



## Report of the Workshop:

### Management of Caribbean cultural resources in a natural environment: Sites of Memory and participation of local communities, Barbados, 11-15 March 2013

A Workshop jointly prepared by UNESCO Offices in Kingston and Havana within the framework of the Caribbean Capacity Building Programme (CCBP), for World Heritage, counting with the support of The World Heritage Centre. Financed by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science of the Netherlands.

---

Following an agreement reached in June 2011 on the Caribbean Capacity Building Programme, between UNESCO, the UNESCO Offices in Havana and Kingston and UNESCO's WH Centre, in coordination with the Barbados National Commission for UNESCO, The University of the West Indies (UWI), Cave Hill Campus, assisted with the organization of the Training Course in the Management of Caribbean cultural resources in a natural environment: *Sites of Memory and participation of local communities* which took place from 11 to 15 March 2013 at Blue Horizon Hotel near to the Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison World Heritage site in Barbados.

In the following pages it is presented an overall report of the workshop prepared over the transcription of the sessions thanks to the contributions of Rapporteur designated for each session and to the compilation of the final report by Dr Tara Inniss,<sup>1</sup> Lecturer of the Department of History and Philosophy, UWI. The review and notes provided also by Dr Isabel Rigol, Dr Alissandra Cummins and also Dr Innis have been very welcome and useful in the preparation of this report.

#### Background

Natural areas often include tangible and intangible cultural heritage that is managed traditionally by local communities. Many of them may have a protected status or natural resources which may imply the participation in its management by external stakeholders from governmental and non-governmental entities, as well as from private companies. This may have an impact on the state of conservation and safeguarding of the area's cultural and natural resources, as well as on the capacity by local communities to continue benefitting from those cultural resources.

Moreover, some of these areas are proposed to be recognised by UNESCO as WH Site, a Man and Biosphere reserve, a site or space of memory, or a Geo-park, among others. This recognition may bring additional protection and management measures by which it is necessary to ensure the full participation of local communities in the nomination procedures, management and evaluation mechanisms of the area. UNESCO has organized a number of activities to

---

<sup>1</sup> Prepared on behalf The University of the West Indies, from the notes taken by each session's reports, revised by Dr Inniss as Rapporteur General. Notes consolidated with the support of Victor Marin and discussed in agreement with Ms Alissandra Cummins

analyse these issues, in particular in Small Islands Developing States (SIDS)<sup>2</sup>, including the Caribbean Member States.

The Barbados workshop is part of these series of activities organized within the implementation of the CCBP,. It also gives follow-up to a workshop organized in June 2012 (Kingston, Jamaica) on the possibility to inscribe new properties from the Caribbean in the WH List, with particular attention to Sites of Memory (see Kingston Action Plan in annex). Sites of Memory is a UNESCO programme that aims at providing recognition and protection to places that have a significant importance for local communities because of their sacred or symbolic values.

By using the CCBP training modules and the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the Convention, the workshop addressed the following subjects:

1. The conservation and management of natural areas
2. The use and management of cultural resources
3. The involvement of communities

Several case studies were discussed, including the *Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park* nomination (Jamaica), as well as other Caribbean study cases.

The agenda of the 5-day workshop was organized by sessions around five thematic debates, and each debate was introduced and chaired by an expert, whose summary was provided by another expert acting as Rapporteur. The summaries of the debates herewith presented include the challenges identified and possible recommendations, were presented in the closing session of the workshop, for their validation and over that basis a set of recommendations on community involvement in the conservation and management of natural areas, and in nomination processes is reflected in this report, also proposed for its publication in UNESCO Havana's periodical "Culture and Development"

The themes of the agenda and ITEMS discussed are referred in order of presentation below this line including the discussions held and recommendations made for its follow up.

## **SESSION 1**

### **CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL AREAS**

Presentation by Dr. Jose Courrau<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Courrau provided the audience with information about the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and its role in the nomination process and he also discussed challenges facing the management of natural areas. He asserted that World Heritage (WH) was important but noted that there were far more cultural heritage sites on the list than natural sites. Noting the importance of natural sites for human survival, he indicated that they have been conserved to ensure the ongoing provision of goods and services and to preserve essential

---

<sup>2</sup> AWH Programme for Small Island Developing States was adopted at the 29th session of the WH Committee (Durban, South Africa, 2005, Decision 29 COM 5B). It is one of the thematic Programmes that resulted from the Barbados Programme of Action (BPOA) on the Mauritius Strategy for SIDS.

<sup>3</sup>Dr Courrau is IUCN Coordinator for Central America and the Caribbean, *Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use*, Notes taken by Dr. Janice Cumberbatch, CERMES, UWI

values. In this regard the IUCN was responsible for supporting the WH Convention in areas such as monitoring.

Dr. Courrau explained the nomination process and made it clear that the final decision for inscription was made by the WH Committee. He listed a number of problems and threats for natural sites, namely agriculture, oil and mining development, tourism, illegal hunting and fishing, deforestation and overuse of natural resources, exotic species and climate change. He also made the point that humans were a major threat to natural areas. He shared experiences where persons working in WH sites were sometimes unaware that they were working in WH properties and many did not even know what the status meant. He said that there was a lack of knowledge of why sites were important and the value of the Convention was not understood.

He concluded with a list of actions that should be taken to preserve natural sites including legislative support; system-site relationship; management categories; participation; and resource accountability. He said that countries should showcase their WH sites and make them stand out through good management.

### **1.1 Discussion**

A discussion followed on the meaning of deferral and referral. There was some discussion on whether there had been an analysis of the sites that had been deferred and whether there was a higher prevalence of natural sites. Some participants wondered if this could possibly explain the reason for less natural sites being inscribed on the WH list based on the fact that it was more difficult to get them listed.

Another suggestion was made that a challenge with natural sites was that they tended to have residents and conflicts of use that made the process of management difficult.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Caribbean heritage practitioners, and especially managers, need to understand the role of the advisory bodies in the evaluation of sites, especially those relating to the natural sites or those possessing natural values. Therefore, increased engagement with advisory bodies such as IUCN on a sub-regional level is needed.
- Due to the nature of Caribbean heritage sites that often possess both natural and cultural values -- the development of Caribbean cultural heritage has been influenced by the historical relationship between humans and their terrestrial and marine environments -- there should be more engagement with natural heritage advisors and local/ regional biodiversity experts, including IUCN, Ministry of Environment officials, the NGO community and The University of the West Indies (UWI) or other regional universities.
- IUCN may consider an analysis of which sites are not inscribed or are deferred and on what grounds does this occur.

## **2 CASE STUDY JAMAICA BLUE AND JOHN CROW MOUNTAIN NOMINATION**

Among several cases studies to be discussed, the nomination of the *Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park* (Jamaica), was prioritized in line with the interest of Jamaica and the deferral of the case in previous session. The session was presented by Ms. Debra Kay Palmer, Manager of the Heritage Preservation and Planning/WH Unit in the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT) counting also with the attendance of Dr Maria Smith from the JAMAICA National Commission for UNESCO, Both participants were during the discursion at the 35 COM as well as some other Barbados participants who attended specially this session. Ms Kay-Palmer made a presentation of the advances in progress and described the location of the site, which was in the Eastern area of Jamaica and comprises 4.5 percent of the country's entire land mass. She noted that site consisted of archaeological cultural remains; and that it was a representation of

the Taino, Spanish, British and Maroon experience in the area. However, the nomination focused on the property's Maroon heritage in a mountainous environment.

In the first application, Ms. Palmer stated that an error made was in not including many of the Maroon sites in the definition of the site and within the boundaries. Another difficulty was designating the application in under criteria 6, 9 and 10 and not including an additional cultural criterion despite the fact that this was explicitly stated in criterion 6. As a consequence the site received a deferral by the WH Committee in 2011. She mentioned that several areas of the nomination that were identified in the evaluation have since been addressed, including the delineation of the property's boundaries to include all cultural resource sites as well as the selection of criteria.

The speaker highlighted that some of the Maroon sites including Nanny Town were pivotal, but fairly inaccessible. Ms. Palmer stressed that they had the full buy in of the Maroons and had sought to address a number of the issues identified by the Committee. For example they were addressing the boundary issues and had redefined the site to include the Maroon sites, including satellite sites; the management plan had been updated; and they were working on the comparative analysis, but this was proving difficult and they would welcome some assistance with it.

The representative of Jamaica noted that there was the recommendation to include the Cockpit Country, but a decision had been taken that the location was too problematic and would not be included. She indicated the various legislative acts that were legislate in place to provide protection for the site including the NRCA Act, the JHNT Act and the Forestry Act. Ms. Palmer also informed the audience that there was a co-management arrangement in place between the relevant agencies that manage the site; and that they were trying to establish an MOU with Maroon communities.

There were plans to train tour guides and hospitality workers and business plans had been created because the Maroons wanted to enhance community tourism opportunities. They were therefore supportive of the move toward WH nomination and some of the community leaders were involved in the process of developing the management plan because they saw how it could help them achieve this goal. Ms. Palmer showed a clip of Maroon intangible cultural traditions, such as traditional drumming and singing, as examples of the cultural heritage represented in the site.

## **2.1 Discussion**

Ms Palmer was asked why the Maroons were not a part of the co-management arrangement and she acknowledged that this was something that should be considered.

Ms. Palmer was asked to explain what was exceptional about the Maroons and she indicated that they had an existence that extended for more than 500 years; that they still engaged in indigenous practices that have been passed down through the generations; that they viewed the mountains as scared and engaged in religious rites and ancient healing traditions using the natural environment.

