

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.9
Paris, 25 September 1995
Original: English

UNITED NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
Nineteenth session

Berlin, Germany

4-9 December 1995

Information Document: Report of the 'Asia-Pacific Regional
Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes', Australia, 27-29
April 1995

**THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL
WORKSHOP ON
ASSOCIATIVE CULTURAL LANDSCAPES**

**A REPORT
BY
AUSTRALIA ICOMOS
TO THE
WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**"Where the physical and spiritual unite"
Carmen Añon Feliu**

**SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE
AND
JENOLAN CAVES, BLUE MOUNTAINS
NEW SOUTH WALES
AUSTRALIA**

27-29 APRIL 1995



CONTENTS

1. Summary and Recommendations	3
2. Introduction	6
Opening session - a celebration	7
Working sessions - understanding	8
3. Defining associative cultural landscapes	8
4. Evaluating associative cultural landscapes	10
Criteria	10
Authenticity and Integrity	11
Boundaries	12
5. Managing associative cultural landscapes	13
Management	13
Monitoring	14
6. Community involvement	14
7. Testing the workshop outcomes	14
8. Implications for the Asia-Pacific region	15
Annexes	
A. List of participants	
B. Workshop programs	
C. Summaries of papers presented	

1. Summary and Recommendations

The adoption of the concept of cultural landscapes by the World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session in 1992 made the *World Heritage Convention* more applicable to a wider international audience. More specifically, in the Asia-Pacific region, the *Convention's* potential application was extended, both culturally and geographically, by the inclusion of this category of heritage. These developments are recognised as having the potential to broaden the representativeness of the World Heritage List.

The Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes held in Australia in April 1995 endorsed the findings of two recent UNESCO/ICOMOS meetings - the June 1994 *Expert Meeting on the Global Strategy and Thematic Studies for a representative World Heritage List* and the November 1994 *Nara Expert Workshop on Authenticity*. These workshops recognised that the consideration of properties of outstanding universal value needs to be contextual (recognising a place in its broader intellectual and physical context) rather than specific (as in the limited approach to viewing heritage solely as monuments or wilderness). The incorporation of the cultural landscape concept in the *Operational Guidelines* is a positive move in this direction. A cultural landscape, in reflecting the interactions of people and their environment, is defined by its cultural and natural elements which may be inseparable.

The Workshop further endorsed the *Global Strategy* and the *Nara Document on Authenticity* as being particularly apt for the Asia-Pacific region because of the continuity of living traditions in relation to land and water within this region. The *Global Strategy* and the December 1993 *Action Plan for the Future (Cultural Landscapes)* emphasised the need for regional workshops and educational programs to increase awareness of cultural landscapes among States Parties. **To allow such programs to take place the Workshop recommended that an extension of time be granted to States Parties to incorporate cultural landscapes in their tentative lists (see the *Action Plan for the Future (Cultural Landscapes)*).**

The World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session in December 1992 revised the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* to allow for the inclusion of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List. The *Operational Guidelines* identify associative cultural landscapes as one of the categories of cultural landscapes. Paragraph 39 (iii) of the *Guidelines* states:

The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence which may be insignificant or even absent.

The Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes examined the definition, evaluation, management and monitoring of associative cultural landscapes with particular reference to the Asia-Pacific region.

The associative cultural landscape category has particular relevance to the Asia-Pacific region where the link between the physical and spiritual aspects of landscape is so important. This is especially so given the nature of cultural practices of indigenous peoples and of long-standing migration patterns through Asia to Australia and across the Pacific Ocean.

The Workshop celebrated the importance and recognition of associative cultural landscapes, exemplified by Tongariro National Park in New Zealand and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in Australia. These two properties have recently been included on the World Heritage List for their associative cultural values, complementing their earlier World Heritage listing for their natural values.

Papers and discussions at the Workshop focussed on the cultural, spiritual and inspirational values of associative cultural landscapes from the perspectives of artists, anthropologists, archaeologists, historians, landscape architects, planners and traditional custodians.

Associative cultural landscapes may be defined as large or small contiguous or non-contiguous areas and itineraries, routes or other linear landscapes - these may be physical entities or mental images embedded in a people's spirituality, cultural tradition and practice. The attributes of associative cultural landscapes include the intangible, such as the acoustic, the kinetic and the olfactory, as well as the visual.

The Workshop participants considered that in the evaluation of any associative cultural landscape for World Heritage listing, the cultural and natural criteria and conditions of authenticity, integrity and management requirements in Paragraphs 24 and 44 of the *Operational Guidelines* should be considered comprehensively.

Clarification of certain terms in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, with particular reference to Paragraph 39 (iii), was suggested as follows:

"Artistic" encompasses all forms of artistic expression including "literary";

"Cultural" includes associations with historic events and with traditions of indigenous and non-indigenous cultures;

"Landscape" includes seascapes. In discussing seascapes it was noted that the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage examines marine environments in terms of shipwrecks and other material evidence and that a useful addition to its work would be the consideration of the associative values linked to the marine environment.

The Workshop recommended that in applying cultural criterion (vi), a broader rather than a narrower interpretation be used, and that in particular oral traditions should not be excluded.

While the Workshop participants agreed that Paragraph 24 (b) (i) of the *Operational Guidelines* is relevant to associative cultural landscapes, they considered that for regional applications the definition of authenticity needed to clarify the interactions between culture and the natural environment.

