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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2015. The World Heritage Committee’s decision to inscribe the property included a number of recommendations, notably concerning interpretation. The statement by the Japanese Ambassador to UNESCO following the decision made a number of commitments relating to interpretation, including mention of the establishment of an information centre. The State Party prepared an interpretation strategy which was presented to the Committee in 2017, and resulted in a further Committee decision with additional recommendations concerning the interpretation of the property. An Industrial Heritage Information Centre in Tokyo was subsequently opened in 2020.

This mission was requested by UNESCO following concerns expressed by some State Parties, notably the Republic of Korea, that the State Party of Japan had not fully complied with the decisions of the Committee and with its own undertakings at the time of inscription. The World Heritage Centre appointed three mission experts, two (Mr Etienne Clément and Dr Judith Herrmann) nominated by UNESCO and one (Mr Peter Phillips) by ICOMOS, to conduct a visit to the Industrial Heritage Information Centre and to report on the visit. Dr Herrmann visited the Information Centre in person from 7 to 9 June 2021, and Messrs Clément and Phillips were able to attend the visit and associated presentations virtually. Prior to the visit, the experts participated in briefing and information meetings with the World Heritage Centre and with representatives from the governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea.

The mission reviewed the information provided at the Industrial Heritage Information Centre (IHIC), with particular attention to the two Decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its 39th (39 COM 8B.14) and 42nd (42 COM 7B.10) sessions respectively and exchanged with staff of the IHIC on any other information provided to visitors. In addition, presentations were made to the mission on conservation and interpretation at seven of the eight areas in which components of the World Heritage Property are located, and also on the work of the Gunkanjima Digital Museum in Nagasaki, a private institution involved in the interpretation of Hashima island.

The mission noted that the Interpretation Strategy as exhibited at the IHIC (Zones 1 and 2), interpretation tools and related material sent before, during and after the mission, gives attention to the way each of the component parts of the serial site contributes to OUV and reflects the various phases of industrialization. While an English translation is available in the form of tablets for visitors to use in connection with the wall panels, the State Party acknowledged that translation into other languages is a work in progress.

The mission noted that the interpretation strategy as implemented at the IHIC also takes into account the periods before and after the period relating to the OUV of the property (1850s to 1910). Although the history of the period up to 1910 is presented extensively, there is far less material on the period after 1910. In particular, the role of the Meiji industrial sites in Japan’s military program after 1910 was barely mentioned as part of the “full history.”

In relation to this period, the mission used as guidance the clarifying statement made by the Delegation of Japan on the date of inscription that is referred to in the footnotes of the above decisions. The mission observed that the IHIC (Zone 3) contains and exhibits archival

---

1 “Japan is prepared to take measures that allow an understanding that there were a large number of Koreans and others who were brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions in the 1940s at some of the sites, and that, during World War II, the government of Japan also implemented its policy of requisition. Japan is prepared to incorporate appropriate measures into the interpretative strategy to remember the victims such as the establishment of information centre.” (UNESCO WH 2015a, pp. 222-223)
records, newspaper clippings, books, academic research, personal records and testimonials with the objective of establishing facts to inform the narrative. A few of these materials acknowledge the harsh working conditions prevailing at some of the sites before and during the 1940s for all individuals working there, including a large number of Koreans and others. Panels also present the policy of requisition established in Japan during World War II. The mission nevertheless observed that, especially about the site of Hashima which is the focus of the oral testimonies, the historical narrative presented to visitors did not attempt to present a variety of narratives in a way that would allow visitors to make their own judgement on all aspects of industrial labor, including the darker side of industrial heritage, particularly during wartime. Oral testimonies provided little evidence of people being “forced to work,” and stated that there was no difference between Japanese workers and Koreans and others in relation to “harsh conditions” or “victims.” Material presented to the mission as “controversial” in that it attested to other narratives is largely limited to the bookshelves in Zone 3.

Although there is material in the archives concerning mining accidents and the like, there is to date, no display that could be characterised as adequately serving the purpose of remembering the victims as exemplified at other industrial heritage sites with similar histories, where the practice of people being forced to work and the use of the sites for military purposes is fully acknowledged without in any way detracting from the primacy of the OUV of these properties. Although the interpretation strategy as a whole rightly gives primacy to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Property, an important objective of the IHIC, as evidenced by the State Party’s statement, was to remember the victims.