## **3 DISCUSSION OF THE JAMAICA BJCMNP DOSSIER**

As a group exercise, participants were divided into small groups of 3-4 individuals with various areas of expertise to evaluate sections of the John Crow and Blue Mountain National Park nomination dossier submitted in 2011 based on Advisory Body evaluations. The Jamaican delegation welcomed the exercise as a means of making further recommendations to improve/ revise its nomination. The objectives of this exercise were to:

1. To obtain experience in drafting and evaluating sections of a nomination dossier;

2. To evaluate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as presented in the 2011 nomination dossier;
3. To critically analyse Advisory Body evaluations and revise a nomination accordingly.

The following comments were made by the groups that reviewed the sections of the dossier:

### **3.1 Executive summary**

Tighten and strengthen the Justification and the Criteria selected. The Executive Summary is sometimes the most important document that will be reviewed prior to discussion at the Committee meeting.. It must be strong and articulate the OUV of the site succinctly. Jamaica must demonstrate the strong link between the natural AND cultural values in a mixed site. There also should be a statement that speaks to the origins and identity of the Maroon groups in Jamaica.

### **3.2 Identification of the property**

**Maps-** Are critical to the dossier and should use UNESCO W H language and meet their criteria of a simple map that outlines the BUFFER ZONE and the PROPERTY (not "Core"). All boundaries should be intact and the PROPERTY boundaries must contain all sites that contain OUV. We note that Jamaica has worked on ensuring that all OUV cultural sites are now within the property with a new map.

Wherever possible, Jamaica should use maps to represent information spatially, i.e. archaeological sites; individual trails with highlighted places of significance; other cultural resources - this is essential to demonstrate that there is a basis on which to manage, represent and interpret the property.

**Boundaries** - The delineation of boundaries in the identification sections should also include a definition or rationale for defining the boundaries for cultural resources and not just replicate the existing boundaries of the National Park and natural heritage management.

**Contact Information:** Who is really responsible for the administration of the property? With whom should UNESCO correspond?

### **3.3 Documentation**

The documentation provided for the property needs to be updated and expanded and should also include references to maps and visual material. There should be a separate section highlighting references to Archaeology and history. There is a rich historical scholarship from Jamaican and other scholars, such as Professor Alvin Thompson, that should support the dossier. In fact, there is a lack of referencing throughout the entire document. References or footnotes would help to explain assertions and provide evidence. It is recommended that the JNHT consult with the History Department at Mona and/or with Professor Alvin Thompson and get a research student to compile all relevant primary (including oral sources) and secondary sources that can help to build a reference file for a Documentation Centre that maybe even the Maroons or local communities could manage.

#### **Additional comments:**

- The first map should not be Jamaica; the spatial representation of the site needs to start with the global and regional and situate the site in the World context.
- There was an excellent article recently in the Jamaica Journal that discussed the integration between cultural and natural.
- Richard Price also has prepared an article on the area, even when there has been some dispute on the work of Price. However there is a lot of information on Maroons in Jamaica and on the natural history and therefore, why is it not referenced? The State

Party should point to all the material that can be accessed. This will all be considered in the evaluation.

- Professor Alvin Thompson has demonstrated the exceptional leadership of Nanny of the Maroons as a female leader who was a gifted military strategist who founded Nanny Town. The global significance of the Jamaican Maroons is well known throughout academia and provides greater depth of understanding to the concept of maroonage compared with Le Morne Cultural Landscape in Mauritius which was an example of temporary flight from bondage. The Jamaican Maroons were so fierce in their resistance to British domination that they thwarted British efforts to effectively colonize and settle Jamaica in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, that a 'peace' treaty had to be brokered with them affording them official land rights and title to land in the John Crow and Blue Mountains and elsewhere in Jamaica. The other exceptional testimony to this heritage for the comparative analysis would be the Suriname Saramaka and other Maroon groups.

### **3.4 Section 2 Historical Development of the Property**

#### **Natural Heritage**

The Natural site and constituent biodiversity is very impressive with high levels of diversity and endemism of numerous plant and animal taxa, and many forest types on volcanic and limestone base rocks. More tables would be useful when summarizing biodiversity. It is not clear how important wildlife is legally protected, i.e. hunting.

Criterion x - in situ critical habitat for threatened and endangered species – the nomination could emphasise the value of high altitude forest as refuge habitat in the face of climate change.

Criterion ix - ongoing ecological and biological processes. The rapid uplift and overwater dispersal makes it a special site for evolutionary processes. But weighed against this is the "interruption" of evolutionary processes by human habitation (Taino, Maroon, European) and the damage to the integrity of the ecosystems (of all except highest altitude forest) caused by deforestation and agricultural conversion. Aside from demonstrating how forests will be protected to maintain remaining integrity, the site needed better enforcement of existing laws and may need to emphasise some restoration plans in the dossier.

Descriptions of biodiversity and censuses could be represented in table format in the document.

#### **Cultural Heritage**

The imbalance between the discussion of the natural features and the culture is clear - 20 pages for natural heritage as opposed to 8 pages for cultural heritage. Other queries included:

- Whose point of view is being foregrounded? The language used is very clinical and tending towards the Eurocentric with 'us' and 'them'.
- There was a need to invest more in the language. State explicitly, why specific sites are identified as sacred and why specific festivals are important. The marginalised facts are part of the problem of interpretation of the document.

#### **Additional comments:**

- Conservation could be associated with culture – naming and showing how the species would advantage the humans.
- Much of the information noted by the groups was also requested by members of the committee. They believe that it is exceptional, but they have not been given the information.
- The Maroon ancestral heritage is critical to the story and it is missing
- Treat the dossier as an interpretive instrument which could be used later to it should give guidelines for signage etc. Also oral references would be helpful.

### 3.5 Section 3 Justification for Inscription

**Comparative analysis** – there is total agreement with the ICOMOS assessment. Too much time was spent trying to project an oral tradition; we take things we hear and repeat them as fact. Go back and ensure that what is said is factual. There must also be a decision on the categories of analysis i.e.) what are we looking at language, ethnicity, landforms? Statements that are made demonstrate that the Jamaican Maroon heritage is exceptional, but there is no evidence stated to prove this. Jamaica needs to identify the 4 – 5 major characteristics and develop them. The matrix is a good attempt but there needs to be a focus on a comparison of the values.

Cultural heritage participants were asked whether she could identify what would be likely characteristics demonstrating the exceptional heritage of the Maroons.

- Comparative Analysis? The biggest feat would be trying to outdistance Suriname.
- Landscape? The group needed to determine what about Jamaica was different – perhaps the landscape – it is mountainous, but both groups of Maroons will use their landscape in a similar way i.e. bush teas, food, medicine etc.
- Archaeology? There is also archaeology.
- Land Ownership? The land ownership/tenure is critical. The fact that they do not pay taxes – a state within a state – they are different from Suriname in this way.
- Creolisation? Creolisation is also a positive characteristic but it has to be spun in the right way - because cultural diversity among the Maroon population in Jamaica may be greater.

Additional unique characteristics might be found in some of Kofi Agorsah's research which looked at the structure of the towns built in defence structure – to what extent are they still relevant in Suriname. There are also specific instruments that would foreground the Jamaica story.

The landscape is one that can be used because of the mountains and valleys and how they were used. There is also the need to emphasise the mixed nature of the site natural and cultural – e.g. the trails – a walking lived experience.

The reach of colonial domination is also important. 100 years of people who could escape colonial denomination using the mountainous landscape and using it defensively.

**Authenticity and integrity** – There is gap between the richness of the maroon past and what is reported. It is as if we are looking at past and present maroons; and it reads contradictory as opposed to a continuum.

**Treatment of cultural criterion** – The Jamaican representative noted that it was not safe to use criterion 6 alone; indeed none should be used on their own. Regarding the natural criteria, on page 169, IUCN stated that Jamaica has a high potential to meet the biodiversity criteria but there is fragmentation and Jamaica must find a way to deal with this. IUCN also recommend a comparison with the Cockpit country. This must be considered. Although the State Party has determined that it will not include it, ideally it cannot be left out. It must be included and the language must indicate that while it cannot be included at this time, it will be brought to fruition, and then submitted as a serial nomination. The country needs a geologist to look at the nomination.

The selection of criterion 3 is good, but the country should not do away with criterion 6 – one is archaeological and one is living intangible heritage. Both are needed and there should be a reallocation of the cultural aspects between the two.

#### **Additional comments:**

- The added value at the site is the intangible heritage. The country should look at the other convention on intangible heritage. They should continue to work for the WH status but they should not ignore the other one. This would require the involving of local communities – indeed one of the most interesting aspects of this site.
- Use the notes provided by the Committee to improve the dossier:
  - When ICOMOS make statement such as “the Windward maroons are reputed to be.” then Jamaica must prove it to be so.
  - ICOMOS also states that the comparative analysis is not considered to be acceptable at this stage. This is an indication that they should work on this as well

### **3.6 Section 4 Conservation and Management of the Property**

The location of figures in the text needs to be rationalised – place figures closer to relevant text. More photographs and visual representations should be used (historic and contemporary).

Improve the writing styles. Use more positive language - as opposed to describing risks to the site as threats, indicate how the management plan is addressing the management of threats.

Look at non-forestry products (i.e. coffee production) and indicate how they will be managed as opposed to being a problem.

Management – it is not certain if the rangers are from the community - make that link to show the direct involvement of the resident community.

In terms of the cultural resource management of the site, there needs to be more explanation of the need for secrecy of sacred sites and how this will be managed, especially in the light of co-management with Maroon communities themselves.

#### **Additional comments:**

- In the language of conservation and nature we will look for consistency – i.e. the completion of the management plans.
- Can Jamaica be more specific vis-a-vis the data, to show uniqueness of the geology and the species?
- The dossier refers to outdated management plans.
- It is clear that the Jamaicans have done a lot of work since the last workshop. The continued weakness is the lack of a proper comparative analysis and the absence of the management plan. Jamaica is convinced of their OUV but they have to convince others. This is the position of ICOMOS as well. Continuing dialogue with Maroons is critical and also will enhance the authenticity of the site and the association of present day maroons with the site is not explicit.
- The Jamaica representative indicated that the management plan has been updated.