The Workshop endorsed the management requirements set out under Paragraphs 24 (b) (ii) and 44 (b) (v) of the *Operational Guidelines*, including those related to integrity and control of visitation to the property nominated. Paragraph 14 of the *Operational Guidelines* was perceived to be somewhat ambiguous in intent, offering some potential for secrecy and conflict rather than the open process considered desirable.

Linkages between the evaluation and management of associative cultural landscapes need to be recognised. Close involvement of traditional custodians, as in the case of Tongariro National Park in New Zealand and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in Australia should be a prerequisite in the assessment of appropriate management regimes for such landscapes.

The Workshop noted the need for an integrated approach to the evaluation of associative cultural landscapes, combining the skills and expertise of natural and cultural heritage experts. ICOMOS should continue to be the lead agency for the evaluation of cultural landscapes but, where appropriate, the evaluation of all categories of landscape should be undertaken jointly by ICOMOS and IUCN to link their areas of expertise.

The Workshop participants considered community involvement and participation to be an important part of the identification, management and monitoring of associative cultural landscapes for World Heritage listing.

The Workshop endorsed the efforts of the World Heritage Committee to establish effective monitoring systems and to consider a cooperative regional approach to monitoring.

2. Introduction

The World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session in December 1992 revised the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* to allow for the inclusion of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List.

The *Operational Guidelines* identify associative cultural landscapes as one of the categories of cultural landscapes. Paragraph 39 (iii) of the *Guidelines* states:

The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence which may be insignificant or even absent.

The December 1993 *Action Plan for the Future (Cultural Landscapes)* recommended a regional approach to the study of such landscapes. At its seventeenth and eighteenth sessions respectively, the World Heritage Committee listed Tongariro National Park in New Zealand and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in Australia as associative cultural landscapes. In addition to these developments, a need was perceived to consider in more detail the definition of associative cultural landscapes, their evaluation, management and monitoring.

In response, Australia ICOMOS offered to organise a regional expert workshop on the World Heritage Convention and Associative Cultural Landscapes. This would follow, almost immediately, the expert regional thematic study meeting on the Asian Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes held in the Philippines.

The Australian Workshop comprised an opening, celebratory session at the Sydney Opera House on 27 April 1995. Papers delivered to the opening session at the Sydney Opera House focussed on the cultural, spiritual and inspirational values of landscapes from the perspectives of artists, anthropologists, archaeologists, historians and traditional custodians. [See attached program at Annex B and summary of papers at Annex C]. The opening session was followed by expert working sessions on associative cultural landscapes at Jenolan Caves in the Blue Mountains region of New South Wales from 28 to 29 April 1995.

The ICOMOS Workshop was sponsored by the World Heritage Branch of the Australian Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories and the Australian National Commission for UNESCO.

Three preparatory meetings were held in Australia in 1994 and 1995. At the first, held at the Australian Academy of the Humanities, Canberra, it was decided to explore associative cultural landscapes as traditional indigenous cultural landscapes (expressed, for example in traditional indigenous cultural and spiritual landscapes) and secondly, as inspirational landscapes (expressed, for example, in the creative works of poets, artists, writers etc.).

The second preparatory meeting, on Indigenous Cultural Landscapes and World Heritage Listing, was sponsored by the Australian Heritage Commission. It brought together work in progress on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander traditional cultural landscapes related to Australia's Register of the National Estate. Many of the issues identified at this meeting were also relevant to the inclusion of associative cultural landscapes in the World Heritage List.

The third meeting, related to artistic associations, was convened by the Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales to identify relevant artists and experts to examine the inspirational aspects of associative cultural landscapes.

Summarised results of the Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes are here presented to the World Heritage Committee for its consideration, together with brief background notes on the papers and preliminary meetings. A full report of the events will be published in due course for dissemination among conservation practitioners and other interested parties.

Opening session - a celebration

The opening of the Workshop at the Sydney Opera House celebrated the recognition of associative cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List through the recent listing of Tongariro National Park in New Zealand and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in Australia as cultural landscapes to complement their earlier inclusion as natural properties. The traditional custodians of Tongariro were represented at the workshop by Mr Tumu Te Heuheu and those of Uluru Kata-Tjuta were represented by Mr Yami Lester, Chair of Uluru's Board of Management.

The celebration was enhanced by the presentation by the Director-General of the UNESCO Picasso Gold Medal to the Uluru Kata-Tjuta Board of Management. This Board includes representatives of the traditional Aboriginal custodians of Uluru Kata-Tjuta and of the Australian Nature Conservation Agency. The traditional owners have majority representation on the Board of Management.

The award of the UNESCO Picasso Gold Medal to the Uluru Kata-Tjuta Board of Management was a clear demonstration of the international recognition of associative cultural landscapes as an important category of heritage environment and of the value of traditional management practices in caring for them.

In his opening address to the Workshop, the Director-General of UNESCO, Dr Federico Mayor, stressed that "man and nature are indeed inseparable" and pointed to the all-encompassing features of the *World Heritage Convention*. For too long in international fora the environment has been compartmentalised into the "natural" and the "cultural". In the Asia-Pacific region there has sometimes been a further division between indigenous and non-indigenous cultural environments. There is a growing recognition that these distinctions are

artificial and there is a need for a more integrated approach as reflected in the cultural landscape concept.