Much of the interpretation material and its presentation, especially its digital interpretation material, were considered by the mission to represent best international practice and a model for other sites. The mission noted that while the IHIC was developed by looking at best practices worldwide by involving nationals with multi-cultural backgrounds and international specialists, experts from some of the other States Parties concerned have not been included in the dialogue about the interpretation of the Property, and considerable historical data held by other countries appears not to be included yet within the research centre collection.

After carefully considering all of the evidence presented both before and during the visit to the Industrial Heritage Information Centre in Tokyo, the mission has concluded that while a number of aspects in the decisions of the Committee have been complied with, some in an exemplary way, and a number of the commitments by the State Party have also been met, the IHIC has not yet fully implemented the undertakings made by the State Party at the time of inscription, or the decisions of the World Heritage Committee both at the time of inscription and subsequently.
1. THE ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROPERTY

1.1. Title of the property, including date of inscription and introduction to the Outstanding Universal Value

In 2015, the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session inscribed the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining, Japan, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

“A series of industrial heritage sites, focused mainly on the Kyushu-Yamaguchi region of south-west aion Japan, represent the first successful transfer of industrialization from the West to a non-Western nation. The rapid industrialization that Japan achieved from the middle of the 19th century to the early 20th century was founded on iron and steel, shipbuilding and coal mining, particularly to meet defence needs. The sites in the series reflect the three phases of this rapid industrialisation achieved over a short space of just over fifty years between 1850s and 1910.” (UNESCO 2015, Dec 39 COM 8B.14) (for the full statement of OUV as adopted in 2015, see Annex 6)

1.2. Summary reference to key decisions and issues relevant under the Terms of Reference of the mission (for entire text of these documents, see Annex 2)

- Dec 39 COM 8B.14 [2015] (UNESCO WH 2015b)
  “The World Heritage Committee, ....
  4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following: ...
  g) Preparing an interpretation strategy for the presentation of the property, which gives particular emphasis to the way each of the sites contributes to OUV and reflects one or more of the phases of industrialization; and also allows an understanding of the full history [1] of each site”
  + footnote [1] to para 4, g: “The World Heritage Committee takes note of the statement made by Japan, as regards the interpretation strategy that allows an understanding of the full history of each site as referred to in paragraph 4.g), which is contained in the Summary Record of the session (Document WHC-15/39.COM/INF.19).”

- Statement by Delegation of Japan (UNESCO WH 2015a, pp 222–223):
  “Japan is prepared to take measures that allow an understanding that there were a large number of Koreans and others who were brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions in the 1940s at some of the sites, and that, during World War II, the government of Japan also implemented its policy of requisition. Japan is prepared to incorporate appropriate measures into the interpretative strategy to remember the victims such as the establishment of information centre.”

- Dec 42 COM 7B.10 [2018] (UNESCO WH 2018b)
  "The World Heritage Committee: ...
  9. Strongly encourages the State Party to take into account best international practices for interpretation strategies when continuing its work on the interpretation of the full history of the property, both during and outside of the period covered by the OUV, and in the digital interpretation materials.
  10. Encourages continuing dialogue between the concerned parties"
1.3. Background on the implementation of the above key decisions

• Follow-up on the key decisions

In 2016, at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee, both the Republic of Korea and Japan reiterated their commitments made in the previous year. (UNESCO WH 2016, pp. 15–16)

After the adoption of Decision 42 COM 7B.10 in 2018, the Republic of Korea expressed its hope for continued “bilateral dialogue between the Republic of Korea and Japan” and for Japan to take into account “best interpretation strategies when continuing its work on the interpretation of the full history” of the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution. (UNESCO WH 2018a, pp. 215–216) Japan welcomed the adoption of the decision; it reiterated its commitment to fully implement the recommendations made by the Committee in 2015 and 2018 as well as to maintain its commitment made in its statement in 2015. (UNESCO WH 2018a, p. 216)

At the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in July 2019 and at the 22nd session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in November 2019, the Republic of Korea stressed the importance of interpretation strategies that consider “the different and even conflicting meanings for different communities and peoples,” that is, the “full history” of World Heritage Sites, and noted that “the Government of Japan showed no willingness so far for the dialogue encouraged by the Committee.” It also noted that the Committee’s credibility was at stake. (UNESCO WH 2019, p. 30 and WHC 2021, Document III) In response to the comment made by the Republic of Korea in July 2019, Japan mentioned that it had been implementing and continued to implement the recommendations made by the Committee in 2015 and 2018. (UNESCO WH 2019, p. 37)