### **3.7 Section 5 protection and management**

There is good regulatory framework for natural heritage; the cultural heritage is less so. What plans are in place to add to the regulatory framework for the cultural aspects?

Rangers are in place but patrols decreased because of limitations regarding resources. Police and army patrols control some activities, especially burning, which would be a significant threat. Maroons also facilitate enforcement. How effective is this? We support the recommendation for training of the rangers in cultural heritage to raise their sensitivity and enhance their ability to do both the education enforcement and the policing enforcement.

Signing of MOU is a good start but the Maroons should be considered as a part of the co-management arrangement. This would be beneficial for a number of reasons:

- In the articulation of the comparative analysis, the voice of the maroons, would assist in the understanding of their uniqueness and lend authenticity to the discourse. This can then be translated into WH speak by the other agencies. It is a wonderful and unique opportunity to have a WHS in which the people whose culture is to be protected are alive to make representation for them.
- The maroons are defined by the natural heritage and therefore are best placed to be at the centre of its protection because without it they would have lost a most valued aspect of who they are.

Perhaps there could be more private sector involvement in the protection of the Park. Which means that there is a need to explain the value of the park to the private sector?

Tourism, especially the maroons' desire for the income that it would generate is good, but there has to be a balance between the benefits and the challenges.

The tourism master plan is now outdated and the JCDT strategic plan shall be also updated.

**Additional comments:**

- Sometimes countries bring the indigenous people to speak on behalf of the nomination and it should be started at grass root level, completed at national level and eventually considered for the corresponding session of the World Heritage Committee in which the dossier is scheduled to be reviewed.

**3.8 Section 6 monitoring**

The group noted the absence of systems to monitor the cultural heritage of the maroons. There should be involvement of the maroons themselves; their testimonies. They should also be involved in decision making.

**Additional comments:**

Participants were also critical of some parts of ICOMOS's evaluation, especially in instances where there was an effort to compare the Jamaica experience with Haiti and Mexico. They noted some linkages but none of significance.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Support the work that is being done by the State Party's management committee to improve the dossier;
2. Since mixed properties must demonstrate OUV of both culture and nature and how these values are used/ transformed by people in their environment, more analysis is required for the demonstration of the interrelationship between the Maroons and their environment;
3. Strengthen all sections of the Nomination Dossier especially the Executive Summary; maps; documentation and referencing; representation of information visually (ie. photos, tables, figures, etc.) and Comparative Analysis;
4. Use inclusive language when discussing the heritage of communities (i.e. Maroons) since this is a representation of the State Party's national heritage and its contribution to the heritage of humanity;
5. Use regional institutions such as UWI to assist in the drafting of sections of the dossier especially the History and Development and Justification for Inscription and the Documentation sections;
6. Deepen the Comparative Analysis based on local (i.e Cockpit Country), regional (i.e. Suriname) and international examples of Maroonage where relevant (i.e. comparisons with the Haitian Revolution are not necessary);
7. Strengthen and update the management plans to consider and mitigate threats to the conservation and management of the property;

8. Develop a comprehensive cultural resource management plan with identification; conservation; interpretation and management of all maroon sites clearly articulated;
9. Explore the co-management potential of communities to conserve and manage their cultural and natural heritage themselves or at least participate meaningfully (equally) with state managers.

## **SESSION 2:**

### **USE AND MANAGEMENT OF TANGIBLE CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Presentation by Dr. Isabel Rigol<sup>4</sup>

Acting also as Moderator for the session, Dr Rigol defined the concept of Cultural Landscapes. She outlined three categories- Designed, Evolved and Associative. With the assistance of a number of illustrations, participants were given a visual tour of several examples in the Caribbean. For the Evolved and Continuing Landscapes, images that featured tobacco, sugar, coffee, cocoa, coconut, orange, grapefruit and banana spaces from across the region were included for the discussion.

The speaker exposed the connections of nature and human creations and therefore the relationships among material and immaterial heritage, thus the convenience to review accordingly the guidelines for the best study of the cases.

For Dr. Rigol, Cultural Landscapes was a “complex category” which included large portions of land with different kinds of heritage - cultural and natural, tangible and intangible. Many of these in the Caribbean are under threat and she urged us to “identify, protect and wisely use our cultural landscapes.”

#### **“The Industrial Heritage of Barbados: The Story of Sugar”.**

As the selected case study analyzed in this session, Dr. Tara Inniss then presented the nomination entitled “The Industrial Heritage of Barbados: The Story of Sugar”. She first emphasised that the narratives of slavery and the enslaved histories were underrepresented on the WH List. These must be acknowledged beyond the slave trading sites of West Africa (i.e. Gorée in Senegal). Hence, one of the aims of the Barbados nomination was to speak to African enslavement in the sugar production context and the contributions of their descendants to the development of Caribbean societies.

As a Serial Nomination, Inniss outlined the four spaces/sites presently in the list: St. Nicholas Abbey; Morgan Lewis Mill; Codrington College and its estates; and Newton Burial Ground. These sites allow for a discussion of human activity and the contribution of labour to the industrial process. As she argued, “How can you talk about material culture of heritage without talking about the people who made it and used it? In the region, we cannot talk about metal works and not speak to labour and those who created and adapted the technologies.”

In this way, the nomination will make the connection between the tangible (i.e. archaeological spaces and built heritage – “Great” Houses; industrial complexes; etc.) and intangible heritage (i.e. processes of enslavement, labour production and creolisation).

An active discussion followed the two presentations with several key issues being raised.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Isabel Rigol attended as Member of ICOMOS Academy. Notes were taken by Dr. Marcia Burrowes, Cultural Studies Programme, UWI*

1. It was pointed out that the Barbados nomination of the Story of Sugar needed to include the case of River Antoine in Grenada. It was, however, acknowledged that there were distinct differences between water and wind technology and production. Nevertheless, including River Antoine in the nomination would enhance the category of comparison.
2. Regarding the Comparative Analysis, Barbados should also look to other small island developing states in the region, as well as Mauritius. And it was pointed out that the Comparative Analysis was a critical component of the nomination and participants were advised to start their process by looking at the comparative sites on the WH List. Such an examination would allow them to note that it unique about their nomination.
3. Barbados was advised to review the 2006 Documents from the Suriname meeting.
4. Barbados was also advised to publish a book about this nomination and the findings of the research. It was presumed that this Sugar nomination would be fair better than the one for Bridgetown, as it would be more comprehensive, with many matters to address. And the emphasis on Slavery and the Slave Routes further heightened its value, beyond its moral discussion.
5. With regard to the issue of acknowledging the human factor in the industrial process, a question was raised about the construct of "industrial" in the region. The technology that was integral to production was transferred from the metropolis to the region. In response, it was argued that the technology was creolised, transformed and adapted. Again the emphasis was on the human factor.
6. In comparative reference to Bridgetown nomination It was additionally pointed out that for the case mentioned, the proposers could *not* speak to the architects and engineers of the site. The enslaved and their descendants were marginalised in the histories of the structures. This led to a discussion of the appropriateness of the title with its focus on "industrial." In response, it was noted that Barbados intended to challenge the construct of "industrial". With its present meanings, the majority of the WH sites in this category were testimony to, for example, structures, design and existing archaeological evidence. Little attention had been paid to the people, the human factor. Participant refereed "Our position is the reverse." As a result, Barbados was not just putting together a dossier; it was challenging ICOMOS and the WH Committee to change their view about industrial heritage. Barbados is aware that the nomination must provide the tools for the investigation.
7. Participants were reminded that the process of nomination was "a long journey". Barbados had begun in 1971, had reviewed a series of studies, which often sent them into different directions for the nomination. Their award of WH status came through in 2011.
8. A question was raised about the composition of the team for the Sugar nomination. Response- primarily the Barbados Museum and Historical Society (BMHS)and UWI as the focus is presently on the research component. Lessons had been learnt from the Bridgetown experience that two teams were needed for the process; one for part 1-3. Equally important was the management and legislation factor. And an expert on maps is vital. Dr Steve Devonish was expressly thanked for his work in this area.
9. A question was raised re the list- would other sites be included? Response- the East Coast National Park- may combine the two or submit separate nominations. More input was needed from CERMES and the Natural Heritage Department.
10. Katherine Blackman, a project coordinator for the Consett Bay Pilot Scheme, spoke to Consett Bay and its Marine and Terrestrial environments and their cultural heritage, which enhanced local fisheries and sustainable management.

11. A discussion ensued regarding the development of the pottery industry in Barbados, and the relevance of the Scotland District and other geological expressions that noted the heritage of clay. Pottery informed the use of sugar moulds, the transportation, shipment and refinement of sugar. Sugar technology often used clay. Clay also led to the development of small cottage industries, which speaks to the involvement of communities.
12. It was noted that only Barbados and Antigua produced clay sugar and that Barbados was also reminded of the importance of the history of rum. It was in Barbados that the term “rumbullion”, or “kill devil” was coined. And the island has a strong rum heritage.
13. Also to be included is the cultural heritage arising out of sugar, the cultural practices of acknowledging the ancestors, the masquerade manifestations and the festival that began in enslavement on sugar plantation. Its modern version, though dictated by the tourism narrative, has strong routes in the sugar heritage.
14. It was also advised that such elements as productivity and innovation must be included in the nomination. Also the issue of transportation and its relationship with the people of the plantations.
15. The final point was raised by Dr. Rigol, who pondered whether it was too soon for the region to consider the category of trans-boundary nominations? She recommended that this was the way of the future.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- The Caribbean can make special claims regarding the intangible values of its sites, especially Cultural Landscapes due to its history of indigenous occupation; Global labour and trade connections i.e. enslavement and expressions of creolisation and freedom that have OUV;
- States Parties may consider pursuing serial nominations based on shared history and heritage;
- Nominations should develop the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage.