The recognition of associative cultural landscapes is particularly relevant to the Asia-Pacific region where a diversity of traditional cultures both depend on and have influenced the landscape for their corporal and spiritual well being.

Working sessions - understanding

Some thirty of the experts present at the Opera House travelled to the Jenolan Caves, a world-famous karst site in the Blue Mountains to the west of Sydney, for further workshop sessions on the *World Heritage Convention* and associative cultural landscapes. Regional participants came from Fiji/Tonga, The Philippines, Taiwan, New Zealand and Australia. Representing ICOMOS, Carmen Añon Feliu, a Spanish specialist in cultural landscapes, stressed the need for recognition of the link between the physical and spiritual aspects of landscapes.

Bing Lucas, representing the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), outlined the evolution of the concept of World Heritage cultural landscapes. Augusto Villalon brought from the Philippines the experience of the recent and related expert workshop on rice terraces as organically evolved cultural landscapes.

Participants discussed definitions, evaluation, management and monitoring, with particular emphasis on associative cultural landscapes in the Asia-Pacific region. Outcomes of the Workshop were discussed in relation to a traditional cultural landscape and an inspirational landscape to gauge the relevance of the cultural and natural criteria and the conditions of authenticity, integrity and management requirements in the *Operational Guidelines* to each case.

3. Defining associative cultural landscapes

In discussing the definition of associative cultural landscapes within the *Operational Guidelines*, and the range of types of landscapes implied within it, the Workshop considered it useful to suggest the amplification or qualification of specific terms included in Paragraph 39 (iii) of the *Guidelines*.

These suggestions were as follows:

The term "artistic" in Paragraph 39 (iii) of the *Guidelines* encompasses all forms of artistic expression, including "literary".

The term "cultural" in Paragraph 39 (iii) includes associations with historic events and with traditions of indigenous and non-indigenous cultures.

The term "landscape" in Paragraph 39 (iii) includes seascapes, so important to island and maritime people and environments. An example cited is the fisheries culture of the indigenous inhabitants of Taiwan's offshore islands. It

was noted that the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage examines marine environments in terms of shipwrecks and other material evidence and that a useful addition to its work would be the consideration of the associative values linked to the marine environment.

The Workshop discussed traditional or indigenous, and inspirational or artistic associative cultural landscapes.

Associative cultural landscapes may include large or small contiguous or non-contiguous areas and itineraries, routes or other linear landscapes - these may be physical entities or mental images embedded in a people's spirituality, cultural tradition and practice. Examples important to the Asia-Pacific region include Aboriginal dreaming tracks in Australia, the spread of Polynesian culture across the Pacific Ocean and the Silk Road from China to the West. Another example would be slave routes such as those by which indentured labourers were brought from the Pacific Islands to Queensland in Australia to work in the sugar industry.

The Workshop agreed that the attributes of associative cultural landscapes also include the intangible, such as the acoustic, kinetic (eg. air movements) and olfactory, as well as the visual (eg. patterns of light, colours and shapes in the landscape). The acoustic dimension is vital to many cultures, for example those in Papua New Guinea which are tuned to the songs of birds or the sounds of waterfalls.

It was pointed out that in Pacific and other cultures in this region, some landscapes have been created by women or carry "religious, artistic or cultural" traditions specific to women rather than men. Therefore, in identifying associative cultural landscapes, gender should be taken into account.

In this region it is vital to recognise that geographical features may have cultural significance without there being any visible archaeological evidence (see Paragraph 39 (iii) of the *Operational Guidelines*). In the absence of cultural fabric, the evidence may exist through words (eg. poetry, songs), photography or paintings - "the landscapes of memory".

Inspirational landscapes may become familiar to people through their depiction in paintings such as those of the strong nineteenth century landscape tradition in Australia exemplified by the works of Conrad Martens which had their European counterparts in the paintings of artists such as Turner.

Sydney Harbour has inspired not only local artists from the early colonial Port Jackson painters to the recent creations of Lloyd Rees, Brett Whiteley and Ken Done, but also the designers of the Harbour Bridge and the Sydney Opera House. These latter tangible inspirational responses have added to the cumulative mix of cultural and natural features in the landscape which, in turn, inspire new associative responses.

The inspirational photographs of Tasmania's Franklin River by Olegas Truchanas, Peter Dombrovskis and others have become a symbol for the wilderness movement in Australia just as Ansell Adams' evocative photographs

of the landform Half Dome in America's Yosemite National Park have become a symbol for the wilderness movement in the United States.

4. Evaluating associative cultural landscapes

The Workshop endorsed the findings of two recent UNESCO/ICOMOS meetings - the June 1994 *Expert Meeting on the Global Strategy* and the November 1994 *Nara Expert Workshop on Authenticity*. These workshops recognised that the consideration of properties of outstanding universal value needs to be contextual (recognising a place in its broader intellectual and physical context) rather than specific (as in the limited approach to viewing heritage solely as monuments or wilderness). The incorporation of the cultural landscape concept in the *Operational Guidelines* is a positive move in this direction. A cultural landscape, in reflecting the interactions of people and their environment, is defined by its cultural and natural elements which may be inseparable.

The Workshop recommended that:

The Workshop noted the need for an integrated approach to the evaluation of associative cultural landscapes, combining the skills and expertise of natural and cultural heritage experts. ICOMOS should continue to be the lead agency for the evaluation of cultural landscapes but, where appropriate, the evaluation of all categories of landscape should be undertaken jointly by ICOMOS and IUCN to link their areas of expertise.

