the site visit to present what they have drafted. So first bullet point says, according to the definition provided in the context of the adoption of fifth C, community should be understood as none state of actors, quoted from this document which is our website. So I’ll elaborate further, they are counterpart of state institution at all levels in the context of the governance of the heritage. So it could go from, according to this, local authorities to individual owners to anybody. It’s collaboration. Do you think it’s the wrong word? Maybe the counterpart was the partner in my understanding. There was not any implication but maybe we can delete the counterpart.

- Amareswar Galla (00:16:25-00:17:07)
  What’s critical over there is the way it’s called. What happened at the Christchurch meeting was that there were the bicultural policies in New Zealand. And that’s why the state party was so keen in the context of adoption. I think you’re very clearly stating that it’s in relation to World Heritage in context of adoption. I’ll leave as it is and then make that change there, “partner of”, yes, “the other partners of state institutions at all level in context of governance of”. … what? I think we need to add something. Grammatically it hasn’t finished.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:17:08-00:17:27)
  It could be “in the context of governance of the heritage resources” or “in the context of governance of the heritage conservation and management of heritage resources.”
  Did you get that, Hyosang? So you’re suggesting deleting some of the text. Can you clarify what exactly?

- Amareswar Galla (00:17:28-00:17:51)
  No, I’m happy with definition there. When the New Zealand state party proposed, the context of World Heritage was made clear. Second thing is that it was the five Cs, so these are collective memories of World Heritage Convention.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:17:52-00:18:31)
  All right, so the second bullet point reads “it is difficult and possibly inappropriate to force individuals within established definitions and categories. The same person may belong to more than one category (owner, expert, local official, religious leader) and defend more than one interest. It is better, therefore, to speak about groups of interest, which may impact on the heritage or be impacted on by decisions taken for the heritage.”

- Stefano De Caro (00:18:32-00:18:44)
  I’ll speak about qualified interest in the sense that it must be accessed. It’s not just ‘I’m interested’. It must related to the better quality.

- Amareswar Galla (00:18:44-00:18:56)
  The sociologically correct term is reference group. The interest group is exactly what you’re saying. So then they’re interest groups rather than groups of interest.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:18:56-00:19:06)
  Shall you change interest groups? Would interest groups be ok? Do you have a comment?
- **Gamini Wijesuriya (00:19:06-00:19:19)**
I actually need clarification on the point whether these community members are already partners, established partner, or potential partners?

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:19:19-00:19:32)**
Both, yes, the point is precisely that we want to make them partners, sometimes they are not. So do you want to add ‘potential’?

- **Gamini Wijesuriya (00:19:32-00:19:36)**
Yes, because that’s why we’re discussing to involve them. This means that they’re already partners.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:19:37-00:20:05)**
Yes. In fact, the counterpart was more neutral there because it means they are there and they are affected whether or not they are partners. But if we call them partners, we mean there is already partnership. So there is some form of cooperation ongoing, which is precisely what remains to be demonstrated. So maybe we want to add in brackets. Yes?

- **Stefano De Caro (00:20:07-00:20:08)**
They must be the partners.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:20:13-00:20:15)**
Yes, they should be the partners.

- **Amareswar Galla (00:20:16-00:20:39)**
I think what Navin is saying is really important. The reason we’re actually doing this is because we are accepting the prospective partners. So I think this is the way to say that they’re, not in the same business anymore, but they may be in the future. They’re existing and prospective partners, as what Navin is saying.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:20:40-00:21:33)**
Yes, all right. Can you put it brackets that existing or prospective / should be the partner? No, this is not there. This is in the previous bullet point in the other word “partners”. Also “should be” is another possible solution that was proposed. Ok, are there any other comments on the second part? Is there anyone want to comment on the second bullet point? Yes, Beatrice.

- **Beatrice Kaldun (00:21:34-00:21:59)**
I find it inappropriate to “force”. It’s not very nice word. It’s too strong and have too many negative implications. In the first sentence, “it is difficult and possibly inappropriate to force individuals within established definitions and categories”. It seems it’s not quite finished about what is forcing into and why.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:22:00-00:22:01)**
Constraint?

- **Beatrice Kaldun (00:22:02-00:22:15)**
Is it still about the heritage? Maybe it’s useful to still be careful about it. Even though you sometimes read the bullet point as individual, it ends in sequence sometimes.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:22:16-00:22:18)**
Do you want to suggest a better word?

- **Beatrice Kaldun (00:22:19-00:22:25)**
I have not thought about it. It’s difficult. I don’t know what we can use instead of ‘inappropriate’.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:22:26-00:22:26)**
‘Undesirable’?

- **Beatrice Kaldun (00:22:27-00:22:39)**
No, it sounds better in ‘inappropriate’. I don’t know. You come up with something better than ‘force’.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:22:40-00:22:43)**
Sorry, maybe Ingunn have a proposal.

- **Ingunn Kvisterøy (00:22:44-00:24:00)**
I’m sorry I’m not very Asian, I’m only Norwegian. My only excuse is that my youngest son has a sister-in-law who’s Korean so maybe that’s my excuse. It’s part of my family and community. My question is whether we need to talk about individuals because we’re talking about groups and community. And I don’t know about any community, which is a single person. So I have a proposal that we actually skip it and cut the first three lines. Instead, we can say that these potential and current communities. Is that what we were talking about, our interest groups? So, we’ll just skip the first three sentences instead of defining current and potential communities as interest groups. It could be ‘different interest groups which may impact on heritage or be impacted on by decisions taken for the heritage.’ Let’s just skip talking about individuals. That’s my proposal.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:24:00-00:24:05)**
You propose not to use the word, individual?

- **Ingunn Kvisterøy (00:24:05-00:24:13)**
Yes, I feel it’s not correct to pull individual identity into this. We’re talking about interest groups or communities.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:24:15-00:24:20)**
Gamini? Do you Agree? Amareswar?
Amareswar Galla (00:24:20-00:25:02)
I'm with Beatrice for that matter of the bullet point where it says that "it is difficult and possibly inappropriate undesirable". That tone needs to go, so I would say it's challenging to locate groups, not individuals. Then let's delete that whole, yes, but until individuals. "To force individual", please delete that. "It's challenging to locate groups within established definitions and categories." It reads much better that way. But still there are difficulties there.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:25:02-00:25:16)
Would that be better? It explains the background to the last statement. Why we speak about interest groups?

Ingunn Kvisterøy (00:25:17-00:25:20)
Yes it's better. I still would just delete the second sentence, though.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:25:20-00:25:25)
Is the one about the same person?

Amareswar Galla (00:25:25-00:25:26)
Yes.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:25:26-00:25:28)
All right, do we agree to delete the second sentence?

Amareswar Galla (00:25:28-00:25:31)
I would support that.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:25:32-00:25:41)
So then, let's delete it. And at this point, can we delete the new text that Hyosang has typed? Because this second one now is satisfactory.

Pilwon Han (00:25:42-00:26:24)
'It is challenging' means positive attitude about the sentence. So I think it should be corrected into 'it is challenged'.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:26:24-00:26:39)
I see what you mean. I'm not sure about it though. I think "challenging" can be understood as it is difficult and problematic. So I think it conveys the sense of what we're trying to say, in my opinion.

Amareswar Galla (00:26:40-00:26:43)
Let's move to the next sentence then.

Gamini Wijesuriya (00:26:44-00:27:14)
Let's just stay at the same sentence for a while. As an expert or a group of experts to say that it is challenging to locate groups is somewhere long committer. I mean it can be understood as "it is challenging, but we can still do it". It has qualifying second part so I think we have to say either we don't want to do it or we would not like to do it. But to say challenging, it means that anything is positive. It's challenging but we can still try and do it.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:27:15-00:27:41)
Yes it's British understatement. 'It's bit challenging' means it can never be done, so it depends on the cultural context. Let's skip this cultural reviewed stereotype.