### **SESSION 3:**

#### **USE AND SAFEGUARDING OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Presentation by Ms Himalchuli Gurung<sup>5</sup>

In addition to her role representing UNESCO Kingston Office, Ms. Gurung made a presentation on the 2003 Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) and explained how the 2003 Convention was different from the WH Convention (1972). Several states parties have ratified the ICH since 2003. She explained that the ICH spoke to safeguarding expressions, skills, practices and knowledge. She provided a detailed comparison in terms of management structures and responsibilities to the WH Convention and the ICC. She also compared the ICH with the Diversity of Cultural Expressions Convention (2005).

She spoke on the importance of community-based safeguarding initiatives and the participation of local communities in safeguarding intangible heritage. In order to promote the ICC, there is

---

<sup>5</sup>Ms. Himalchuli Gurung, is specialist for Culture at UNESCO Kingston Office, and notes were taken by Dr. Cleve Scott, Department of History and Philosophy, UWI, assisted by, Ms. Afi Martin, Department of History and Philosophy, UWI

the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, but nominations to this list must have the consent of the communities that are targeted. Ms. Gurung reviewed the on-going ICC activities in the region, including the development of a new Cultural Policy in Belize.

Taking advantage of comparative analyses offered by the speaker, Victor Marin from the UNESCO Havana Office stressed that 2003 convention focuses securing grassroots interests. He also noted the importance of communities being involved in identifying and preparing a dossier on ICH, given the guidelines of that convention requesting the necessary participation of the local communities for the validation of inventories, studies and any proposal concerning the bearers of the intangible expressions.

As case studied considered in this session, Ms La Vern Phillips from the St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG) National Trust delivered a presentation on the La Soufriere National Park in which she explained that it was categorized as a geo-heritage park which explores the relationship between indigenous people (the Kalinago); the descendents of Africans and Europeans (plantation landscapes) and the volcanic landscape of La Soufriere. The site was described as site in which one could see the destruction of the tropical landscape due to successive volcanic eruptions.

Queries from the participants revealed that the nomination needed to conduct an inventory of all of the natural and cultural values that differentiate it from other volcanic landscape sites. Participants noted that the criteria for selection needed to clear and could use both cultural and natural criteria as a mixed site. Prof. Carrington urged the SVG Trust to review the outcomes of a 2001 meeting that was held in SVG about the La Soufriere National Park. A deeper comparative analysis with regional volcanic sites as well as Le Morne Trois Pitons in Dominica and the Pitons in St Lucia also needs to be undertaken. He also suggested that the SVG Trust could look at nominating the site under criteria (vii) and (ix).

Due to the amount of archaeology that has already been done in SVG, it is unnecessary to stress the importance of the site for further archaeological excavation, especially as excavations tend to destroy archaeological sites. Researchers should analyse and compile all existing work into the Documentation Section of the nomination (#7).

There was a suggestion for a more in depth survey needed to be done to evaluate the cultural value of the site with the use of more historical data. The proposal offers great potential but the OUV must be defined. Vincentian culture experts suggested that the volcano should be seen as a central feature of the landscape that defines Vincentian culture and peoples, particularly of the Kalinago/ Garifuna populations who were forcibly removed from the island to Belize in the late 18th century. Maroonage also needs to be explored.

There were two (2) areas requiring attention in the management of the site -- disaster and risk mitigation as well as illegal cultivation of narcotics.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Caribbean heritage practitioners and UNESCO must inventory all of the relevant reports arising out of UNESCO processes and meetings relating to Caribbean natural and cultural heritage to ensure the continuity and dissemination of relevant information that States Parties can use in the drafting of nominations. There is a lack of continuity in the recommendations that are made to improve the management and conservation of tangible and intangible heritage in the region. The establishment of a Category II Research Centre on SIDS or Small States could be developed to assist regional heritage practitioners to develop systems for documentation;
- States Parties must inventory all relevant cultural and natural values that are relevant to sites even if some values do not have "OUV" so that they can be conserved and managed through management systems;

- The role of intangible heritage and connection to national identity must be demonstrated in nominations.

### **FIELD TRIP (Western Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison)**

Mr. Kevin Farmer, Deputy Director of the BMHS led participants on a walking tour of Western Bridgetown where participants discussed some ongoing projects to enhance the OUV of the property through the creation of public spaces and restoration projects that will speak to community development and public education. Participants reviewed the following ongoing and potential projects:

1. **Constitution River Redevelopment Project Phase II** which will restore some of the original features of the tidal estuary of the Constitution River which dissects Historic Bridgetown and creates one of two (2) historic port spaces in the property, the Careenage. Participants noted the need for community consultation and the implementation of a sustainable handover plan that would create economic opportunities for urban communities and limit pollution of the river system to prevent flooding. Participants also noted the need for a holistic residential vision for the project that would ensure that local residential communities benefit from improved amenity.
2. **Central Bank of Barbados' Mason Hall Restoration Project** which has restored the original site of Harrison Free School established in 1733 and is one of the earliest free schools established in the Caribbean. It will house a philatelic and numismatic museum which will allow visitors to Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison to explore the economic development of the property. Participants evaluated the project from an architectural authenticity standpoint as well as a measure that would provide employment opportunities for residents of the property and economic stimulus for businesses in the area.
3. **Church Village Redevelopment Project** which will create a public green space for Barbadians living and working within the property. Using archaeological evidence of the historic impoverished urban tannery located outside of St. Michael's Cathedral, the site will be redeveloped providing landscaped green space with cultural facilities such as an amphitheatre and interpretation about the original residents of the site.
4. **Queen's Park (potential for the restoration and redevelopment of urban park space).** Participants explored the original property which was the historic headquarters for the Commander of the British Troops for the Leeward Islands Station. Now managed by the National Conservation Commission and the Ministry of Culture, the site is in need of cultural resource management that would include a restoration and interpretation plan for the site as well as a community-centred activity plan to bring life back into the park.

## **SESSION 4:**

### **VISION OF TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE IN NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES<sup>6</sup>**

Moderator Dr. Kevin Farmer

The St. George's Fortified System was the selected case for this session and Michael Jessamy, Heritage Conservation Officer in the Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation and Culture, delivered a presentation on it. Experts of UNESCO have visited some sites in Grenada including the St George's Fortified System. These series of site visits by the international body began in 2001 when Grenada started preparations for the listing of sites on the Tentative List.

Grenada is important in the Caribbean as it was the head of the Windward Islands from 1885. There are several considerations concerning the military aspect of heritage that the town possesses. There are several establishments that were once affiliated or still are affiliated with Fort George (i.e. For instance, Market Square, the General Hospital Compound among others) additionally; there are several military structures throughout the island like magazines systems and open ramparts.

Fires have been largely responsible for destroying the built heritage of much of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Building Code of 1792 was established as a result of fires. Most of the buildings which have remained in St George's are from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. These buildings reflect those of the 18<sup>th</sup> century which was destroyed by fire. Their major characteristics are red clay tiles and ballast bricks.

There were eight (8) fortifications used during the heyday of the fortified system of St George's. The Richmond Hill Forts, which were largely created to serve Fort George, was a retreat [refuge] fort. Fort George, on the other hand, is a Citadel which protected the harbour. It is also a Coastal fort. The Fortified system was largely started by the French at a time of rivalry between the British and French for colonies in the Caribbean.

Mr Jessamy outlined the OUV of the site saying that the fortifications are not just the battlements, formerly located in several parts in the town. The fortifications, have in several ways, defined the Capital. It can be considered as a Fortified City. He stated that the following points could be developed for the Justification of Inscription:

1. The forts were built by enslaved labour. Approximately, 1, 000 enslaved peoples from the plantation built the Richmond Hill forts and many were able to gain some financial reward for their labour as they were paid.
2. The Town of St George is one of the largest commissariat in the English speaking Caribbean. The area is the Financial Complex of the country.
3. Fort George, in particular, is highly significant because it is involved in a number of important political and military episodes of the island's history including the more contemporary history. Town first established with Fort George from 1706 to 1710.

He highlighted the major management issues affecting St. George's Fortified System:

1. Change of Use: Lands in Richmond Hill.
2. Squatting: People have been squatting on these lands for over 200 years. It is believed that some of the lands have been given to people by those politicians who may not fully understand the significance of the site. There are some concrete structures on the site.
3. Intrusive Development: Telecommunications companies have erected their antennas on the site of Richmond Hill because of the height of the hill itself. Fort Frederick for

---

<sup>6</sup> Session conducted by Dr. Kevin Farmer, Barbados Museum & Historical Society and notes taken by Rapporteur: Ms. Katherine Blackman, Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (CERMES), UWI, assisted by Ms. Candia Mitchell, Department of History and Philosophy, UWI

instance is located on a hill which rises to 730 feet above sea level. Nevertheless, these antennas have proved disadvantageous because they are placed within the buffer zone.

4. Sale of Heritage Properties: Some of the other forts have been sold by successive Governments of Grenada.
5. Looting: Rocks and bricks have been removed from Fort Frederick and Fort Matthew and used in buildings in St George's
6. Disaster: Hurricane Ivan changed the landscape. Resources that had already been granted from the EU for the rehabilitating of the forts were reallocated to other rehabilitation programmes.

Queries from participants included a discussion on how the community is involved in the heritage interpretation and management. Some discussed the potential of the site to explain the Intangible orientation of Caribbean heritage sites as being in the social consciousness of the people. Participants also identified the need to develop the site as a *Site of Memory*, which could include the fallout of the Grenada Revolution. Rigol advised Jessamy to start with a comparative analysis with other sites in the region and internationally.