On the question of evaluation the workshop participants addressed the following questions:

Which of the natural and cultural criteria in the *Operational Guidelines* are relevant to associative landscapes?

What constitutes the authenticity, both in character and components, and integrity required by the *Operational Guidelines* in relation to associative cultural landscapes?

How should boundaries of associative cultural landscapes be determined in relation to both functionality and intelligibility, as required by the *Operational Guidelines*?

Criteria

The Workshop recommended that, in evaluating any associative cultural landscape for World Heritage listing the criteria in Paragraphs 24 and 44 of the *Operational Guidelines* be considered comprehensively. Tongariro National Park and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park, the two places in this region now listed as associative cultural landscapes, were found to meet both cultural and natural criteria.

Cultural criteria in Paragraph 24 (a) of the *Operational Guidelines*, relating to "unique or exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilisation" (cultural criterion iii) and "associated with ... artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance" (cultural criterion vi) were clearly applicable to associative cultural landscapes. It was noted that cultural criterion (vi), according to the *Guidelines* should not be used in isolation except "in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria, cultural or natural".

Cultural criterion (iv) dealing with "landscape which illustrates significant stages in human history" and (v) relating to "an outstanding example of a traditional land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change", may also apply to associative cultural landscapes.

The Workshop recommended that in applying cultural criterion (vi) a broader rather than a narrower interpretation be used, and that in particular, oral traditions not be excluded.

The Workshop considered that the natural criterion defined in Paragraph 44 (a) (iii) may be relevant for an associative cultural landscape. The criterion highlights "superlative natural phenomena", "areas of exceptional natural beauty" and "areas of exceptional aesthetic importance". It is important that any nomination for World Heritage listing clearly specify how and why the landscape is seen as having these qualities, which may well be by cultural association.

There are management implications arising from the specific criteria used to evaluate associative cultural landscapes. The criteria in Paragraphs 44 (a) (ii) and (iv) for evaluating natural properties for World Heritage listing may, for the purposes of integrity, require the maintenance of biological diversity. While changes to Paragraph 38 have emphasised the potential for traditional cultural practices to assist the maintenance of biological diversity, management problems may arise if traditional land-use practices are seen to conflict with other nature conservation strategies.

The Workshop, noting that communities which are stakeholders in properties of World Heritage significance may not always be aware of the criteria and the listing process, supported the requirement for educational programs and full consultation with all communities which are culturally associated with the properties. It is recognised that in some instances cross-cultural differences may lead to conflicts concerning evaluation, listing and management of properties.

Authenticity and Integrity

The Workshop endorsed the wording of Paragraph 11 of the November 1994 *Nara Document on Authenticity* which states that :

All judgements about values attributed to cultural properties as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to base judgements of value and authenticity on fixed criteria. On the contrary, the

respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong.

While the Workshop participants agreed that Paragraph 24 (b) (i) of the *Operational Guidelines* is relevant to associative cultural landscapes, they considered that for regional applications the definition of authenticity needed to clarify the interactions between culture and the natural environment.

Authenticity, related to the criteria for which a place was nominated, should encompass the continuation of cultural practices which maintain the place. This authenticity, however, must not exclude cultural continuity through change, which may introduce new ways of relating to and caring for the place.

Because of the particular characteristics of associative cultural landscapes, authenticity may not refer to the maintenance of the fabric of a place, or its reconstruction to an earlier or original configuration. Instead, authenticity may mean the maintenance of a continuing association between the people and the place, however it may be expressed through time. This may on occasion necessitate the need for acceptance of some change to the landscape as well as a change in attitude to it.

The Workshop accepted the need to fulfil the conditions of integrity set out under Paragraph 44 (b) of the *Operational Guidelines*. It would seem that Paragraph 44 (b) (iii) may most often be relevant, through its reference to sites of 'outstanding aesthetic value'.

An example discussed in regard to authenticity and integrity was Mount Fuji in Japan. In addition to its natural values, Mount Fuji has undoubted spiritual, artistic and inspirational values. However, a range of landuses, protective mechanisms and management regimes for the surrounding areas have affected integrity and made boundary determination difficult.

Boundaries

World Heritage listing requires determination of property boundaries with reference to a clearly defined geocultural region and the capacity to illustrate the essential and distinct cultural and natural elements of such regions or cultures.

The Workshop found that it can be difficult to specify boundaries for associative cultural landscapes because of the difficulties in quantifying the values and in delineating where they are expressed. However, it found that boundaries could be sought for each defined value and that the overall boundary incorporating all values could be presented by maps based on overlays for each.

For traditional indigenous associative cultural landscapes, it is necessary to define boundaries with reference, for example, to spirituality, cultural tradition and practice, language, kinship and social relationships and/or the interactions (including use and care of plant and animal species) that exist between people and their natural environment.

The boundary requirements for properties with natural values set out in Paragraphs 44 (b) were seen to be relevant for associative cultural landscapes where the nomination depended on any of the criteria in Paragraph 44 (a).

5. Managing associative cultural landscapes

Management

The Workshop endorsed the management requirements set out under Paragraphs 24 (b) (ii) and 44 (b) (v) of the *Operational Guidelines*, including those related to integrity and control of visitation to the property nominated. Paragraph 14 of the *Operational Guidelines* was perceived to be somewhat ambiguous in intent, offering some potential for secrecy and conflict rather than the open process considered desirable.