Amareswar Galla (00:27:42-00:28:32)
Beyond to the next sentence, it's appropriate. I don't think we have to say "better value judgment". It's too much there. It's simple to say it's appropriate to refer to interest groups which may impact on the heritage. It's appropriate to refer to interest groups. Let's delete in between interest groups, and I'm not comfortable after the comma, "which may impact on heritage or being impacted by decision taken for the heritage." I think that needs reworded. I'm trying to think.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:28:33-00:30:49)
Do we agree on the ideas? I don't know. If there's no further comment, let's move further down as we have a lot to go through. The next one says that "consideration should be given to all interest groups that is communities", in the plural. We can skip that maybe, whether they live within a listed property or outside, whether they played a role in the making of the heritage and/or use it on a regular basis or not." I was trying to go beyond the notion of local communities as opposed to none local communities. However, the second paragraph qualifies, "for the purpose of management, priority should be given to addressing the concerns of those who will be the most impacted by decisions taken at the site, or to those who have or may have the most influence on what happens at the heritage property". So this is the way to allow possibility of considering communities that may not be local but have high stake, which is more inclusive. So I had a feeling it reflected better specificity of the Asian context where you have stakes placed in communities that live sometimes far away from the heritage property, as in case of Lumbini but also others. I don't know, what is the feeling? Do you have a microphone?

Floor (00:30:30-00:31:06)
Priority often means that people that are not in the priority group shouldn't be dealt with. So I would say "the way it's given to" or "priority often like". The rest doesn't matter.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:31:07-00:31:12)
I see what you mean.

Floor (00:31:13-00:31:31)
We can't be all things to all people. You have to prioritize so that's one of the things for managing. I think in the matter of the wording, you're
absolutely right. It's a bit ambiguous. It needs to be reworded.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:31:31-00:31:35)
  “Particular consideration should be given.” Would that be better?

- Floor (00:31:36-00:31:40)
  I would say something different. Because I was talking about our level of community should have chance to be involved but here you’re saying that only the one with highest priority can be involved.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:31:50-00:32:00)
  No, that was precisely what I was trying not to say. But thank you for catching that. Yes Beatrice?

- Beatrice Kaldun (00:32:01-00:32:24)
  I have another point. I think that Galla said earlier today or yesterday about this. Interest groups and communities are actually not the same. But suddenly we get into replacing communities by interest groups. So now we get to these different words.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:32:25-00:33:06)
  Yes, I just suggested taking this out just earlier. I was going to take it out. Thank you for reminding me. We can always go back in the light of the full document. Now let’s focus on the special groups. It’s very important to give other consideration to the interest of minorities and maybe we can add the word special groups with limited political influence including indigenous people, women, youth, immigrants, etc. Yes?

- Amareswar Galla (00:33:07-00:35:00)
  I’m reading the context of culture that was discussed with UNESCO on the state parties. I would not use the term minorities because even with the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous people, the whole question of minority became very sensitive. There’s always a question of whether you are a visible minority and what kind of minority. So there’s a whole range of issues come up. So I would recommend it’s very important to give adequate consideration to the interest of affirmative action groups. Affirmative action groups are from policy governance point of view. Affirmative action groups such as indigenous people, women, youth, recent immigrants, and refugee can be mentioned because there’s direct impact on World Heritage Properties. And let’s take out the limited influence and put down to the interest of affirmative action groups such as. And then, because you said ‘such as’ already you don’t need that again. So I would take out that. And then let’s put comma so that they’re empowered or ‘they are able to’, in the decision making process, or conservation process.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:35:01-00:35:05)
  Can you type that Hyosang? After ‘refugees’, let’s put ‘so that they are empowered’,

- Amareswar Galla (00:35:06-00:35:07)
  ‘To participate equitably.’

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:35:08-00:35:10)
  Yes, Kai?

- Kai Weise (00:35:11-00:35:39)
  There are communities that are more led by women and where the men are minority. So I think that all listings might be taken out. We could take it out, because there’s a specific group for every site and if you put an standard example, it might be misunderstood.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:35:40-00:35:41)
  But it’s agreed,,
  (00:35:42-00:35:44) No, no

- Amareswar Galla (00:35:45-00:36:28)
  I agree with you but if you look at the whole evaluation of millennium development goals which was presented in Rio, the thing that came out is that we actually identify otherwise it’s too ambiguous and too broad. And the indigenous people want to be identified and should be identified as indigenous people. And there was a debate about whether we would say women, or gender. It was about specific language as well as about the young people now. Even World Heritage Convention holds regular youth forum.

- Giovanni Boccardi (00:36:29-00:36:37)
  Yes. Gender and youth are identified as specific force of concern within UNESCO as a priority. Do you disagree?

- Ingunn KvisterØy (00:36:38-00:36:52)
  I’m sorry, yes. We do have gender, but we do not have women. They’re too very different. I’m sorry I reacted as Norwegian to this because I’ve heard so many times the group of “women, children and other handicapped”.
  (00:36:58-00:37:11) It was sort of an automatic reaction to “women, youth”. I just feel uncomfortable with women, as all women.

- Amareswar Galla(00:37:12-00:37:14)
  Within UNESCO, we use gender. We don’t actually say women.

- Ingunn KvisterØy (00:37:15-00:37:16)
  Yes, they don’t talk about women.

- Amareswar Galla(00:37:17-00:37:19)
  And the gender mainstreaming is a policy of UNESCO.
And that’s another thing.

Ok, then let’s take it out. Yes, we can take out the full paragraph if you feel it is controversial. Beatrice?

We talked about it. We were progressive with action groups because action group is very specific. For example, in China, you don’t talk about affirmative action. It’s an ethnic minority. And even Han Chinese is a part of ethnic minority. So again, we get into these issues how it was handled in Thailand. There are people that have ethnic minorities but have no citizenship. You get into all these issues in a way.

Yes I’ll explain where this is coming from. There was this discussion of the new communities that recently established themselves at heritage places. And the question was what their connection to the place is and there was attempt to include them so that’s where this is coming from. Then, all other concerns came forward in the process. But if you think this is generating problems other than solving them, we can just delete.

I think the action group is,...

No, you don’t say ‘actin groups’. It’s ‘affirmative action groups’. You don’t separate affirmative action. It’s whole policy approach of UN system. If you think minority would cause a problem, use affirmative action groups. But you don’t say action groups, it’s affirmative action groups.

Let’s hear from Hyosang for a moment and then we’ll decide what to do.

I get what Amar is talking about the affirmative action group. But we want to make these as practical as possible and try not to introduce new concepts and words. And we want to make it down-to-earth so that anybody who is reading it can actually understand it. So perhaps, could we just say diverse groups? No?

This affirmative action is a purpose so I would use affirmative action or some other groups. And I would take out ‘such as indigenous people, women and youth’ because those groups vary from place to place as Kai mentioned. But you can use something else, not necessarily affirmative action groups but it’s the policy that people understand. Affirmative action group has been around and it was debated and discussed at Rio+20 so that’s why I mentioned it. That’s all. You can use whatever you think is appropriate.

I don’t know. I have the feeling that this is creating problems. Maybe the paragraph above we should qualify what we mean by interest groups by saying that this covers all those that may be concerned. If you just read the following last of the paragraph, can you scroll down Hyosang, this one was trying to follow on from the previous one to say why we need to consider all types of the people including those who have recently settled at heritage sites, which is the subject of our consideration. The reason is because we are not just looking at the word ‘past’ and conserving the memory of the past. We’re also looking at the ‘present’ and also the word ‘future’. And this new community, new in bracket, will play a major role. That was the sense of the last bullet point, which was related to the one above. So, that was the context. If you have any suggestion to solve this problem, please let’s hear it.