• Information submitted by Japan

In November 2017, Japan submitted a SOC report followed, in January 2018 by a revised version to correct factual errors. The SP notes that the report was drafted after consultation with Local Conservation Councils and takes into consideration advice from national and international members of the Industrial Heritage Expert Committee set up for the property. It was approved by the National Committee of Conservation and Management for the overall serial property and is in line with the Strategic Framework of the property. (Cabinet Secretariat 2018)

With reference to recommendation g) made by the Committee at the time of inscription, the Cabinet Secretariat developed an Interpretation Strategy, based on a full Interpretation Audit by independent international experts, the ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (ENAME Charter, 2008), as well as specific advice by the President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Interpretation and Presentation. (Cabinet Secretariat 2018, pp. 41, 381) Progress can be summarized as follows:

- Common interpretation material for the whole series includes OUV as well as information on the history of iron and steel, shipbuilding, and coal mining. Site specific interpretation pertains to the 23 component parts and their contribution to OUV, national and local values. (ibid., pp. 43, 371)

- The full history of each site comprises the OUV period (from 1850s to 1910) as well as the period prior to 1850s and from 1910 to the present, depending on the component site. (ibid., pp. 50–51)

- Historical research and oral testimonies are to be carried out to reflect the full history of each site, including “research on Koreans in Japan before, during, and after the War, including research on the policy of requisition of Korean workers.” (ibid., p. 51)
- The IHIC was to be established in Tokyo, “as a ‘think tank’ that contributes to dissemination and enlightenment of industrial heritage conservation.” It should exhibit information mainly on the overall property, “as well as other information on industrial heritage, including workers’ stories.” (ibid., p. 52)
- Information will be available in Japanese, English, Chinese and Korean. (ibid., p. 375)
- Mediums of interpretation include, amongst others, a 3D resource, two websites, a map, an app, and immersive multi-display platforms. (ibid., pp. 52–53, 382–396)

In November 2019, Japan submitted another SOC report, based on another interpretation audit (Cabinet Secretariat 2019). The report was prepared jointly by the Cabinet Secretariat, local governments, component part owners, and other parties. It is based on the Strategic Framework and progress reports in response to the Committee’s decisions in 2015 and 2018. Progress can be summarized as follows:

- The report concludes with regard to paragraph 9 of Decision 42 COM 7B.10 that “interpretation has been implemented properly based on the Interpretation Strategy.” (ibid., Executive Summary)
- Regarding paragraph 10 and dialogue with concerned parties, “discussions have been carried on regularly with those involved” in the property, including the relevant ministries, local governments, component part owners, managers, experts in and outside Japan, local communities, chambers of commerce and industry, as well as tourism associations. An Industrial Heritage Expert Committee was established that consists of “specialists from Japan and abroad” as well as The National Committee of Conservation and Management for the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution comprising relevant government ministries and local governments. (ibid., pp. 42–44)

The following progress can be noted, based on the SOC report submitted by Japan in 2020 (Cabinet Secretariat 2020):

- The IHIC was opened on March 31, 2020, in Shinjuku Ward, Tokyo, “as a comprehensive information hub for Japan’s industrial heritage centering on the ‘Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution.’” (ibid., p. 6)
- Descriptions and interpretations of the “full history” of each component part are presented at the IHIC. (ibid., pp. 2, 8, 14)
- Japan collected information “of industrial labor at work sites during World War II as regards workers, including former civilian workers from the Korean Peninsula and others.” Primary sources (laws, official notices, public documents and documents of related organizations and corporations) that “enable visitors to understand recruitment, official placement, requisition, and repatriation and testimonies,” as well as newspaper articles, publications and books, and other documents from before, during and after the War are being collected and archived at the IHIC. (ibid., pp. 2–3, 8, 18)
- Information on Japan’s policy of requisition is exhibited at the IHIC. (ibid., p. 18)
- Guidance on international best practices on World Heritage interpretation and presentation was offered by the President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites, and other ICOMOS experts. (ibid., p. 13)

A draft report commissioned by the Cabinet Secretariat and entitled Interpretation Audit: Tokyo Industrial Heritage Information Centre was submitted to the mission team in June 2021. It is based on a visit of the IHIC by an international expert in industrial heritage on 21 April 2021. The report notes the following (Gamble 2021):