Paragraph 24 (b) (ii) of the *Operational Guidelines* regarding the adequacy of legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms applies to associative cultural landscapes. Paragraph 24 (b) (ii) appears to presuppose the arrest of change whereas what will often be needed is a mechanism to manage change appropriately. A management plan, or other conservation arrangement, should provide people with the framework and mechanisms to manage change, whilst conserving the stated values of the property.

Linkages between the evaluation and management of associative cultural landscapes need to be recognised. Close involvement of traditional custodians, as in the case of Tongariro National Park in New Zealand and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in Australia should be a prerequisite in the assessment of appropriate management regimes for such landscapes.

With reference to the management of associative cultural landscapes, it should be recognised that indigenous peoples make an important and ongoing contribution to the maintenance and care of the values of the place.

The Workshop recommended that:

Interpretation programs for World Heritage associative cultural landscapes need to promote the traditional and/or inspirational values for which the places were nominated. For traditional indigenous landscapes, this interpretation program should be developed in consultation with, and with the agreement of, the appropriate traditional owners/custodians.

Education programs and information services need to be made available to State Party governments and the general public to encourage a greater feeling of ownership and respect for World Heritage properties.

Monitoring

Inspirational places such as artistic associative cultural landscapes are particularly difficult to monitor due to the lack of an effective gauge. One measure of success

is whether or not the values for which the landscape was noted are still appreciated by the community and respected by visitors. Another measure of success is whether or not the place itself continues to inspire creative works.

With reference to the monitoring of traditional cultural landscapes, the need to involve indigenous peoples must be recognised.

There is a need to protect all associative cultural landscapes, not only from neglect but also from the excesses of presentation and visitor overuse. The impact of heritage management regimes must therefore be monitored regularly, and appropriately controlled.

The Workshop accordingly endorsed the efforts of the World Heritage Committee to establish effective monitoring systems and to consider a cooperative regional approach to monitoring.

6. Community involvement

The Workshop participants considered community involvement and participation to be an important part of the identification, management and monitoring of associative cultural landscapes for World Heritage listing.

7. Testing the workshop outcomes

To test the outcomes of the Workshop, and particularly the relevance of the criteria in the *Operational Guidelines* to the inclusion of associative cultural landscapes in the World Heritage List, two associative cultural landscapes of World Heritage potential were discussed. One of the landscapes chosen had cultural associations to indigenous peoples, and the other, artistic associations. A simple testing methodology involving the consideration of the following questions in relation to each of the cultural landscapes was used:

Does the property fit the definition of associative cultural landscape in the *Operational Guidelines*?

If so, which criteria does it satisfy?

Does it satisfy the requirements concerning authenticity and integrity?

Does the associative cultural landscape have adequate management arrangements in place?

Is it of outstanding universal value?

How would you identify the boundaries?

The example of the indigenous cultural landscape was found to satisfy a range of both natural and cultural criteria. The example of the inspirational landscape met several cultural criteria and possibly some natural criteria. Boundary

definition for both examples was not possible given the constraints of information available to Workshop participants. Nonetheless, the exercise served to confirm the Workshop findings on definitions, evaluation and management.

8. Implications for the Asia-Pacific region

The adoption of the concept of cultural landscapes by the World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session in 1992 made the *World Heritage Convention* more applicable to a wider international audience. More specifically, in the Asia-Pacific region, the *Convention's* potential application was extended, both culturally and geographically, by the inclusion of this category of heritage. These developments are recognised as having the potential to broaden the representativeness of the World Heritage List.

The Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes held in Australia in April 1995 endorsed the findings of two recent UNESCO/ICOMOS meetings - the June 1994 *Expert Meeting on the Global Strategy and Thematic Studies for a representative World Heritage List* and the November 1994 *Nara Expert Workshop on Authenticity*. These workshops recognised that the consideration of properties of outstanding universal value needs to be contextual (recognising a place in its broader intellectual and physical context) rather than specific (as in the limited approach to viewing heritage solely as monuments or wilderness). The incorporation of the cultural landscape concept in the *Operational Guidelines* is a positive move in this direction. A cultural landscape, in reflecting the interactions of people and their environment, is defined by its cultural and natural elements which may be inseparable.

The Workshop further endorsed the *Global Strategy* and the *Nara Document on Authenticity* as being particularly apt for the Asia-Pacific region because of the continuity of living traditions in relation to land and water within this region. The *Global Strategy* and the December 1993 *Action Plan for the Future (Cultural Landscapes)* emphasised the need for regional workshops and educational programs to increase awareness of cultural landscapes among States Parties. To allow such programs to take place the Workshop recommended that an extension of time be granted to States Parties to incorporate cultural landscapes in their tentative lists (see the *Action Plan for the Future (Cultural Landscapes)*).

In this vital United Nations Year of Tolerance, in culturally diverse areas such as the Asia-Pacific region, it is important to encourage people to share what can be shared of their values, traditions and places; to care for that which cannot be shared; and to respect places reflecting different values and practices from their own. World Heritage listing of associative cultural landscapes and their ongoing management should reflect these values.