Participants also suggested that strategic partnerships needed to be developed at all levels to ensure that the heritage of St. George's Fortified System was preserved. Caribbean heritage practitioners cannot achieve their goals on their own and needed to assemble a team of competent technical people in various parts of government and the community to produce a nomination and get state support.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Given the development agendas of Caribbean SIDS, it is essential for heritage practitioners to demonstrate how heritage conservation can fit into sustainable development for disaster risk preparedness; housing and sanitation; tourism; and community development;
- Caribbean heritage practitioners must also enlist the support of technical experts and governmental support to produce nominations and develop management plans;
- Caribbean heritage practitioners must also advocate for the utilization of UNESCO WH Preparatory Assistance (and other EU or multilateral instruments) to help with the production of nominations and conservation of heritage.

#### **SESSION 4: CONTINUATION <sup>7</sup>**

Dr. Cleve Scott contributed also with the moderator for the second-half of Session 4. The intent of the session was to highlight the experiences of the Barbados team in developing their dossier for Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison (HBG); and to inform the other countries present of some of the useful strategies that could be employed when developing their dossiers. The panel consisted of Mr. Steve Devonish, Ms. Sheron Johnson and Ms. Alissandra Cummins.

#### **Mr. Steve Devonish, Director of the Natural Heritage Department, Government of Barbados**

Mr. Devonish spoke on the importance of having both technical and political support. Often in the region the technical capacity is well established; however, the political environment (locally, regionally, and internationally) needs to be established. Demonstrating how Barbados was able

---

<sup>7</sup> Moderating Dr. Alissandra Cummins, Chair Barbados National Commission for UNESCO

to establish its political presence in the heritage arena, Devonish discussed the journey of the country's appointment to the WH Committee which led to the formation of professional relationships with a number of member States.

Speaking of the experience after the initial nomination for HBG was deferred, Devonish said Barbados was comfortable that the technical components were sound; the weaknesses, however, lied in the evaluation of the dossier. A team was therefore set up to address the critiques of the dossier, and presented their case in an impactful way to the evaluators of the WH Committee. Ultimately the case was successful because it was delivered on the grounds of technical credibility, political competence, and the support of CARICOM.

#### **Ms. Sheron Johnson, Senior Cultural Policy Officer Government of Barbados**

Ms. Johnson stated that advocacy was critical to the nomination process. A number of well-placed stakeholders were identified and utilised as advocates for the site. These core persons formed the WH Taskforce who had the mandate to produce the nomination dossier. A technical committee was also set up by the Cabinet.

One of the main lessons learnt from the nomination of HBG was the need for community involvement from the inception of the nomination process. It is important that communities are made aware of the purpose and benefits of the nomination – how it relates to them and how they would be involved. While this level of community involvement was not done in the initial stages of the nomination for HBG, the team have outlined a number of actions in the Management Plan geared at raising community/public awareness. Examples of actions include:

- Establishing a subcommittee for capacity building and education
- Establishing a public awareness committee (includes meeting with Permanent Secretaries of various government departments)
- Public tours of the site
- Public lectures
- Panel discussions
- Outreach programmes in conjunction with the Ministry of Education
- Pictorial exhibitions

Ms. Johnson highlighted the following plans for the future:

- Working more closely with the Ministry of International Affairs to strengthen connections/involvement of the Diaspora;
- Involving the youth (through Facebook and the creation of 'Apps')
- Involving artists
- Developing a list of benefits (e.g. entrepreneurship through the provision of tours and souvenirs; opportunities for funding; opportunities to enhance cultural identity; tie-in with cultural industries; promotion of sustainability).

#### **Ms. Alissandra Cummins, Chair, Barbados National Commission for UNESCO**

Ms. Cummins presented on the procedures Barbados followed when developing the nomination of HBG. She stated that it was necessary to build a foundation of knowledge about the WH Convention, the operational guidelines, and what is needed for a nomination. This information must then be transmitted to the relevant players and groups involved in the nomination process.

Ms. Cummins pointed out that most countries should have developed a Tentative List; and it is solely the decision of the State Party what is nominated. It is also important to establish boundaries. That is, the emphasis should be on the OUV and focal features of the nomination.

It is important to note that while there is a committee that coordinates the nomination process, the dossier is not written by the committee. Consideration must therefore be given to how labour would be divided. The specific knowledge bases (experts) required will be determined by the attributes of the nomination. In the case of Barbados, there was a research team (dealing with the historical aspects) and a technical team (looking at management of the site, monitoring and conservation of the site, legal frameworks, etc.). It is recommended that the two teams do not work simultaneously. Enough time should be allocated so the research team could first produce the draft dossier, which the technical team would then work from.

Ms. Cummins reiterated the importance of comparative analysis, as it is through this process that the uniqueness and global significance could be determined. The appendices are also important to include in the dossier and in fact may be larger than the dossier itself. The appendices would include things such as legislation, policy statements, and programmes, listings of technical documents, maps, and photographs. It was further suggested that an editor be contracted, as well as a graphic design and production team.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- States Parties must develop strategic partnerships at the local, national, regional and international levels to advocate for the nomination of Caribbean WH properties. They must demonstrate technical proficiency and become credible participants at the WH level, but also do the work on the ground to sustain support from local, national and regional partners. WH is a 'balancing act' for advocacy;
- The agency responsible for the WH designation and reporting/ monitoring must be able to demonstrate its ability to promote public outreach and the benefits of WH status to local communities;
- Using the experience of successful regional nominations and management practices including Barbados approach to nomination, sub-regional States Parties can become more familiar with the WH process and how it can operate to reflect the OUV of Caribbean heritage.

## **SESSION 5:**

### **COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT<sup>8</sup>**

Presentation by Ms. Zarja Rojer, Coordinator, Architecture & Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering at the University of the Netherlands Antilles

The speaker highlighted on the strategies the authorities in Curaçao have employed to involve the community and other stakeholders in the process for nomination of the Plantations in West Curaçao on the UNESCO WH List. She identified the legal and financial framework that was used to support the nomination and highlighted the roles of the various organisations that are involved in the management of the nominated site. She noted the social programme that underpinned the process which served to get community buy in for the nomination and spoke of some of the challenges impacting the sustainability of the management system.

#### **Description of the Property:**

The property which comprises four plantations (the Ascension, San Juan, Savonet and Knip plantations) is described as a cultural landscape that reflects a picture of the Caribbean slave plantations dating from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century.

---

<sup>8</sup> Moderator for this session was Kevin Farmer and notes were facilitated by Rapporteur: Ms Sheron Johnson, Ministry of Culture of Barbados

On these plantations the living memory and intangible heritage of the enslaved are still visible through the intact slave quarters, outbuildings, archaeological sites and memorials. These plantations are well maintained and are used as museums and as places to celebrate and interpret the cultural heritage. They reflect a distinctive variant of Caribbean slave plantation that evolved between the mid 17<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century and are remarkable examples of how the enslaved and other groups interacted under adverse conditions.

#### **Justification for Nomination:**

The Site has been nominated under criteria ii, v and vi.

- ii. to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
- v to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change.
- vi to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

The plantations are the product of three centuries of exceptional architecture, a unique landscape and prominent monumental art. Each plantation has a typical Curaçao mansion of landhuis. The plantations are an outstanding example of traditional dwellings and land use, characteristic of interaction with the natural environment under harsh conditions.

#### **Comparative Analysis:**

A comparison has been made with haciendas in Latin America. Both used little capital and little technology, and had little incentive to modernise. The main difference was that the plantations in Curacao were run on enslaved labour, while the haciendas employed farm hands. Unlike other plantations the Curaçao plantations did not exports goods, but what they produced formed part of the 'supportive infrastructure' of the slave trade. The plantations which are well maintained have been adapted for use as museums and for yearly activities such as markets and exhibitions. Unlike the plantations in South Africa and Indonesia these plantations because of the dry tropical climate faced challenges in terms of water management.

#### **Governance:**

As a result of a public revolt in 1969, key historic areas in Willemstad's historic core were lost to fires. This was followed by sheer neglect of the city's historic structures in the next two decades. This led to the enactment of set of legal and financial instruments for the protection of the historic city started in 1988 by ICAW Interregional Committee Action Willemstad. This legal and financial framework supports the foundation for the nomination of the Plantations. There are as follow:

1. the development of a Monuments Plan for Curaçao (1990, 2001);
2. The development of an Island Development Plan (1995);
3. the establishment of an Island Monuments Ordinance (1990);
4. the establishment of a Register of Protected Monuments;

Until 1990 only two organizations were active in the field of monument preservation:

- The Curaçao Monuments Foundation established in 1954 which has restored more than 100 monuments, offices, houses, forts, museums and public buildings
- The Curaçao Housing Foundation which has restored residences.

Under the management structure the following institutions and organizations have various roles. Monument Policy Development falls under the aegis of the Monuments Bureau which is part of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning and Housing. The Monuments Bureau is responsible for the development of a preservation policy, the implementation and enforcement of the Island Monuments Ordinance, the process of the designation of monuments and their inclusion in the Register of Protected Monuments. The Bureau coordinates the process to issue restoration and building permits. Coordination and Financing is managed by the Urban Redevelopment Secretariat which seeks to encourage people to return to urban areas to live and coordinates programs for preserving the infrastructure within the inner city.

Implementation is done by the Willemstad Urban Rehabilitation Corporation, the Curaçao Housing Foundation, Curaçao Monuments Foundation and private owners. The University of the Netherlands Antilles and the Pro Monumento Foundation play a supporting role in generating awareness.

**Other organizations are:**

The Curaçao Monuments Council which is an independent advisory body, appointed by the Island Government that comprises members who have expertise in areas related to monument preservation. The Council provides advice on monuments policy matters, criteria for the designation of monuments, appeal by owners on the designation of their property as a monument and on requests for the demolition of monuments.

In terms of funding the Curaçao Monuments Fund Foundation provides subsidies and soft loans to Government and the private sector for the restoration of monuments as well as, technical guidance during the restoration process and the provision of information and advice to prospective clients, architects and contractors on legal, financial, technical and preservation matters.