- The IHIC was opened on March 31, 2020, in Shinjuku Ward, Tokyo, “as a comprehensive information hub for Japan’s industrial heritage centering on the ‘Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution.’” (ibid., p. 6)
- Descriptions and interpretations of the “full history” of each component part are presented at the IHIC. (ibid., pp. 2, 8, 14)
- Japan collected information “of industrial labor at work sites during World War II as regards workers, including former civilian workers from the Korean Peninsula and others.” Primary sources (laws, official notices, public documents and documents of related organizations and corporations) that “enable visitors to understand recruitment, official placement, requisition, and repatriation and testimonies,” as well as newspaper articles, publications and books, and other documents from before, during and after the War are being collected and archived at the IHIC. (ibid., pp. 2–3, 8, 18)
- Information on Japan’s policy of requisition is exhibited at the IHIC. (ibid., p. 18)
- Guidance on international best practices on World Heritage interpretation and presentation was offered by the President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites, and other ICOMOS experts. (ibid., p. 13)
- The IHIC is “a research and communication facility” that focuses on “domestic and international industrial history and heritage, including industrial labour and workers’ lives.” (ibid., pp. 3–4)
- Its Main Exhibition (Zone 2) showcases “an interactive ‘full history’ of the 23 component parts that comprise the World Heritage Site.” (ibid., p. 5)
- The Reference Room (Zone 3) functions as an archive and library related to Japanese industrial history. It contains material covering all three periods – before 1850s, from 1850s to 1910, and after 1910 – depending on relevancy for each site. It focuses on industrial labour and particularly on Hashima Island during World War II. Over seventy oral history testimonies include those of former workers from Japan, Korea, and elsewhere. Material is being collected and evaluated on an ongoing basis, including that related to wartime conscripted workers in Japan. (ibid., pp. 5–6, 23, 24)
- Guides and an app/audio tour are available in multiple foreign languages. (ibid., p. 25)

• Information submitted by the Republic of Korea
After several correspondence sent to WHC in 2020 (see below), the Republic of Korea submitted in November 2020 a confidential Review Report with annexes addressing the implementation of the 2015 and 2018 Committee decisions regarding the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution. The report is based on an extensive collection and review of material, including press releases and testimonies as well as on a visit of the IHIC. Concerns raised by the Republic of Korea can be summarized as follows:
- The Interpretive Strategy developed and implemented by Japan does not meet the requirements established in 2015, that is, the recognition of the full history of each site and the remembrance of victims of forced labour.
- Best international practices for the interpretation of the property, such as Rammelsberg Mine, Völklingen Ironworks, and Zollverein Mine, and multiple narratives have not been taken into account at the IHIC.
- There is a lack of dialogue with concerned parties, such as the Republic of Korea and NGOs.

• Correspondence received by UNESCO
WHC communicated to the mission numerous letters and documents from concerned parties received by UNESCO. Among them, a series of letters and “non-papers” sent in 2020 by the Republic of Korea expressing its concerns about the implementation of the 2015 and 2018 Committee decisions. The non-papers anticipated the key points elaborated on in the submitted Review Report in November 2020, as outlined above. UNESCO was also informed that a meeting between the Republic of Korea and Japan took place on 7 February 2020.

• Other background documents considered by the mission
In 2008, the ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites, short ENAME Charter, was established. Its purpose is to define the basic principles of interpretation and presentation as essential components of heritage conservation and as a means of enhancing public understanding of cultural heritage sites. The Charter emphasizes that “interpretation should also take into account all groups that have contributed to the historical and cultural significance of the site” as well as that “cross-cultural significance […] should be considered in the formulation of interpretive programmes.” (ICOMOS 2008, paras. 3.3 and 3.6)
Following the World Heritage Committee’s Decision 39 COM 8B.14 and the recommendation of the International Conference on World Heritage Interpretation in November 2016, the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC) was commissioned to prepare a study on Interpretation of Sites of Memory. The study recognizes that “some World Heritage properties and nominated properties proposed on the basis of other criteria may have memorial associative values which need to be interpreted as part of or in addition to their Outstanding Universal Value” and “should be particularly taken into account when developing the interpretation of the property.” (ICSC 2018, p. 28)

• **Other meetings before the mission**

Prior to the visit, the mission experts participated in briefing and information meetings with the World Heritage Centre and with representatives from the governments of Japan and from the Republic of Korea (Annex 9). At these meetings, the positions of both States Parties were presented as reflected in the documents and other information submitted to UNESCO and summarized above.