Annexes

Annex A

List of participants

Australia ICOMOS

Participants at Caves House

Ms Carmen Añon Feliù

ICOMOS
Ulises 114
Madrid 28043
SPAIN
Fax +34 1 300 3427

Mr Tumu Te Heuheu

Traditional custodian of Tongariro
and Dept of Conservation
PO Box 361
Taumarunui
NEW ZEALAND
Ph +64 7 895 8212
Fax +64 7 895 6664

Mr Augusto Villalon

ICOMOS The Philippines
107 Wilson Circle
1500 M. Manila
THE PHILIPPINES
Fax +63 2 722 5745

Dr Konai Helu-Thaman

Department of Education
University of the South Pacific
PO Box 1168
Suva
FIJI
Ph +679 31 3900
Fax +679 30 1305

Mr Roland Chih-Hung Lin

Yaoshan Cultural Foundation
5F No 219, Sec 1 Tun Hwa S. Road
Taipei
TAIWAN
Ph +886 2 772 8272
Fax +886 2 776 1978

Mr PHC (Bing) Lucas

Senior Adviser
IUCN Commission on National
Parks and Protected Areas
1/268 Main Road
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Ph +64 4 232 5581
Fax +64 4 232 9129

Mr Eru Manuera

Director, Kau Papa Atawhai
Department of Conservation
PO Box 10420
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Ph +64 4 471 0726
Fax +64 4 471 1082

From Australia**Dr Sandy Blair**

President, Australia ICOMOS
and
Australian Heritage Commission
GPO Box 1567
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 271 2111
Fax 06 273 2395

Mr Paul Carter

Australia Centre
University of Melbourne
131 Barry Street
Carlton Vic 3053
Ph 03 344 7235

Ms Joan Domicelj

ICOMOS Vice-President
and Heritage Consultant
401/102 Alfred Street
Milson's Point NSW 2065
Ph 02 955 7089
Fax 02 955 2928

Ms Helen Halliday

World Heritage Unit
Dept of the Environment, Sport & Territories
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 274 1018
Fax 06 274 1023

Prof Rhys Jones

Research School of Pacific & Asian Studies
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Ph 06 249 3037
Fax 06 249 3040

Ms Jane Lennon

Heritage Consultant
11 Joynt Street
Hamilton Qld 4007
Ph 07 862 4284
Fax 07 262 7470

Mr Richard Mackay

Jenolan Caves Reserve Trust
and Consultant Archaeologist
Godden Mackay Pty Ltd
56 Commonwealth Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010
Ph 02 319 4811
Fax 02 319 4383

Prof Isabel McBryde

Dept of History
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Ph 06 249 2791
Fax 06 249 4083

Dr Betty Meehan

Director, Aboriginal & Torres Strait
Islander Section
Australian Heritage Commission
GPO Box 1567
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 271 2111
Fax 06 273 2395

Mr Warren Nicholls

Director, World Heritage Unit
Dept of the Environment, Sport & Territories
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 274
Fax 06 274 1023

Mr Rob Power

Manager, Heritage Branch
NSW Dept of Planning
GPO Box 3927
Sydney NSW 2001
Ph 02 391 2065
Fax 02 391 2336

Mr Tony Press

Executive Director
Australian Nature Conservation Agency
Protected Areas - North and West
GPO Box 1260
Darwin NT 0801

Australia ICOMOS

Participants at Caves House

Dr Rosemary Purdie

Australian Heritage Commission
GPO Box 1567
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 271 2111
Fax 06 273 2395

Mr Ian Stapleton

Vice-President Australia ICOMOS
and Heritage Architect
Clive Lucas, Stapleton & Partners Pty Ltd
155 Brougham Street
Kings Cross NSW 2011
Ph 02 357 4811
Fax 02 357 4603

Ms Sharon Sullivan

Executive Director
Australian Heritage Commission
GPO Box 1567
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 271 2111
Fax 06 273 2395

Prof Ken Taylor

Dept of Environmental Design
University of Canberra
PO Box 1
Belconnen ACT 2616
Ph 06 201 5148
Fax 06 201 5034

Ms Sarah Titchen

Dept of Archaeology & Anthropology
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Ph and fax 06 241 8621

Ms Meredith Walker

Heritage Consultant
4 Rayner Street
Leichhardt NSW 2040
Ph 02 818 1803
Fax 02 818 2008

Prof Elizabeth Webby

Dept of English
University of Sydney NSW 2006
Ph 02 351 2226

Dr Neville White

School of Genetic and Human Variation
La Trobe University
Bundoora Vic 3083
Ph 03 479 2266
Fax 03 479 2480

Dr Elizabeth Williams

World Heritage Unit
Dept of the Environment, Sport & Territories
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Ph 06 274 1018
Fax 06 274 1023

Mr Jon Willis

Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park
PO Box 116
Yulara NT 0872

Mr Michael Wilson

Office of the Minister for the Environment,
Sport and Territories
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Annex B
Workshop programs

AUSTRALIA ICOMOS INCORPORATED
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES
PERMANENT ADDRESS: PO Box 77, Grosvenor Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION and CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Thursday 27 April 1995