**Community Involvement:**

A bottom up approach to community involvement has been implemented where various stakeholders including neighbourhood development teams are involved in the management and development of the Historic Inner City.

**Case study: Fleur de Marie**

Fleur de Marie which is a densely populated area is the home to workers of the oil company and once was a ghetto area. It since has been revitalized through a social programme that has improved the housing stock, provided training for the residents and has seen a sports field provided for the community. As part of the revitalized programme the structure of the small houses were kept and the residents themselves have embarked on projects such as establishing their own markets and setting up projects to showcase their intangible heritage. In one project the community was taught to separate its own garbage.

When Curaçao became autonomous, the Netherlands had to start over and provide financial assistance to the citizens where it was needed. An action plan was already drafted that could be implemented immediately. The implementation of which, saw a huge impact on the city and people living there. It is necessary to keep doing the social work.

### **Other important organizations:**

The Curacao Monuments Foundation which is mandated to acquire, restore and manage cultural property and save it for future generations and to promote public awareness and interest for Curaçao's cultural heritage;

The Willemstad Urban Rehabilitation Corporation, which is set up as a commercial enterprise that purchases and restores historic buildings and places them on the real estate market.

The Curaçao Housing Foundation which is active in the field of social housing and since the late-eighties has acquired quite a number of dwellings for restoration in the 'Action Areas' for monument preservation in the inner city. It also contributes to the strengthening of the residential function of the historic inner city.

In addition there are a number of private parties who see the value of preserving the inner city along the shoreline and inwards and assist in the effort. However there have been instances of friction between these private parties and Government who may have different views as to the use and ownership of the alleyways between the houses.

The Pro Monumento Foundation acts as a pressure group with a watchdog function. It continuously monitors developments and projects within the historic areas and where necessary takes actions against developers or the government. It also assists in raising public awareness among the public.

The University of the Netherlands works on the educational and awareness component of the curriculum within the Architecture and Civil Engineering Programme and this has been extended to teachers in the high schools. The University has also hosted CCBP course on modules 1&5.

### **Problems**

In 2010 when Curaçao, the Netherlands, and Aruba separated and the Netherlands became autonomous, it resulted in a dislocation and loss of several government key organizations and personnel. The implementation of the Management plan has been a casualty. Its implementation is needed in order to guarantee the continuous preservation of all its areas and to properly face development pressures. What now is needed is a stronger government entity to address heritage issues and a coordinator or site manager with enough power to enforce action. There is also a need for further awareness and involvement.

Participants were interested in the funding mechanism for the conservation and management of heritage in Curaçao. The entire mechanism is funded by NGOs who receive funding from the Netherlands, which is a distinct difference to the heritage is funded in the English-speaking Caribbean.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Community involvement must underpin WH nominations, and should begin before the site is nominated. The use of a bottom up approach allows community involvement in the management process.
- The session highlighted yet another management model that could be used by Caribbean State Parties, different from those found in the English-speaking Caribbean, but equally effective supported by a different kind of legal framework. The State Party has a relatively strong legal and financial framework that supports for the nomination of the Plantations.
- The integration of social programming through poverty alleviation schemes demonstrates how strategies such as housing and other amenities, funding, sports facilities can be used to successfully transform the lives of the communities using heritage.

- The implementation of incentive schemes was a unique funding model that provides subsidies and loans for persons who want to restore historic properties. This is a model that could be adopted by the region.
- The development of thematic studies on the Caribbean is a way forward for research and documentation on Caribbean heritage sites.<sup>9</sup>

## **SESSION 5:**

### **COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PANEL DEBATE**

Moderation of the session by Dr Tara Inniss<sup>10</sup>

After an introduction, participants agreed that there were three (3) main rationales for community participation in the identification, nomination, conservation and management of heritage sites in the Caribbean:

- To understand the role of communities in determining their own heritage values within the Caribbean;
- To communicate the benefits of WH to communities; and
- To create meaningful or “genuine” engagement with communities using participatory approaches.

1. Communities in the Caribbean require an identification and nomination process that highlights the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the role of Caribbean people in creating their own identity and culture (including intangible and tangible heritage). This must be communicated and defended internationally as part of international agreements supporting cultural diversity.

2. The promotion of heritage conservation cannot be achieved without communities and states realizing the benefits of heritage. Persons living and working within sites need to have access to employment and entrepreneurship opportunities in heritage to benefit from sites so that they can understand the value of conservation. Benefits to communities are not only economic, but they can also be the creation of better tools to communicate local challenges to state authorities for better working relationships; more responsive governance; access to cultural and recreational space and a path to sustainable development. Heritage restoration must go hand in hand with social development as a comprehensive plan to alleviate poverty and provide services and employment to local communities.

3. Stakeholder analysis was seen as a critical tool for the identification of communities in small states since community stakeholders or constituents not only work and live within sites but also refer to communities of “users” who interact with sites for leisure and other activities and who have active relationships with sites on a periodic basis. For example, in La Soufriere in St. Vincent and the Grenadines users of the property include cadet corps and hiking enthusiasts who can be active advocates and managers for the identification, conservation and

---

<sup>9</sup>For example, the WH Centre (WHC) is aware of the importance of Dutch architecture and it was noted that this might be the case since in depth studies have been conducted supporting this type of architecture which serves to provide the WHC with ample information about this type of architecture, especially in countries like in Surinam and Curaçao. The session exemplified how private and public sector bodies have come together to nominate the site. Therefore, Dutch and Spanish sites have the advantage because their landscape and architecture has already been studied and documented. There are instances where a State Party brings a nomination to WHC and it may be at a disadvantage because WHC lacks knowledge about the property. It was stressed that education of WHC about the region must be part of the nomination process and that research and education must be something that the rest of the Caribbean will have to address.

<sup>10</sup>Moderator: Tara Inniss, Notes taken by Rapporteur: Ms Sheron Johnson, Ministry of Culture of Barbados

management (monitoring and evaluation) of WH sites. The inclusion of these groups broadens the base for which heritage can be supported in small states.

Stakeholder analysis must be operational at several levels of the administration and management of sites, taking into consideration the special interests of groups that can be used in conservation and management. Stakeholders at the administrative level include governmental and non-governmental levels and communities who live and work in the site should be involved in the identification and management of sites. We should avoid artificial groupings and organisations that do not truly reflect the community or that are created solely for the purpose of meeting the requirement for stakeholder consultation.

Participants also agreed that at the community level, participation had to be “genuine” in which partnerships were created between heritage managers and users and inhabitants of sites in the conservation and management of sites where real benefits were communicated and realized for persons who reside and work within or near sites (see above).

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

- When working with diverse Caribbean communities at all levels, heritage practitioners must ensure that the following considerations are used as rationales for “genuine” community participation and empowerment in the conservation and management of heritage:
  - 1) To understand the role of communities in determining their own heritage values within the Caribbean;
  - 2) To communicate the benefits of WH to communities; and
  - 3) To create meaningful or “genuine” engagement with communities using participatory approaches to identifying heritage sites and managing them.

## **SESSION 6:**

### **CARIBBEAN NETWORKING**

Session introduced by Dr Alissandra Cummins<sup>11</sup>

Ms. Cummins started the session with discussing how achievements and progress developed after the 2004 Caribbean Action Plan for WH (Suzhou, China 28<sup>th</sup>COM) and what needs to be improved and updated to involve Caribbean territories and local communities in WH benefits.

Victor Marin mentioned the actions taken under the Caribbean Capacity Building Programme (CCBP) and sites considered in the Caribbean highlighting on the need to widespread the concepts and thematic focus. Later on Zarja Roger explained the focus from UNA for university approaches and agreements made by the university.

Dr Scott referred to the convenience of defining scopes and how other indicators than skills and capacities can be done as fund raising, disciplines exchanges, Ms. Cummins explained on the relevance for a regional approach over local cases and read parts quoted from a meeting held in Barbados related to Heritage and the implementation of Barbados Plan of Action for the WH property and for Mauritius Strategy.

Dr. Inniss discussed the role UWI can play in the development of dossiers and management plans for WH. The UWI is a successful regional institution [Cave Hill Campus, Barbados; Open Campus, Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean; Mona Campus, Jamaica and St. Augustine,

---

<sup>11</sup> Moderators Dr. Alissandra Cummins and Victor Marin, UNESCO CCBP and notes taken by Dr Tara Inniss UWI

Trinidad and Tobago] with significant capacity to facilitate capacity building; consultancies and networking. The Government of Barbados has already supported the notion of establishing a Category II Research Centre in Barbados that would contribute to the organization of these activities in the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) and small Caribbean States. Dr Carter also supported the notion that Cave Hill Campus, UWI already has significant capacity in research on the Eastern Caribbean.

Maria Smith discussed the need to develop online courses for wider dissemination of heritage training. Similar outreach can be conducted at other regional tertiary-level institutions and through the UWI Open Campus. Katherine Blackman, from the UWI Centre for Environmental Resource Management and Sustainability (CERMES) at Cave Hill Campus, exposed on the different courses and approaches from UWI point of view.

Dr Scott spoke on the need for continuity between exchanges at UNESCO meetings and to ensure that there is a steady development of WH nominations. Deidre Myers highlighted the need for more comparative studies and an archive of data which appraises the values of the sites. Dr Rigol spoke celebrating Dr Scott remark on continuity and mentioned the need of publications and compile declarations and positions held in several events so UNESCO or universities could spread that info that should be gathered and edited for common use as referential documents.

Dr Scott asked about the role of National Commissions (NAT COM) in these courses Alissandra explains how NAT COMS are interface in between UNESCO and States Parties (including government and civil society) and the position that NAT COM may help for establishing the national Heritage Committee.