But can we remove ‘such as indigenous people to women’ because you can’t have that without the gender but gender doesn’t fit there?

Ok, let’s take that out and reconsider the two paragraphs together.

I think we have to keep the two paragraphs probably separate because the first one is talking about who is getting an impact and to what level and it’s an action related or reaction related point. And the other one is qualifying whether they have sufficient empowerment to react politically.

Maybe you can use ‘youth, refugees etc’. So it is the only tool which has a standard definition and the ‘etc.’ means all the action groups possible.

You’re talking about two different problems now. Navin, do you have drafting suggestions?

No, I don’t have the drafting suggestion. But I was looking at ‘qualifying’, we should not try and look at combining the two paragraphs then we lose the meaning. The problem is with the drafting not with the fact that it’s separated.

The point of the first of these two bullet points on the slide was that it was first that it’s important to give adequate consideration to those people that are less culturally connected to the heritages. But then this definition created a problem because what it means to be culturally connected. You spoke about those who created the heritage. But there’s a problem of separating people because this creation goes on continuously you created it. You connect to them, not connected. So it’s difficult to express this idea but I feel that it corresponds to real issue there. So if you can help me finding the right word, I think we’ll make some progress because I think it’s the point which is pity to lose completely.
Amareswar Galla (00:44:11-00:44:41)
If you disagree against this sentence, it will become much easier. It's very important what it is to give adequate consideration to the interest and consideration for whom of the interest of the affirmative action groups. So they are empowered to participate equitable because that is the participated democracy. So I think the way it stands there still retains a dispute and we should drop to it.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:44:42-00:44:43)
Ok, Gamini?

Gamini Wijesuriya (00:44:44-00:45:03)
I think what Navin is saying is that this is not only related to the para before. It has merit only on its own because not only new people but culturally connected people also add to innovation.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:45:03-00:46:42)
Sure, so then what gives the implication? Shall we modify it, or keep it? All right, so combine the two. Let's merge the two bullet points, Hyosang, saying that 'it's important in order to' and basically address all people not just the new communities but also the new communities, then we'll rework it. Let's merge the two and make it of general application to all those that are there, including the new comers as it were. Ok, then we'll fix it. Someone will fix it. Then, this is also very complicate one. I'm going to ask joy who drafted it to explain what she meant.

Joycelyn Mananghaya (00:46:43-00:47:29)
Idea here is to talk about OUV, sustainable development on the other values impacting World Heritage and heritage properties in general including its communities. So we start the first paragraph. It says there, "although the WH Convention has recognized the importance of OUV as the underlying criterion for inscription of WH properties, other values have emerged and have been recognized in Asia in relation to heritage and communities. These other values are not necessarily associated with the concept of OUV and are often connected with spiritual beliefs and practices that are deeply rooted in the way of life of the people". Yes, please Navin?

Navin Piplani (00:47:30-00:47:43)
I would like to very quickly point out. Do we want to say other values have emerged or do other values have always been there but the outstanding newest values coming top of it?

Joycelyn Mananghaya (00:47:44-00:47:50)
Probably you're correct. They have not emerged in fact they have been there for a long time. Yes, thank you Navin.

Hyosang Jo (00:47:51-00:47:57)
Shall we say 'recognized'? 'Have been recognized', oh it's already there. Can we just say 'other values have been recognized'?

Joycelyn Mananghaya (00:47:58-00:48:19)
It could be 'Have been recognized', 'have been understood', 'have existed'? 'Have been in existence'?

Amareswar Galla (00:48:20-00:48:47)
I think it just needs a bit of twicking. We can do it afterwards. There's a hierarchy created there, between OUV and then other values. But if you're talking about communities, the values that were values of the communities should not be treated as other values but maybe notice that it is made out afterwards. It could be good not to have an hierarchy.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:48:48-00:48:53)
I wanted to read, in this context, of the text of this 2003 outcome.

Joycelyn Mananghaya (00:48:54-00:48:55)
It's with me.

Giovanni Boccardi (00:48:56-00:48:58)
I gave it to you. Can you read the paragraph?

Joycelyn Mananghaya (00:48:59-00:50:39)
It says here 'Outstanding universal values and local values. The first one is recognized that the World Heritage Convention aims to protect cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value but underscore the whole range of values including local values intangibles, unspiritual values and traditional management systems should be fully understood, respected and taken into account in the process of identification and sustainable management of world heritage. As an example, in what quote, there, I don't know how to pronounce, where the NGO, etc has developed inventories and networks of secret forest with the support of the government and international development research center based in Canada.' And then, the second one is 'emphasize that universal and local values support of continuum, not the hierarchy and should not be separated. Indeed it's not viable to identify or manage universal value without acknowledging and maintaining the value to the local people.' And then, the third one is 'acknowledge the world heritage properties are dynamic entities where cultural and social values evolve. They should not be frozen in time for the purposes of conservation. Indeed the continuity between the past and the future should be integrated in management systems of accommodating the possibility for sustainable change best ensuring the evolution of the local value of the places not impaired.'

Giovanni Boccardi (00:50:40-00:51:37)
Yes, Stefano, I'll give the floor for a moment. I think this is the text is ok. We don't have yet come up with anything significantly different. I just feel that the third paragraph is somewhat problematic in the context of the World Heritage Convention because OUV is there. It's fixed and written down so some points when situation changes, we will have a problem. So it's bit hypercritical to write this paragraph and live with it.

Stefano De Caro (00:51:38-00:52:29)
I was just reading 49th paragraph of the guidelines. It means the cultural and natural significant which is so exceptional as to transcendent national boundary. This is the problem. It's not to be model of universal. You can have something regional which is model for all humanity not it is to transcendent.
It is mandatory that it’s not regional or national. And this is the problem.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:52:00-00:52:56)**
  Yes we are not trying to solve the problem of convention. But please, Navin, do you withdraw? Ok. So maybe we reaffirm what basically said in this document that we clarify that OUV is good for inscription.

- **Stefano De Caro (00:52:57-00:53:16)**
  Being transcend doesn’t mean that importance is absolute. It’s more than every orders but it’s a model at the level of local.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:53:17-00:54:34)**
  I feel that we’re getting into outside the scope of this meeting. Because criteria used for the inscription already provide for a cultural context, for instance, criterion number 3, if you’re familiar with convention, said if something has exceptional testimony to cultural traditional to a civilization, then it merits inclusion of World Heritage. So obviously it has to be taken in the context of the culture, whatever it is. It could be bigger than a nation or smaller than a nation but it’s not global by definition. So there are contradictions even within the convention as it stands. So let’s not try to solve them at this moment. So what was then the point with OUV what we discussed yesterday and today? Is there anything that we fear that we want to say or to add?

- **Navin Piplani (00:54:35-00:55:10)**
  The third paragraph you mentioned is important so if we’re thinking of completely getting rid of it then maybe we need to keep saying that there are relationships of OUV with other values or sustainable values of other values impacting World Heritage property or something like that, if you’re not really finding the concept but we want clarify the relationship both for state parties and communities, if that makes sense.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:55:11-00:55:59)**
  At this stage we need drafting suggestions, not nice ideas.

- **Navin Piplani (00:55:20-00:55:39)**
  So if we don’t want to touch the first point drastically, are you saying that we should keep it or modify it or delete it?

- **Stefano De Caro (00:55:40-00:55:57)**
  Maybe just instead of order, if you say additional, it does mean that they are different from OUV. There’s something in addition to OUV.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:55:58-00:56:56)**
  So are we happy with the three paragraphs as they stand? My feeling, when we discussed yesterday, was that the question was with respect to OUV, the purpose. A good manager of the World Heritage properties, should he or she just aim at protecting OUV of when he or she plan and implement conservation strategies and programs? Or should he or she also try to achieve sustainable development benefits, for instance? So should this be deliberate at the objective of World Heritage conservation, in addition to protecting OUV or should we stop when we are satisfied that the OUV is going to be protected?