Sydney Opera House

Chair: Sandy Blair, President, Australia ICOMOS

- 9.10 Welcome by John Langmore, MP, representing the Prime Minister and the Minister for the Environment, Sport and Territories
- 9.15 Official opening by Federico Mayor, Director-General UNESCO
Global context, Bernd von Droste, Director World Heritage Centre
- 9.30 Overview of regional context, Joan Domicelj, ICOMOS Vice-President
- 9.40 Cultural and spiritual associations of landscapes: Uluru
Yami Lester, Chair Uluru Kata Tjuta Board of Management
- 10.00 Imagined landscapes: Aboriginal and Archaeological Perspectives
Professor Rhys Jones, Australian National University
- 10.20 Coffee
- 10.50 Cultural and spiritual associations of landscapes: Tongariro
Tumu Te Heuheu, traditional custodian Tongariro, New Zealand
- 11.10 Cultural Landscapes and the World Heritage Convention: the Road to Tongariro
and Uluru Kata Tjuta, PHC (Bing) Lucas, IUCN Commission on National Parks and
Protected Areas, New Zealand
- 11.30 Landscapes of Disappearance
Paul Carter, Australia Centre, University of Melbourne
- 11.50 Inspirational value of cultural landscapes:
Ray Joyce - photographer, Tasmania
- 12.10 Inspirational value of cultural landscapes:
Janet Laurence - sculptor, Sydney
- 12.30 Closing remarks, Ian Stapleton, Vice-President Australia ICOMOS
- 12.40 Lunch at Sydney Opera House
- 2.00 Bus for those delegates who will go to Jenolan Caves House

This event has been sponsored by the World Heritage Branch of the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Sport & Territories, the Australian Heritage Commission and the Australian National Commission for UNESCO.

AUSTRALIA ICOMOS INCORPORATED
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES
PERMANENT ADDRESS: PO Box 77, Grosvenor Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000

Expert Workshop

**World Heritage Convention
and Associative Cultural Landscapes**

**Friday 28 & Saturday 29 April 1995
Caves House, Blue Mountains, NSW**

Program

Friday 28 April 1995, 9am start

Session 1: Defining types of associative cultural landscapes

Chair: Joan Domicelj, Vice President, ICOMOS

- Background and historical context
 - Representative, UNESCO World Heritage Centre (10 minutes presentation)
 - Comment by Sarah Titchen, Australian National University (5 minutes based on precirculated paper)
 - Report by Augusto Villalon, The Philippines Workshop (5 minutes)

- Working group discussion of defined associative landscape types (traditional cultural practices; inspirational/artistic)

Rapporteur: PHC (Bing) Lucas, IUCN

Morning tea 10.30 - 11.00 am

Session 2: Evaluation issues

Chair: Carmen Anon Feliu, ICOMOS

- Application to date
 - Uluru Kata Tjuta - Jon Willis (5 mins)
 - Tongariro - P H C (Bing) Lucas (5 mins)
 - (comment to address three points below)
- Working Group discussion
 - Group 1 - Chair: Isabel McBryde; Rapporteur: Helen Halliday
 - Group 2 - Chair: Elizabeth Webby; Rapporteur: Liz Williams
 - Which natural and cultural criteria are relevant?
 - Test of authenticity (character and components) and integrity
 - Boundary (extent related to functionality and intelligibility)

Lunch 12.30 - 2 pm

Session 2: Evaluation issues (continued)

- Continued Working Group discussions

3 pm Working group rapporteurs report back to plenary session
Summary: Chris Betteridge

Afternoon Tea 3.30 am - 4.00 pm

Session 3: Management/Monitoring

- Presentations

- Management issues - Tony Press, Australian Nature Conservation Agency (5 minutes)
- Community involvement - Rosemary Purdie, Willandra World Heritage Area community liaison committee (5 minutes)

- Working Group discussion

Group 1 - Chair: Tony Press; Rapporteur: Sharon Sullivan

Group 2 - Chair: Ian Stapleton; Rapporteur: Richard Mackay

5.30 pm Working group rapporteurs report back to plenary session
Summary: Chris Betteridge

7.00 pm Reception hosted by Jenolan Caves Reserve Trust

8.00 pm Dinner, followed by slide talks by regional participants

Saturday 29 April 1995 - Caves House

Session 4: Testing outcomes of Day 1 with case studies

Chair: Augusto Villalon, ICOMOS The Philippines

- Working Group discussion

Group 1 - Chair: Isabel McBryde; Rapporteur: Jane Lennon

Group 2 - Chair: Paul Carter; Rapporteur: Liz Williams

Working group rapporteurs report back to plenary session

Summary: Chris Betteridge

Morning tea 10.30 - 11.00 am

Session 5: Implications for the Asia/Pacific region

Chair : Representative, UNESCO

- Working Group Discussion

- Outcomes of workshop

- Summary & action plan

Rapporteur: Joan Domicelj, Vice President, ICOMOS

Lunch 12.30 pm- 1.30 pm

2 pm - Depart for return to Sydney

Annex C

Summaries of papers presented

Opening session - Sydney Opera House, 27 April 1995

Welcome to participants

John Langmore MP, representing the Prime Minister of Australia and the Minister for the Environment, Sport and Territories

In welcoming delegates to the Workshop Mr Langmore stressed the need for recognition of the combined works of people and nature. He referred to the latest version of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* which now recognises associative cultural landscapes.

Mr Langmore highlighted the fact that Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park is only the second associative cultural landscape in the world to be included on the World Heritage List. He suggested that workshop participants might consider nominating the central parts of Canberra for World Heritage listing since, in his opinion, Australia's capital is "the best planned modern city in the world".

Official opening

Federico Mayor, Director-General, UNESCO

Dr Mayor reported that 142 State Parties are now signatories to the *World Heritage Convention*. Of the 440 sites on the World Heritage List, 88 are in the Asia-Pacific region, with 11 in Australia. He stressed the need for a collective effort by the international community to promote the concept of a shared human heritage which transcends national boundaries.