Dr. Inniss discussed the problems identified and how to proceed, which could be addressed by universities. Cummins proposed to consider how a Category II Research Centre may help to foster links in the region. Ms. Rojer explained that at the University of the Netherlands Antilles (UNA) could use their Library services to help assist in identifying heritage-related documentation. Candia Mitchell discussed the need for more publications and Isabel Rigol mentioned the convenience of producing Caribbean manuals.

Ms. Cummins insisted on a database and the need for better accessibility to documents in time and information considering that libraries in most cases are passive recipients of information and other tools should be also considered to make it more accessible.

Rosene Reid from Natural Heritage Department discussed Youth Path projects and the outcomes. The idea of Youth Path was very welcome by Jamaica and Maria Smith mentioned on the use of that UNESCO program as useful for BJCMNP and Marin highlighted on the need of opening minds and knocking to different UNESCO (and other entities') doors to look for integrity and the need of a task force.

Ms Cummins summarizes the session highlighting the issues which arose and mentioned the need for considering accessible ideas and activities allowing us to share better the available resources and those we may have widening our outreach. Amongst those ideas the enlargement of the number of CCBP modules as to integrate capacities, on assessing environmental impacts on heritage was also considered.

A Matrix (S.W.O.T.) was constructed with the participants and some expressed on the need for resource documents. Other inputs were referred to different Universities and the large collection of local documents produced to be made accessible for other countries.

The opportunities provided by CCBP modules and those for the use of the existing back-up resources manuals from WHC were also highlighted, considering also resources from the advisory bodies to the WH convention.

Participants also remarked on the need of interdisciplinary approach and to improve coordination and ensure continuity and more integrated capacity building actions the need of better updated visions on HERITAGE was remarked.

The need of an adequate cultural policy to be implemented on heritage issues was exposed by Dr Cleve Scott considering it should be in the agenda of the ministers at CARICOM level and other international coordination mechanisms

Debates on how to focus on these and other points were interesting and involved all participants. Importance to address to ICOMOS national committees informing and requesting for involvement was highlighted by Dr. Rigol on behalf the advisory body, she insisted also on the need of engaging local communities as well as let them being included in the promotion, attention and benefits of the sites. Information on ICOMOS and USA National trust web site was mentioned remarking on community involvements initiatives.

Michael Jessamy referred to ongoing OAS initiative for the Caribbean on heritage as well as Zarja Rojers referred to a recent study on Caribbean Tourism.

The transcription of the SWOT matrix is displayed in next page:

<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Capacity to deliver CCBP academic/ professional development programmes based on Caribbean environment and experiences i.e.) University of the Netherlands Antilles (UNA) --Department of Architecture and Engineering (Heritage and Restoration); The University of the West Indies (UWI) Cave Hill Campus -- CERMES, Department of History and Philosophy; Department of Management Studies and Biological and Chemical Sciences (also potential at Mona, St. Augustine and Jamaica University of Technology)</li> <li>• EUCARINET [EUCARINET is a four-year INCONET Coordination Action, supported by the European Commission (DG RTD-INCO), whose main goal is to strengthen bi-regional sustainable dialogue on Science and Technology between Europe and the Caribbean <a href="http://www.eucarinet.eu/">http://www.eucarinet.eu/</a>]</li> <li>• Strong advocates for heritage in-country</li> <li>• Regional organizations and platforms for culture/ heritage/ heritage tourism exist such as CARICOM OAS, bilateral agendas</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linguistic barriers (Dutch at UNA/ English at UWI)</li> <li>• Lack on training on history and heritage</li> <li>• Lack of coordination and continuity</li> <li>• Insufficient Interaction with regional universities and with those with existing research entities/programs</li> <li>• Lack of participation in ICOMOS and IUCN</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of a Category II Research Centre in the region</li> <li>• Regional and in-country use of expertise at regional universities</li> <li>• Database of regional research /expertise which is accessible and sustainable</li> <li>• New courses focused on WH and an interdisciplinary approach to WH</li> <li>• More capacity building programmes for regional institutions</li> <li>• Heritage as a plank for sustainable development</li> <li>• Linking Sustainable Tourism and Heritage at the national and regional levels</li> <li>• Stronger legal frameworks for effective management of heritage</li> <li>• Forum UNESCO University and Heritage</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of awareness and enforcement</li> <li>• Human resource loss</li> <li>• State budget not focused on culture and heritage</li> <li>• Lack of regional integrations and approaches on Tourism and Heritage</li> </ul>

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Consider establish a Research Centre for the Caribbean sub-region (probably under Category II centre) which may be related to global challenges on the protection of World Heritage in Small Island Developing States.
- Foster more exchanges and cooperation among regional tertiary-level institutions, including universities;
- Develop more Internet-based capacity building courses through regional universities;
- Encourage more use of local and regional experts at regional universities;
- Publish more documents, manuals and thematic studies related to exposing the OUV of Caribbean heritage.

### Session for concluding remarks

After the previous session, there was short time given for concluding remarks and participants thanked the organizers. Participants received their Participation Certificates delivered by UWI and UNESCO organizers.

### Additional report on Field Trip (The Industrial Heritage of Barbados: The Story of Sugar)

On the next day Friday 15 March a field visit was conducted by Mr Kevin Farmer, Deputy Director of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society. Participants discussed how to proceed with drafting the nomination dossier and management plans for the properties included in the current serial nomination comprising, Newton Enslaved Burial Ground; Codrington College, Morgan Lewis and St. Nicholas Abbey.

Debates and recommendations made were integrated as a Way Forward for the nomination of this property presented later as a draft compilation of the nomination dossier at The Caribbean Training Course in the Preparation of Nomination Dossiers for WH 24- 28 March 2013, St. Mary's, Antigua & Barbuda.

The Barbados Delegation was particularly grateful for the insights and recommendations provided by the participants to the visit. After the visit some review was made and the protection of the property's OUV and factors affecting the conservation of the property were summarized in a presentation made at the Antigua workshop on May 25, 2013.

The recommendations now encompass elements of community participation in the management of cultural resources in a natural environment as a direct result of the assistance provided in this workshop.

## EVALUATION

Participants completed an evaluation of the Training Course. Here are some of the Comments recorded by participants. Eleven (11) forms were received.

1. How useful was this workshop in strengthening your capacity in completing the draft nomination file?  
Very Useful – 9  
Somewhat useful – 2  
Not Useful – 0

*Sample Comments:*

- It is extremely useful and necessary to obtain critique, direction and focus from colleagues engaged in the WH process. This was very good for the sites presented and reviewed and discussed.
- Gave new ideas to addressing the issues such as OUV.
- I have garnered a wealth of expertise on how to write a nomination file. Two of the ones I would always remember is beginning with a comparative analysis and determining OUV.

2. How useful were the presentations and activities used to deliver the sessions?

Very Useful – 9  
Somewhat useful – 2  
Not Useful – 0

*Sample Comments:*

- It was a good exercise to learn from other countries & help them where needed. More group exercises are needed.
- Presentations on the role of IUCN, aspects of cultural landscapes and the ICH Convention were useful and clarify issues/ uncertainties in these areas.

3. How useful was the field trip exercise?

Very Useful – 8  
Somewhat useful – 1  
Not Useful – 0  
Did not respond – 2

*Sample Comments:*

- The field trip exercise was enlightening. Barbadians seem proud of their heritage and quite appreciative as well. This I think is lacking in my country. I have a better awareness of heritage and its outstanding value in society.
- This allowed participants to link the theory with the physical site.

4. What did you like best about this workshop?

*Sample Comments:*

- The sharing among participants and presenters.
- It was very interactive. The documents were useful and clear. The recommendations were practical. The discussion was fruitful.

Caribbean Networking – how we can move forward.

5. What could have been improved about this workshop?

*Sample Comments:*

- A bit of more focus on natural heritage and maritime landscapes.
- One on one discussions with experts to help with cases

6. Any other comments/ suggestions

*Sample Comments:*

- Inclusion of Postgrads: Each could have been asked to present on some of the work they have done.
- Perhaps more representation from across the region. Good to hear the concerns about our neighbours. Would enhance regional cooperation.

- More group work – maybe preparing a nomination paper based on a site visit in the host country; maybe meet with a community

7. How would you rate the facilities at the hotel?

- i. Rooms: Average
- ii. Dining: Average
- iii. Workshop meeting rooms and facilities: Average



Ministry of Education, Culture and  
Science of the Netherlands



BARBADOS  
National Commission  
for UNESCO

## Report of the Workshop:

### Management of Caribbean cultural resources in a natural environment: Sites of Memory and participation of local communities, Barbados, 11-15 March 2013

#### Summary of Recommendations from the Sessions

Recommendations arising out of this Training Course should be considered for follow up meetings, periodic reporting and a review of the Caribbean Plan of Action in 2014.

#### GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Caribbean heritage practitioners, and especially managers, need to understand the role of the advisory bodies in the evaluation of sites, especially those relating to the natural sites or those possessing natural values. Therefore, increased engagement with advisory bodies such as IUCN on a sub-regional level is needed.
2. Due to the nature of Caribbean heritage sites that often possess both natural and cultural values --the development of Caribbean cultural heritage has been influenced by the historical relationship between humans and their terrestrial and marine environments -- there should be more engagement with natural heritage advisors and local/ regional biodiversity experts, including IUCN, Ministry of Environment officials, the NGO community and The University of the West Indies (UWI) or other regional universities.
3. IUCN may consider an analysis of which sites are not inscribed or are deferred and on what grounds does this occur.
4. Specific recommendations for the nomination of the Jamaica Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park
  - Support the work that is being done by the State Party's management committee to improve the dossier;
  - Since mixed properties must demonstrate OUV of both culture and nature and how these values are used/ transformed by people in their environment, more analysis is required for the demonstration of the interrelationship between the Maroons and their environment;
  - Strengthen all sections of the Nomination Dossier especially the Executive Summary; maps; documentation and referencing; representation of information visually (ie. photos, tables, figures, etc.) and Comparative Analysis;
  - Use inclusive language when discussing the heritage of communities (i.e. Maroons) since this is a representation of the State Party's national heritage and its contribution to the heritage of humanity;

- Use regional institutions such as UWI to assist in the drafting of sections of the dossier especially the History and Development and Justification for Inscription and the Documentation sections;
  - Deepen the Comparative Analysis based on local (i.e Cockpit Country), regional (i.e. Suriname) and international examples of Maroonage where relevant (i.e. comparisons with the Haitian Revolution are not necessary);
  - Strengthen and update the management plans to consider and mitigate threats to the conservation and management of the property;
  - Develop a comprehensive cultural resource management plan with identification; conservation; interpretation and management of all maroon sites clearly articulated;
  - Explore the co-management potential of communities to conserve and manage their cultural and natural heritage themselves or at least participate meaningfully (equally) with state managers.
5. For the best use and management of tangible cultural resources, the Caribbean can make special claims regarding the intangible values of its sites, especially Cultural Landscapes due to its history of indigenous occupation; Global labour and trade connections i.e. enslavement and expressions of creolisation and freedom that have OUV;
  6. States Parties may consider pursuing serial nominations based on shared history and heritage;
  7. Nominations should develop the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage.
    - Caribbean heritage practitioners and UNESCO must inventory all of the relevant reports arising out of UNESCO processes and meetings relating to Caribbean natural and cultural heritage to ensure the continuity and dissemination of relevant information that States Parties can use in the drafting of nominations.
    - There is a lack of continuity in the recommendations that are made to improve the management and conservation of tangible and intangible heritage in the region. The establishment of a Category II Research Centre on SIDS or Small States could be developed to assist regional heritage practitioners to develop systems for documentation;
    - States Parties must inventory all relevant cultural and natural values that are relevant to sites even if some values do not have “OUV” so that they can be conserved and managed through management systems;
    - The role of intangible heritage and connection to national identity must be demonstrated in nominations.
    - Given the development agendas of Caribbean SIDS, it is essential for heritage practitioners to demonstrate how heritage conservation can fit into sustainable development for disaster risk preparedness; housing and sanitation; tourism; and community development;
    - Caribbean heritage practitioners must also enlist the support of technical experts and governmental support to produce nominations and develop management plans; Caribbean heritage practitioners must also advocate for the utilization of UNESCO WH Preparatory Assistance (and other EU or multilateral instruments) to help with the production of nominations and conservation of heritage.
  8. States Parties must develop strategic partnerships at the local, national, regional and international levels to advocate for the nomination of Caribbean WH properties. They must demonstrate technical proficiency and become credible participants at the WH

level, but also do the work on the ground to sustain support from local, national and regional partners. WH is a 'balancing act' for advocacy;

- The agency responsible for the WH designation and reporting/ monitoring must be able to demonstrate its ability to promote public outreach and the benefits of WH status to local communities;
  - Using Caribbean accumulated experience on successful regional nominations, regional States Parties can become more familiar with the WH process and how it can operate to reflect the OUV of Caribbean heritage.
  - Community involvement must underpin WH nominations, and should begin before the site is nominated. The use of a bottom up approach allows community involvement in the management process.
9. The session highlighted yet another management model that could be used by Caribbean State Parties, different from those found in the English-speaking Caribbean, but equally effective supported by a different kind of legal framework:
- The State Party has a relatively strong legal and financial framework that supports for the nomination of the Plantations.
  - The integration of social programming through poverty alleviation schemes demonstrates how strategies such as housing and other amenities, funding, sports facilities can be used to successfully transform the lives of the communities using heritage.
  - The implementation of incentive schemes was a unique funding model that provides subsidies and loans for persons who want to restore historic properties. This is a model that could be adopted by the region.
  - The development of thematic studies on the Caribbean is a way forward for research and documentation on Caribbean heritage sites.
  - When working with diverse Caribbean communities at all levels, heritage practitioners must ensure that the following considerations are used as rationales for "genuine" community participation and empowerment in the conservation and management of heritage:
    - To understand the role of communities in determining their own heritage values within the Caribbean;
    - To communicate the benefits of WH to communities; and
    - To create meaningful or "genuine" engagement with communities using participatory approaches to identifying heritage sites and managing them.
10. Considering new categories of UNESCO centres it was exposed the idea of establish a Category II Research Centre for the specifically for the Caribbean sub-region which may be also related to global SIDS and small developing states and also:
- Foster more exchanges and cooperation among regional tertiary-level institutions, including universities;
  - Develop more Internet-based capacity building courses through regional universities;
  - Encourage more use of local and regional experts at regional universities;
  - Publish more documents, manuals and thematic studies related to exposing the OUV of Caribbean heritage.



**Management of Caribbean cultural resources in a natural environment:  
Sites of Memory and participation of local communities  
Barbados, 11 – 15 March 2013**

*Final List of participants, updated after the Workshop*

#	Country	Name	Position/Organization	Contacts
1	Barbados	Dr. Alissandra Cummins	Chairperson Barbados National Commission for UNESCO Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development. The Elsie Payne Complex,	Tel: 246-427-0201/246-436-1956 Fax: 246-429-5946 <a href="mailto:alissandra.cummins@gmail.com">alissandra.cummins@gmail.com</a>
2		Dr, Richard Goodridge	Department of History & Philosophy Cave Hill Campus, UWI Barbados	<a href="mailto:richard.goodridge@cavehill.uwi.edu">richard.goodridge@cavehill.uwi.edu</a>
3		Dr. Tara Inniss		<a href="mailto:tara.inniss@cavehill.uwi.edu">tara.inniss@cavehill.uwi.edu</a>
4		Ms. Deidre Myers		
5		Dr. Cleve Scott		
6		Dr. Marcia Burrowes		Cultural Studies programme University of the West Indies
7		Katherine Blackman,	Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (CERMES), UWI Cave Hill Campus [Rapporteur Alternate]	<a href="mailto:katherine.blackman@cavehill.uwi.edu">katherine.blackman@cavehill.uwi.edu</a> ; <a href="mailto:katamele@yahoo.com">katamele@yahoo.com</a>
8		Dr. Janice Cumberbatch		
9		Dr. Neetha Selliah		
10		Prof. Sean Carrington	Department for Biological and Chemical Sciences. University of the West Indies /UWI	
11		Prof Julia A. Horrocks		
12		Ms. Sheron Johnson	Senior Cultural Policy Officer, Ministry of Family, Culture, Sports and Youth	Haggat Hall, St. Michael. <a href="mailto:sheronj@gmail.com">sheronj@gmail.com</a>
13		Mr. Steve	Director, Natural Heritage	

		Devonish,	Department and Vice-Chairperson of the Barbados World Heritage Committee, Government of Barbados.	
14	Curacao	Ms. Zarja Rojer	Co-ordinator Architecture & Civil Eng Faculty of Engineering University of the Netherlands Antilles Curaçao	<a href="mailto:zarja.rojer@una.an">zarja.rojer@una.an</a>
15	Grenada	Michael J. J. Jessamy	Heritage Conservation Officer Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation and Culture	1-473-440-0366 work Cell 435-6990 <a href="mailto:homemchessamy@hotmail.com">homemchessamy@hotmail.com</a>
16	Jamaica	Ms Debra Kay Palmer	Manager – Heritage Preservation & Planning/World Heritage Jamaica National Heritage Trust 79 Duke Street, Kingston, Jamaica	Tel: 876.922.1287-8 or 876.922.3990 Fax: 876.967.0924 <a href="mailto:debrakaypalmer@jnht.com">debrakaypalmer@jnht.com</a> <a href="mailto:debbiepal99@yahoo.co.uk">debbiepal99@yahoo.co.uk</a>
17		Dr Maria Smith	Programme Manager , Jamaica National Commission for UNESCO	Tel: 926-5480; 618-1332 Fax: 929-4022 <a href="mailto:mariaasmith@hotmail.com">mariaasmith@hotmail.com</a>
18	Saint Vincent & Grenadines	Ms Lavern Bentick-Phillips	Administrative Assistant for the SVG National Trust.	<a href="mailto:svgntrust@gmail.com">svgntrust@gmail.com</a> 7844512921(W) 7845331769(cell)
19	Cuba*	Isabel Rigol ICOMOS	Member of the ICOMOS Academy Honorarium President ICOMOS Cuba	120 Calle 28 Playa Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba phone: 53.7.203 2960 <a href="mailto:irigol@cubarte.cult.cu">irigol@cubarte.cult.cu</a>
20	Costa Rica*	Jose Courrau IUCN	Coordinator, Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use. IUCN/ Mesoamerica Office Caribbean Initiative	P. O Box 607 – 2050 San Pedro de Montes de Oca. San José, Costa Rica Phone: + 506.2283.8449 Fax: + 506.2283.8472 <a href="mailto:Jose.COURRAU@uicn.org">Jose.COURRAU@uicn.org</a>
<b>UNESCO</b>				
21	Havana	Victor Marin	CCBP Coordinator UNESCO Havana Office Calzada 551, Vedado La Habana 10400	UNESCO Havana Calzada 551, Vedado La Habana 10400 phone: 537 8327741 / 833 3438 (ext 116) <a href="mailto:v.marin@unesco.org">v.marin@unesco.org</a>
22	Kingston	Himalchuli Gurung	Programme Specialist for Culture	UNESCO Kingston Cluster Office for the Caribbean The Towers, 3rd Floor, 25 Dominica Drive Kingston 5, Jamaica Tel: 876 630 5300 Fax: 876 630 5325 <a href="mailto:h.gurung@unesco.org">h.gurung@unesco.org</a>

\* ICOMOS and IUCN experts do represent the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Convention, but not necessarily the countries they are from