- **Amareswar Galla (00:57:00-00:59:52)**
  I think the way you put it is absolutely critical. You hit the nail on the head. Just to give an example of how your problem entices all, when Ha Long Bay was inscribed initially for the esthetical landscape values. But whose notion of esthetic became a point of the debate. Initially there was a recommendation of fishing communities so living in the Bay set in tries but then it was recognized that their values actually inform the whole waterscapes. Then it was decided that they are just custodian of World Heritage area. My drafting suggestion is that rather than hierarchy of OUV, I would start of ‘a range of’. Please write in the before ‘although’. ‘A range of cultural values’ and the next part of the bullet point, I would start it of ‘ranges of cultural value inform those properties that are inscribed on a World Heritage list’. And then let’s just delete all of initial values etc. So then I would go to OUV there, ‘a range of cultural value informs those properties that are inscribed on the world heritage list’. I like that word ‘transcend’. Stefano, I think you have to write wording there, can you come up with the drafting line? These inform that drafting of the Outstanding Universal Value in inscription process of the World Heritage properties or whatever properties there are. And then you’ll be able to start ‘although’, delete from ‘although the WH Convention has recognized values blah blah blah’. But I would stop deleting where this… We want to say this kind of paradigm shift in Asia is significant, so that last bit about Asian is written maybe then in the preamble there are already Asian, we are talking about Asia so we don’t say it there. Ok that’s fine, yes.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (00:59:53-01:00:11)**
  Yes, now I would like to have the proceedings of the meeting that was held in Brazil, where there was a nice paragraph said this. It would take few minutes before I can download it.

- **Amareswar Galla (01:00:12-01:00:13)**
  Can we do the second sentence in the time while you’re downloading it?

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:00:14-01:00:17)**
  Sure.

- **Amareswar Galla (01:00:18-01:01:04)**
  So these values, not other values which are the local culture values, may not rather than saying ‘not necessarily inform’, we need something more positive like ‘inform the concept of OUV’. Actually it’s ‘it may or may not inform the concept of OUV’. And after OUV, I would like to put full stop and say ‘they are often connected with spiritual belief and practices that are deeply rooted in the way of life of the people’, which was straight from what Joy was reading out before.

- **Stefano De Caro (01:01:04-01:01:10)**
  Instead of inform integrated, add something to the...
- **Amareswar Galla (01:01:10-01:01:28)**
  Yes. It’s ‘May not be’. It’s ‘May or may not be integrated with the concept of OUV’, yes.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:01:29-01:01:50)**
  Ok, can I read what said in this Brazil meeting? Maybe it will inspire you. So, the meeting stresses that Cultural Heritage is the result of dynamic interaction where the tangible and intangible dimensions cross over. It called for more inclusive definition of heritage in the World Heritage context that is OUV, which would place emphasis on its inherent relation to the local communities and their well-being. Hence it’s relevant to the notion of and goals of sustainable development. It means OUV must come from within the site and from the build on the connection and relationship between the people and their environment. So you cannot come from above. You cannot be disconnected from that relationship that are also the root of sustainable development.

  That was the message from the Brazilian meeting. I don’t know if it’s helpful. Anyway this is one concept. The other concept was deliberate pursuit of sustainable development as one of the possible objectives of World Heritage conservation in addition to protecting OUV. I don’t know if you agree to that. If you do, then we might have a paragraph that says so. Is there any comment on this? No? Shall we add this one line? Let’s take just another bullet point, which would say ‘World Heritage to deliberately pursue sustainable development in addition to maintaining OUV’. Now shall we scroll down? Do we need to review the other bullet points within this discussion on OUV or can we move forward? I’m looking at the watches and it’s 5:15. We still have another hour so we have some time. It’s too much under pressure to take bright ideas in a short time. That’s a challenge in a good sense.

- **Amareswar Galla (01:01:50-01:01:55)**
  I think the spirit of the point is fine. I think it just needs reading like for instance ‘World Heritage properties and their communities or’ not ‘its communities’, things like that. So I think two or three people are easier to read it than such a large group.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:01:55-01:01:50):**
  All right, so it’s just few disagree with the ideas.

- **Hae Un Rii (01:01:55-01:01:50):**
  Let’s take it out, take out ‘the Asian’.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:01:55-01:01:59):**
  Ok, then can you scroll down a little bit? Ok, I think that’s quite acceptable. Further down. Joycelyn, have you presented this? Please go ahead.

- **Joycelyn Mananghaya (01:01:55-01:01:59):**
  Where are we now? Are we at that point? At what point shall development be allowed to come into a heritage site so that it does not impact on the values by which the site has been recognized as a WH property? The answer to this is the point by which sustainable development is achieved at its optimum, I’m not sure about this word if it’s correct, whereby communities are able to enjoy the environmental and heritage values of the site, at the same time all benefit from the values of economic development. So it’s actually related to the paragraph that is before that where I said that at what point is sustainable development going to be allowed to permit into heritage areas. So that balances created between such and the conservation and sustainability of the environment its heritage or other important aspects.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:01:59-01:02:04):**
  I see no objection as the good chair says. So, let’s say it’s adopted. Shall we move further down, please? The last bullet point was to think of repetition of what we said about so let’s leave it for the time being. It might disappear later on. Gamini, there’s a third set of ideas was related to capacity building. Would you like to explain?

- **Gamini Wijesuriya (01:01:59-01:02:04):**
  The first bullet point probably can go into preamble. I’m not sure. It may not be because we all talk about having a paradigm shift as heritage in general but World Heritage has endorsed that so that is where we can start. And what should I do? Giovanni? What should I do?

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:02:04-01:02:09):**
  Please present the ideas. Please explain your ideas. Or is there no need?

- **Gamini Wijesuriya (01:02:04-01:02:09):**
  Ok. So I have mentioned that this paradigm shift that we all recognize. This can stay here or can go into the preamble. That’s what I’m suggesting. But in principle, I think it’s good to keep it somewhere because many presentations and many presenters suggested that. And World Heritage also recognizes in that so can be retained if you have objection. Second and third bullet points which is about engaging communities, is a new idea. Of course, it may not be new for other sectors, but for us it is new for us. And there’s a need to generate knowledge, and clarify some issues, as we are doing, and development some tools. And we also need to share the knowledge between the communities and us. The most challenging task is to transport that knowledge to where things are happening. Some of us are in that process but it may not be to the site and government, institution and so on. That’s the bullet point three. Do you agree? Is there no objection? Then, we make a reference to a heritage capacity building strategy where, as the presented paper, we recognize World Heritage Committee has adopted that there are three audiences that need to be addressed. It may be in different levels and issues but they all have contribution to make in the process. Therefore, this request that all of them are addressed and then sharing their experience is recommended like what we did last two days. If that is alright with you, we can go to the next one. And some of the principles and program should aim at strengthening the ability of relevant audiences. One is to propagate the idea of engaging communities among the heritage practitioners. And then sometimes you may need changers in registration, system, institution and planning processes to engage community. And then, getting communities involved at all appropriate levels is something we have to keep in mind. That we discussed particularly for the World Heritage from preparing of a tentative list nomination, management plan. In fact it’s given in the present guideline.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:02:09-01:02:14):**
  Thank you, Gamini. I think you explained presentation very well and it helped me to understand the situation. Is there any comment? Beatrice?