Referring to the 1992 decision by the World Heritage Committee to accept cultural landscapes for inclusion on the World Heritage List, Dr Mayor said that it was hoped that the imbalance between the disproportionately large number of European cultural heritage sites and the rest of the world could be redressed.

Dr Mayor expressed the view that people and nature are inseparable. He emphasised the role that nature plays in shaping the creative and spiritual life of humans, but said that it is wrong to take the human species out of the equation when considering ecosystems. He stressed the need for interaction with those who are actually living in World Heritage ecosystems.

Tongariro National Park, in the North Island of New Zealand, was the first associative cultural landscape to be listed on the World Heritage List, in 1993. Its natural features are closely related to the identity of the Maori people.

Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park in Australia has been recognised as an associative cultural landscape because of the continuous interrelationships

between the traditional Aboriginal custodians and the natural environment for more than 5000 years.

Dr Mayor advised Workshop participants that a proposal has been put to the Executive Board of UNESCO for a Merlina Mercouri Memorial Prize for the management of cultural landscapes. He stressed the need for integration of conservation and sustainable development if we are to protect the most important part of the biosphere - human beings - for our children and their children. "Humans are the eyes of the universe", he said, "our most important monument".

Overview of regional context

Joan Domicelj, ICOMOS Vice-President

In a paper titled "Diversity, Regionalism and Landscapes of Association" Ms Domicelj stressed the need, in this vital United Nations Year of Tolerance, and in culturally diverse areas such as the Asia-Pacific region that:

"... we encourage people to share what can be shared of their values, traditions and places; to care for what cannot be shared; and to respect places reflecting different values and practices from their own."

Ms Domicelj endorsed UNESCO's strong moves towards regionalisation which, she said, are well echoed amongst its friends and advisers - ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM. ICOMOS, for example, now holds regional assemblies and supports regional discussion of issues such as tentative lists, cultural heritage at risk and the mutual monitoring of World Heritage listed properties.

Recounting the tale of her recent visit to the 2000 year old Ifugaoan high country stepped rice terraces in the Philippines, and sporting a broken leg as proof, Ms Domicelj likened the series of regional meetings and workshops to a celebratory feast in which the participants would "celebrate the extraordinary range of human responses to landscapes - as lovers, explorers, artists and, above all, as custodians". In the Asia-Pacific region, she said, "the wisdom of indigenous cultures in caring for the land is overwhelming."

Ms Domicelj outlined the proposed structure of the working sessions of the Workshop and linked its objectives to the 1994 *Global Strategy for a representative World Heritage List* and attempts to redress imbalances in the present list under the theme of "Human Coexistence with the Land" - a change of emphasis from monumentality to complexity and from single places in isolation to places within their physical and cultural contexts.

Cultural and spiritual associations of landscapes : Uluru

Yami Lester, Chair, Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park Board of Management

Imagined landscapes: Aboriginal and archaeological perspectives

Professor Rhys Jones, Australian National University

Cultural and spiritual associations of landscapes: Tongariro

Tumu Te Heuheu, traditional custodian, Tongariro National Park, New Zealand

Cultural landscapes and the World Heritage Convention: the Road to Tongariro and Uluru Kata-Tjuta

PHC (Bing) Lucas, IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas, New Zealand

Landscapes of Disappearance

Paul Carter, Australia Centre, University of Melbourne

Inspirational value of cultural landscapes

Ray Joyce, photographer, Tasmania

One of Australia's foremost photographers of historic buildings and non-indigenous landscapes, Ray Joyce likened himself to a hunter, stalking his prey in the dawn and the dusk. His presentation of 120 colour transparencies chosen at random from his vast collection of images emphasised the importance of light and its changing qualities with the seasons and the time of day. By its nature photography is subjective and while the photographer argued that his images were individually insignificant, as a collection of work they reflect the inspirational value of cultural landscapes. A recurring theme in Ray's photographs is what he terms "the singing line", the boundary between the land and the water. The photographer's fascination with this subject was a major factor in his recent decision to relocate his place of residence to a farmhouse beside a river in rural Tasmania.

Inspirational value of cultural landscapes

Janet Laurence, sculptor, Sydney

Working sessions - Jenolan Caves, 28-29 April 1995

Cultural landscapes and the *Operational Guidelines*

Sarah Titchen, Australian National University

Sarah Titchen presented a brief outline of the background and historical context to the inclusion of cultural landscape categories in the *Operational Guidelines* and the concomitant revisions to the cultural and natural criteria.

It was noted that the December 1992 revisions to natural heritage criteria (ii) and (iii) have removed references to people and their interactions with the natural environment, and to exceptional combinations of natural and cultural elements of the environment. The recognition of such

interactions and combinations through World Heritage listing must now be achieved through application of the cultural landscape categories.

The Philippines Workshop

Augusto Villalon, ICOMOS, The Philippines

Application of evaluation issues to date: Uluru Kata-Tjuta

Jon Willis, Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park

Application of evaluation issues to date: Tongariro

PHC (Bing) Lucas, Senior Adviser, IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas, Wellington, New Zealand

Management issues: Uluru Kata-Tjuta

Hilary Sullivan, Australian Nature Conservation Agency

Community involvement

Rosemary Purdie, Willandra Lakes World Heritage Area Community Liaison Committee