- **Beatrice Kaldun (01:02:14-01:02:19):**
  I don’t have any major objection. I just think that what Gamini is describing is actually more of capacity building. It’s engaging. It’s awareness rising and
including in zone. But it’s more than just capacity building.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:12:45-01:12:48)
This is because two years ago...

- Beatrice Kaldun (01:12:49-01:12:54)
I’m not raising a question. I’m just saying the title is misleading of capacity building so you may erase the title.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:12:55-01:13:49)
Yes, this is because we’re using two different definitions of capacity building. Previously capacity building was more understood as training where you bring a group of people who were mostly heritage practitioners, technicians or officials from government and you pass the skills and they learn how to do things. But two years ago, there was a new policy adopted by the World Heritage Committee. In this context, building capacity was taken in a much broader sense including empowering and raising awareness, etc. So I think that is the context to the language and the heading capacity building.

- Beatrice Kaldun (01:13:50-01:14:25)
You say building capacity rather than capacity building. What Korean colleagues said earlier is that sometimes we talk to certain community for its document. It’s not terribly correct all the time. You all know it. But, the point was made earlier. We want to give it to certain layout to people to read it and digest it and we also want them to understand.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:14:26-01:14:38)
Ok, it’s ok with me for saying building capacity. So can you make that change, Hyosang please? Would you change the title?

(01:14:39-01:14:42) The first sentence, ‘participants recognize’
(01:14:43-01:14:47) Please just invert the words.

- Amareswar Galla (01:14:51-01:16:49)
Before you do that, can I just contextualize why it became a policy term within UNESCO? The Director General of UNESCO, he came to Cape Town to discuss with Mandela about Robben Island. I was present in that meeting and I was working for the presentation offered. Mandela kept on saying capacity building is a priority for the African National Congress because we’ve been so long marginalized. We have to learn to take over the governance. So Mayo came back to UNESCO, capacity building was in every second sentence in his talk. So globally whether you talk about World Bank or Asian Development Bank, whether you talk about policy makers, capacity building has particular policy connotation. It’s training plus capacity. Training is only one element of capacity building. It’s actually having the capacity, the infrastructure. So, I would be very careful to change that because it has very strong policy location internationally and within UNESCO. So I just want to share that it’s up to you if you want to change it. But I would if it’s problematic for me to use or even recommend it, because we all know what capacity building is. There’s millions of dollars put into what are called capacity building. And if you go to the webpage, it clearly gives you in terms of sustainable development what capacity building as a policy position is. If you look at some of those axiomatic principles that inform policies not only among the several state parties but clearly everybody understands what capacity building is.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:16:50-01:17:04)
Yes I think you made a point. We also refer to what UNDP says about capacity building in drafting this World Heritage document so it is somewhat accepted. Yes Gamin? I'm not raising a question. I'm just saying the title is misleading of capacity building so you may erase the title.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:17:05-01:17:14)
Also one of the fifth, SCIs, the committee, capacity building is one of the SCIs. That’s also one reason why we head out and also why that is the definition of.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:17:15-01:17:19)
Are you satisfied, Beatrice, that we leave it given all these contexts?

- Beatrice Kaldun (01:17:20-01:17:33)
I don’t care because I know what it means. It was the other people who read it. Because this will be any reference made it in many languages. I mean here are only two Chinese people who will read it in English anyway.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:17:34-01:17:54)
Ok then, when you translate it into Chinese, try to make it clear, thanks. Ok well, China is one billion three hundred millions so we have to be careful.

- Hae Un Ri (01:17:55-01:17:59)
Before we go down the first sentence,

(01:17:59-01:18:01) First of bullet point, yes?
(01:18:02-01:18:07) The participants recognize,

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:18:08-01:18:43)
Oh, that is grammar. All right, so let’s assume that on the other bullet points under this heading we agree and we’ll fix the wording later on. And let’s move further down. Hyosang, if you please, down there, this was the question of the, at what scale communities and heritage conservations can be reconcile and this was drafted by Kai. Kai, would you like to explain what you have written?

- Kai Weise (01:18:44-01:20:00)
I think I’ll just read it. And the.. so ‘World Heritage requires the definition of boundaries that contain all or most of the attributes that express the OUV of the property. An added layer of protection is possibly required through a buffer zone. These tools required for management of the heritage might however create divisions within the large spheres of communities. The interaction and impact between the communities and the heritage (which can be positive or negative and in either direction) can spread out spatially from being in the immediate vicinity to the surrounding region and in certain
respects even cross the globe’. So I’ll read the second one as well. ‘The definition of “spatial realm of influence” might be required for administrative purposes, however in reality the influences of and impacts on the heritage are only, specially are not, I think that’s supposed to be not specially defined’.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:20:01-01:20:06)
  Can you scroll down? S-p-a not s-p-e.

- Kai Weise (01:20:07-01:20:39)
  ‘Mechanisms of assessing the qualitative and quantitative influences and impacts are needed that are independent of location. The introduction of fully developed form of heritage impact assessment would be a means of assessment beyond artificial boundaries.’

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:20:40-01:20:51)
  So there is the problem in the first bullet point and the possible solution in the second. Is there any suggestion?

- Navin Piplani (01:20:52-01:21:58)
  I don’t have the drafting suggestion but conceptual suggestions to raise two points. One is that if we can emphasize and clearly state the link between the heritage properties, which are inscribed and protected, and the communities outside and how we can participate and how we can get this dialog ongoing. The other was if we can very clearly identify what do we mean by fully developed form of heritage impact assessment? Do we want to say that heritage impact assessment should include or address community involvement? And what is this impact that we are talking about? What is the impact of nomination on community? I think that assessment should address that somewhere. Secondly, once this nomination has happened and people are impacted, how can they come out of it or recover? I think that solution has to be provided within the nomination.

  The heritage can be measured. Ok, Hyosang, did you capture the two suggestions? Since we’re on this paragraph, the last one basically was to further qualify what heritage in practice assessment should consist of including mitigation measure. So, first of all, it should assess impact on people as well as heritage. It should assess the social impact but also propose mitigation measure, which is what normally impact assessments do. And then the first proposal, I think it refers to the previous bullet point. Now here I want drafting suggestions from you.

  Perhaps we can change the last sentence of ‘the introduction of fully developed form of heritage impact assessment’. And we could just capture Navin’s idea of including it in the factors you mentioned which were the impact assessment including the impact on people and also mitigation measures. Why don’t we change the sentence to that way? If that encompass of highlighted, let’s change it.

  So, I don’t know, have you come up with any suggestions?
  (01:24:28-01:24:57) Alright, maybe we want to think about it and come back to it later on? Shall we do that? Ok so then let’s go on for the time being. This was the some other text contributed by Professor Park. I’ll give you the floor.

- Sohyun Park (01:24:58-01:25:56)
  I’ll just read through and I’m not sure if it might be inserted as separate item here. But the content is ‘interests in World Heritage and World Heritage Inscription have increased greatly in Asian countries, and their enthusiasm might reach a point where unnecessary competitions arise among municipalities and local communities’. And the second one is ‘these high interests in World Heritage and World Heritage Inscription need to be constructively connected to the efforts of sustainable development, which should evenly spread out from the very first step of nomination preparation to the post-inscription stage of conservation and management’, I don’t know.

- Amareswar Galla (01:25:57-01:26:23)
  I like the second point because sustainable development should be addressed far from the beginning, not after it’s bringing parachute consultant do it. And that’s what often happens. And the first point is concerned, you’re speaking the truth, none of us is going to disagree with this but how are you going to put this in? It’s slightly diplomatic language. So I guess we can put it as it is.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:26:26-01:26:30)
  Sorry, I was looking at the text.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:26:31-01:26:57)
  I fully agree with you. We can combine the second one but that’s very important one. First one is perhaps discussed at some point before. We are thinking of how to utilize for the benefit of heritage so if you can write something like that, that’s ok. Otherwise, this will not be acceptable.

- Sohyun Park (01:26:58-01:27:05)
  Please do revise this in a politically correct or diplomatically polished way.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:27:06-01:27:50)
  So can you write, Hyosang, to be diplomatically polished? But anyway, I guess the point is to harness this enthusiastic commitment energy which is often the stage before inscription and make it a powerful motor of sustainable development and conservation. Alright, is there anything else? I think we have something else.

  Nothing but just for the student, you might explain what is the ‘WH’ and what is ‘SD’ for the student.

  ‘SD’ is sustainable development and ‘WH’ is World Heritage. I suppose it’s quite easy I’m sorry for the acronym but you are typing fast. Ok then, there’s some more text below, I’m afraid. This is important. Now, Hyosang, you contributed to this. Would you like to provide some context to read it? Thanks.
Yes, it's bit long. And again, we can diplomatically polish it. It's more to realistic circumstances. Basically, we need to find a method to merge the local traditional protection systems that probably have been there and which may not have been the format of systems. Those systems have sustained this heritage for more than few hundred years before the actual enactment of legal policy that actually served the motor for the government currently. So the first paragraph is just to highlight the problem we have. There are actually two tears of problems that these two systems are separated and the only method of communication between these two is dominated by the government basically through official hearings or gadget or publishing. So the problem one is that we need to find the place where we can merge the two systems. And problem two is that we need to find some other methods of communication between the traditional systems and the government. So the following three paragraphs are trying to perhaps suggest a method to target the problems. First of all, every heritage has a different community that is directly involved with it. And the community holds different characteristics, compositions and relationships to the heritage. And it's important to identify these components first and the mechanisms that these communities were worked on because they all different from one heritage to another, so you can't set a standard of the format of communities. So after you identify that, these components have to be recognized by the government authorities and also be reflected into the current systems of managing the heritage. It must be reflected into the management plan of the heritage. And it also needs to be done with participation of consent of communities in the process from the start. And then the third bullet point mentions the method of communication. It needs to be diversified and utilize both conventional method but also employ new methods that would be addressing the characteristics of the specific community. When I had a sentence, I had a mind that nowadays we rely very much on Internet, the web, the gadget, official announcements in Korea. And the elderly people in rural area don't have the connection to these very readily. We can also employ the conventional method of mail as well but there needs to be a point where we actually address the exact components who is going to read this and who is this going to affect. And we need to devise up methods that would be appropriate for that particular heritage. So that's the context of this text. And I'm open to any suggestions or changes. Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:31:55-01:32:03)
Thank you, Hyosang. It is this something very Korean related or do you think it applies to all of the continents?

- Hyosang Jo (01:32:04-01:32:34)
I have to say it's very Korean-oriented. It comes from my own personal view as well. But I would be happy to imply, produce more inputs that would shape it more in Asian context as we formatted this conference.

- Amareswar Galla (01:32:35-01:33:13)
I would say that all the four points are excellent. They reflect the situation not just in Korea but it equally applies in India and some other places. And the only small change is the way you say traditional practices because WIPO, World Bank and everybody is now using term when you want to say traditional knowledge systems, because this is the systems approach that's being applied so it's more realistic. That's only small change I would recommend. But I would leave all the four points as they are because they're great.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:33:14-01:33:25)
Good. Gamini, do you want to say something? Agreed, ok. Traditional knowledge systems.,

- Hyosang Jo (01:33:26-01:33:27)
‘Traditional knowledge systems’ and where should I put it? Sorry I’m lost

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:33:28-01:33:28)
Can you type it, Hyosang?

Yes, I can type it but I just want to know where.

- Amareswar Galla (01:33:33-01:33:47)
You can put it at the example of bullet point three. In the first line, ‘ownership and rights of the communities to continue their traditional practices must’, But grammatically it needs to be massaged and you can do it.

Alright, ok.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:33:49-01:34:31)
Well, ‘Continue systems’ is a bit awkward. It was better ‘practice’, maybe to ‘maintain’. So this is really about the how to do it. Gamini, did I understand well that you were suggesting that capacity building part could be put in the end? Can you do that Hyosang? Just shift it after the last part.

- Gami Wijesuriya (01:34:32-01:34:55)
Can I just suggest one word addition in Hyosang’s point? In the first line where you mentioned, it is better to say in the current government dominating systems of heritage conservation and management, because conservation is separate to management in some systems.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:34:56-01:35:00)
Yes we’ll try to.

- Gami Wijesuriya (01:35:01-01:35:11)
Can we go to the top on continuity thing and remove the word that I added? I think I was completely out of context.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:35:12-01:35:14)
It’s further down.

- Gami Wijesuriya (01:35:15-01:35:18)
Yes, it’s gone.
- Giovanni Boccardi (01:35:19-01:35:24)  
No, it’s further up. That says ‘heritage characterize by continuity’.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:35:24-01:35:25)  
Let’s remove that. I think that it’s not necessary.

- Hyosang Jo (01:35:29-01:35:30)  
Oh, it’s here.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:35:30-01:35:31)  
Yes, it’s fine.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:35:34-01:37:09)  
Ok, and can you go back to the end? There was a highlighted part. No, let’s go further down, to the very end of this document. Yes, there’s a question link to the table. By table, it was meant this one which was identifying possible concerns that would be addressed each stage of the implementations of the World Heritage Convention. It’s identified by types of interest groups. We would call them interest groups. And it was meant to serve us the guidance to draft the possible future text for the operational guidelines. However, we didn’t really have time to go into detail and even now I think it would be difficult to discuss this or to revise it because it’s too rich and complex. So I don’t know what to suggest with respect to this very useful tool. I’m not sure whether to try and look at it in the light of this discussion produce revised version and then share it with all of you or simply set it aside for the time being. I don’t know. What do you people feel?

- Amareswar Galla (01:37:10-01:37:50)  
I’ve been through it and I think it’s good. It provides good structure and there are a lot key points in there. Once you start tableting something like this, you become far more powerful. And you got to be careful. If I were dealing with this, I would not put it in the proceedings. But I would still distribute it because there’s a lot of effort gone into it. And I think it informs the process of thinking about these issues. That’s what I think.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:37:51-01:38:04)  
Perhaps it could be part of the background document for the meeting and distributed as such but not as an outcome of the meeting. Would you agree with that? Gamini?

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:38:05-01:38:14)  
Yes, I think I want to highlight what it says. It’s not only such an important document but this is also a reflection from the case studies.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:38:15-01:38:16)  
Yes that’s right.

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:38:17-01:38:29)  
So I think it’s the important point so it should be part of this proceedings so whatever. It will be a useful reference point for all.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:38:30-01:39:12)  
Because at the beginning of the first day, Professor Park said that the aim of this meeting was to try to feel those boxes with specific suggestions. But we didn’t get that far, so maybe we should say that the distribution of the future revised version of this table as a final outcome would be agreeable to all. It will be something like the conclusive paragraph that leads all to set out the future work plan.

- Pilwon Han (01:39:21-01:39:30)  
Is there any difference between ‘interested group’ in the draft and the ‘interested party’ in the table?

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:39:31-01:40:12)  
That’s precisely the reason why we hesitated including this into the final outcome, because we’ll have to check all of these issues and there may be a lot. So we don’t even want to going to this in this. So it’s almost six o clock. Gamini? Yes exactly, I wanted to know opinion and we need to listen to everyone.

- Sohyun Park (01:40:15-01:40:16)  
Yeah, maybe I will speak in Korean.

We prepared the table to clarify the characteristics of seven different cases after we received them and to use it as a practical guideline for examining the cases. The gaps that appear here are due to the problem of choosing a common language in translating the table that we first made in Korean back into English. If we’re going to have a discussion about it now, I hope you will give opinions about its structure rather than about specific word choices. Concerning time, if we are to move our discussion in a more practical direction, I think that we need the variables on the left and the variable sorting system on the right columns more than the issue of definition of each word contained in each column. If you can give your opinions about the arrangement, or whether it is difficult to sort them out in terms acknowledged internationally or by the UNESCO, I think it would be a stepping stone for what we can do in the next step.

(01:42:04-01:43:48) I realize all these individual words put into this each column needs to be agreed upon. And we should very carefully choose the terms which would fit to the context that we have been discussing which is whole UNESCO conventions, all other chapters and previous meetings. So for that matter, all these keywords we should be careful and cannot be produced as the outcome of this conference. However, for the next step, I wish we can discuss about the structure of this kind of chart and how we can either move from here, and in which direction we will move to. This kind of step or, on the right column, this kind of sort of interest groups or other sort of players and categorization might or might not be appropriate. So it might be a bit helpful for the next step in this kind of structural discussion. Then we can decide whether we can develop it further into more structurally or revise all these keywords. Then I realize that even I’m not so comfortable about choosing words. But where could we go from here on? I think it could be advised while I’m having you here.

(01:44:45-01:45:05) Equalizing or some better termed word should be here, but those are the word problems. But at least we can give some advice on the structure problem from here? Bluntly say, is this kind of structuring appropriate or not? I might ask this kind of very basic question.
- Stefano De Caro (01:45:08-01:45:40)
  Maybe we can prove the idea with the table which is produced by Professor Park to describe the phenomenon of the inclusion of the communities into the procedure. And we can invite Professor Park to update to the line of the document, this kind of document because it’s a useful procedure to have a way of describing.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:45:41-01:45:50)
  Yes, it’s not just to describe but also to guide the process of integrating this into the operational guideline. Gamini?

- Gamini Wijesuriya (01:45:51-01:46:10)
  I was going to say the same thing. This is the very useful process. We can make a reference to making the document and expect the Professor to develop so that it will be eventually distributed.

- Sohyun Park (01:46:11-01:46:18)
  However, we should use the proper structure and proper terms in order to be useful. That’s definitely what we need from here.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:46:19-01:46:45)
  So I think what Professor Park is saying is ‘let’s using this time that we have to receive comments on the structure and then it will be finalized later on’. So it seems that we have thirty minutes left if I’m not wrong. Then this is the very good use of our time.

  Chairperson, may I make a comment? First of all, I would like to thank Professor Park because it’s always good when somebody starts something like this. It’s turning on the ignition. How we drive it is different but that’s the future thing. I think this is great. Stefano and Gamini said that based on the way of the document revised, a lot of things could be updated. The second thing is that when you look at work shape for involving community checklists, it’s not so much involving. We’ve been doing that before for consultation, we consult, that was my first model I was presenting based on the case study. It’s actually community engagement. It’s inclusive process. The process is good. But if you want to put the communities in a more equitable platform, which is the whole idea, we need something there. So it’s not top down in terms of the structure of the table. We need something we can discuss but it’s really good to have a structure to move for the second. I just want to make a comment about interest groups. I mean sociologies use reference groups when they are talking their own use of communities. There are many reference groups within a community. But once there is a stake or once you have a stake, then it becomes interested group. And it’s not necessarily a party because the moment you say interest party, it gives a different some kind of semi-legal status. So group is more sociological unit. That’s why I was saying interest group and interest party. That’s all, thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:49:12-01:49:19)
  Thank you. Anyway, please, all of you contribute your comment later on to this so that we can all, Hyosang, please?

  Yes, I just want to maybe give a little bit more explanation. We wanted to aim for which actually connects to the paragraph that Professor Park proposed before was to channel the energy that goes into the World Heritage Inscription. That is why we tried to channel it through the whole process of inscribing the properties. That’s the actual stages of first step of the inscription and the evaluation process follows after. Whatever the advisory body look at during the evaluation process, the state parties will very fully respect. And then, we need such mechanisms that these energies be channeled after the inscription, so that these activities or the whole idea of involving the communities need to continue on afterwards the inscription. So can we device up, can we actually assess if the initial approaches to understanding of involving and trigger the consent of local communities be more emphasized at the inscription process? So that they may be more strengthened after the inscription as well regardless of whether being, be hold nomination process being ended or not. So I think it’s very practical approach from us. We’re facing so many energies, so many desires from the local governments, but they don’t have the actual practical guidelines. We know the concept and we want to involve the communities and we realize that there are communities but the thing is how we incorporate it into the process that’s already established in the conventions.

- Amareswar Galla (01:51:34-01:52:59)
  I really appreciate that explanation. I think that makes a lot of sense. And I think the structure is really good. Apart from updating, I would still emphasize that involving is too weak. I think that we’ve been very strong throughout the discussion. Gamini has been saying paradigm shift. I mean it’s not about involving, it’s actually engaging and that’s one thing I would suggest. And the other thing is my experience of working with World Heritage properties in Asia in different countries. When it comes down to the visitors, visitors from domestic and visitors from international are very different. They’re different obligations, different processes when you’re dealing with the visitors both domestic and international, not just in Vietnam, Afghanistan, India and several places. You said the wonderful word at somewhere along the line in your preface which Linda Prodol always used to say when she was in UNESCO. She always pointed that ‘Remember, this is aspirational’. So I want to say that this is a wonderful aspirational document which we much needed. So thank you for clarifying. I really support this. I think it’s very useful. Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (01:53:00-01:53:01)
  Kai, please?

- Kai Weise (01:53:02-01:55:00)
  Since we’re asked to comment so I will make it really short. I think we had a whole discussion in connection with the community on the one side and the governments or the authorities on the other side. So I think that differentiating between the two sides, which we don’t want to put as in polar position however, I think there are differences in approach. And within the community which we’ve been talking about, there is differentiation between those who are directly involved and those who are not in respect to what Professor Muneta showed. There are various levels of involvement of the community. So we actually differentiate these columns according to that. And I think as mentioned so I’m going to steal her comment. That actually starts with tentative list, so this whole procedure should actually start much earlier where we’re talking about prioritizing national heritage and tentative list’s. Then it will give everyone a chance to actually begin this discussion at the much earlier time. And the effort putting on the tentative list means that we’re far away from World Heritage but still we’re already starting to work towards it. It may also means that we’re you’re not under pressure, you can take decisions at the time where you’re preparing towards the nomination. And I think that’s very important stage, which might come.
before this. And without going into the content, I think that would give a framework to which would need to be filled out then.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:55:02-01:55:08)**
Please, Stefano. Speak into the microphone, please?

- **Stefano De Caro (01:55:09-01:56:05)**
This procedure of community's involvement is useful not only for the World Heritage but for the heritage in general. And even if there's side of property which does not fit for the outstanding values into the heritage, can we use the involvement of communities for the better of the heritage on the national level in any way? This is a way of channeling. The energies from the commitment of the local communities will lead toward the goals.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:56:06-01:56:56)**
Yes, can I answer that? I think maybe we should clarify that. We are making sure that these ideas will be integrated into the procedures and laws of the convention. But at the same time, we are aware that when they end up in the conventions, they have much wider impact and they set the standard and they become the established practice for heritage, which is not even on the list. I think this is something repeatedly mentioned, so I think we can underline it again as conclusion. It's a very good point.

- **Amareswar Galla (01:56:57-01:58:13)**
I totally support what Kai and Beatrice have said. I would really change this. What you are trying to do here is civil society participation. That's what you are trying to do. So I would just change the word 'civil society', to 'checklist for civil society participation'. Then that's what you're trying to do. The active citizenship is actually the policy framework in many countries now, such as how to have active citizenship and civil society participation. Other sustainable if you really want to save that, don't start, with the tentative list like Beatrice and Kai said. You can see the impact made by an example. You can google this. The fallout from the inscription of the Western God on the World Heritage list because there was no civil society participation and consultation made a lot of communities in the area shocked asking what the World Heritage list is. So it was dazzling all over for a good cause. So I think it's very useful discussion and debate about the Western God inscription that would help to further develop this. Thank you.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (01:58:14-01:58:15)**
Professor Muneta?

- **Yoshifumi Muneta (01:58:16-02:02:06)**
I would like to say something different on the discussion. First of all, I appreciate very much for making an outcome of this conference. And again, I do express my sincere appreciation to ICOMOS Korea for this particular involvement of community. I have observed this country, and we have lots of things to learn from Korea for this particular matter. Korea is now in transition. Actually, disintegration is going on and many people are becoming so active to take part in the decision making processes so respectable democratization is happening in the field of conservation. Also, I know that slow city movement is very active in Korea and also the most beautiful billet association which has started from France came in Korea now to protect the cultural landscape and so on. So Korea is very international country now taking an important role to change the paradigm, not only in Korea but also in all of the developed countries. So I respect very much of the new participation of Korean people’s effort to change the things. And beside today’s effort of Korean people, we need to remember that Korea was famous for Se-ma-eul movement30 or 40 or maybe 50 years ago. It’s very old. But when I’d been working in United Nation developing program for Barangay in Philippine and Kampung in Indonesia and Malaysia, there were Kampung improvement programs which were very developed by special approach popularity. And also we’re talking about Gramin Bank, Micro Banking System now. And this kind of approach is what UNDP and UNEP are talking about the community. So now we just started to talk about community participation in our society of heritage. I remember when we met in Rio de Janeiro for United Nations’ conference of environment and development in the year 1992, we established the local agenda which is the definition of activities of local government for sustainable environment development. So for the development of this discussion on involvement of community beside ICOMOS and World Heritage Centre, we might have an occasion to invite the local government of Asia to talk about sustainable heritage development and involvement of community. This kind of activity is quite important to local government. And the local governments need capacity building specially to change their mind of involving the community. This kind of future development is very important. And maybe the Korean government continues to take the important role in the future, not only in the field of heritage but also in more social and economy development and sustainable development as well as society. Thank you.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (02:02:07-02:02:08)**
Yes, Gamini?

- **Gamini Wijesuriya (02:02:09-02:03:46)**
The issues why tentative list and some of the procedures are missing are because all case studies are already on the World Heritage list. Therefore, perhaps you should be able to draw some conclusions from these to be more useful. That will be a one more column to add like what Kai and you said. We had a definition of working idea of communities and we said communities are non-state sector, within communities, so that is perhaps why you are talking about this residence. And perhaps you can work in this direction together with the government section and leave the other interest group section. But more important thing will be to draw up some conclusions in these processes because here you’re assessing and preparing the nomination as well as you’re preparing management plan, and so on. Anyway, these are some ideas. Thank you.

- **Giovanni Boccardi (02:03:47-02:05:13)**
I also would like to make a comment on my own behalf of this point. I think this should be a general relevance, not only related to the case studies if it’s to serve any. And of course, it should reflect the structure of the operational guidelines, which lays out all the procedures of the convention. It’ll come like the definition of establishment of the World Heritage list from the beginning, inventory tentative list and others. And in that respect, there is a very important component of the process of the World Heritage Convention which is the last part, section 6 and 7. It is about to support the World Heritage and capacity building. I think that could be inserted at the point as we had very important suggestions and implications that are related to communities. And this component is not yet reflected in your structure so four steps rather than three on this dark column on the left would be nice. And I had one more comment, but now I forgot about this. I’ll come back. Does anyone else have an opinion?

- **Sohyun Park (02:05:14-02:07:51)**
These kinds of comments are exactly what we need to move on from here and I appreciate three of your comments very much. Certainly this should be
more general and acceptable level since it started from the 7 wonderful cases that we thankfully received from the participants. So we can move on from here to the next step. But since we're at the end of the discussion, I think I should combine together. It goes very much with the local. You mentioned about the civil society. And I think it really goes along with the local political culture, which I think it is quite Korean or in some way it's Asian phenomena. Because of the political panning culture, I'm afraid we're not much promoting these participatory approaches in our daily basis so we don’t have that much participatory planning practices in day to day basis. And yet we want this kind of community involvement in a more practical way. And we wanted to use this mechanism of World Heritage brand to activate and make a plan in a more effective way. So I'm afraid that I should acknowledge this kind of hidden agenda here. So as you mentioned, the reason we're not using a more national way is because we need some international influence in order to use in a national way. I think it is a sad situation here. It's what we’re expecting from here frankly. But then it's a mutual way that we are influencing outside and also we are influenced by outside too. So I appreciate that very much and this kind of conference is really a good stepping stone for us to grow and evolve from here on. So I’m very grateful about this kind of opportunity.

- Stefano De Caro (02:07:52-02:08:48)
You know what that does normally mean. You have to release the size from the top with, independent from communities and then the other side, business is usual. So there's such a better cases. There's not really a moment for the World Heritage site to the normal administration. The best example from community involvement which was one of the winners of the award of the European community for involvement of the community could never be a world heritage site because there is not the outstanding exceptional value. But from the point of your community involvement, it’s a standard.

- Sohyun Park (02:08:49-02:09:20)
Actually all Asia is really changing day to day. So we're adopting these challenges and opportunities. And also we're also evolving domestically too. The students here are the next generation but certainly it will be different from today so we're altogether preparing for the next stage.

- Amareswar Galla (02:09:21-02:11:11)
Thank you so much for saying that, Professor Park. I would like thank everybody over here because you’ve made to get to the stage. Some of us are getting old, grey-haired by trying to do this. But I personally really appreciate. I have been dealing with World Heritage site in 1982 and I’m an old man. It has been 30 years down the track. But the one thing why I mentioned Western God inscription is not just the criticism of India. But I think it's for all of Asia to think about. If you think about accreditation process of NGOs and the UN system, you get a clear idea that the majority of NGOs has participated internationally come from 7 western countries, the majority. In Johannesburg 89% of NGOs working for sustainable development was from 7 western countries. The point is what happened in India. It was inscribed which was fine. They got a very strong ambassador, very strong resources and incredible knowledge in capacity. But they forgot that Indian NGOs were extremely powerful. So there’s whole NGO culture emerging in Asia and India is one of the very good examples for this. So I think in that table, it's important to add how we will incorporate that NGO culture. We’re talking about the committee of the World Heritage area but incorporating that NGO culture is really important. Thank you.

- Giovanni Boccardi (02:11:12-02:12:25)
Thank you so much. I think we have to bring this to a close. I'm told that translators have to leave at 6:30. This opportunity to thank all of them very much for the wonderful work you've done. And I think as we have said in this final suggestions in our document, we recognized this idea will have to be translated in concrete operational procedures within our operational guideline which will also impact on the wider national heritage policies. We welcome your draft table and we suggest this to be further developed based on the outcome of the meeting incorporating the specific ideas that have been come from the floor as well as other that may come later, of course. And that would be very meaningful output from this whole workshop. So unless there are other comments from the participants, I’ll close this session.

- Amareswar Galla (02:12:27-02:12:32)
I just want to thank the chair for taking on the challenging people.

- Giovanni Boccardi (02:12:35-02:13:14)
I just wanted to thank all of you for being very patient and contributing to this exercise. Although as Gamini said at the beginning we keep talking and talking and in Venice high water are there for 190 days, I’m sure that one day all of this thinking will lower down the water. Thank you so much and lunch will be served in 5 minutes, dinner I’m sorry. Breakfast will be served the next door in 5 minutes. Thank you all.