2. **THE MISSION**

2.1. **Basic facts about the mission**

As a follow-up of the two Decisions of the World Heritage Committee 39 COM 8B.14 and 42 COM 7B.10, the above-described statements, reports and correspondences received by UNESCO, after consultations with the concerned State Party and ICOMOS, UNESCO decided to send a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission to Japan to conduct a visit of the Industrial Heritage Information Centre (IHIC). It is located in the Shinjuku district in Tokyo, within the Annex of the Statistics Bureau of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications.

Preparations for this mission have been delayed due to various restrictions linked to the COVID-19 pandemic. The mission finally took place from 7 to 9 June 2021.

It was composed of three experts, one traveling to the IHIC in Tokyo and the other two being connected by online video all along the three days of the mission. The mission visited the IHIC twice, had comprehensive exchanges with the Director and staff of the IHIC as well as with representatives of the Cabinet Secretariat and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State Party. The mission team reviewed the materials sent before during and after the mission by the authorities of the State Party and the IHIC.

The composition of the mission team, the mission programme, and the list of persons met are in Annexes 3, 4 and 5.

2.2. **Constraints of the mission**

The fact that only one member of the mission travelled to Japan while the other two were abroad was a major constraint. However, thanks to a very competent technical team, the video connection was very efficient all along a three-days mission.

It was nevertheless a challenge for the three experts to exchange views among themselves. This had led UNESCO to suggest that the programme of the mission include a second visit to the exhibition when the team members could be among themselves with only the interpreters and the Director of the IHIC. This suggestion by UNESCO was partly accepted: the team could indeed make the second visit with the Director and the interpreters, and the representatives of other national authorities remained, although they agreed to not intervene in the discussions. None of the three experts could read or speak Japanese language, unfortunately. Although more and more information has been translated
by IHIC in languages other than Japanese and although the Director of IHIC is fluent in English, the team still needed interpretation to understand the part of the material presented which was not in English. Two interpreters assisted the mission. The mission was informed that one had been dispatched from the Japan Convention Services, Inc., the other seemed to have been previously involved as interpreter for the IHIC. They were of great help throughout the mission.

2.3. Terms of Reference of the mission (for the full text, see Annex 1)

- Conduct a visit to the Industrial Heritage Information Center (an annex building of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications located in Tokyo, Japan) related to the World Heritage property ‘Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining’ (Japan), inscribed on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015);
- Review the information provided at the Information Center, with particular attention to the two Decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th (39 COM 8B.14) and 42nd (42 COM 7B.10) sessions respectively;
- Exchange with staff of the Information Center on any other information provided to visitors (e.g. brochures and other material);

3. ASSSESSMENT OF THE MATTER

3.1. Introduction to the key issues covered by the mission from the relevant decisions of the World Heritage Committee

The mission to the Industrial Heritage Information Centre in Tokyo was required by its terms of reference to consider a number of principal factors arising from the prior decisions of the Committee and the undertaking by the State Party:

- Interpretive strategy showing how each site contributes to Outstanding Universal Value and allows an understanding of the full history of each site (Decision 39 COM 8B.14);
- Measures to allow an understanding of a large number of Koreans and others brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions, and the Japanese government’s requisition policy (Statement by Japanese delegation at the time of inscription);
- Incorporation into the interpretive strategy of appropriate measures to remember the victims such as the establishment of information centre (Statement by Japanese delegation at the time of inscription);
- Best international practice for interpretation strategies on the interpretation of the full history of the property both during and outside the period covered by its OUV and in the digital interpretation materials (Decision 42 COM 7B.10);
- Continuing dialogue between the concerned parties (Decision 42 COM 7B.10).
3.2. Actions by the State Party (either already taken or planned) regarding each of the key issues

3.2.1. Summary of Actions by the State Party as identified in documents received before the mission

An interpretation strategy:
As previously outlined, an Interpretation Strategy was developed and submitted in 2017. Three areas of importance were identified. The first two pertain to common interpretation material for the whole series, including OUV as well as information on the history of iron and steel, shipbuilding, and coal mining. The third refers to site specific interpretation of the 23 component sites and their contribution to OUV, national and local values (Annex 7 Fig. 1 and 2). The IHIC was proposed as a “think tank” in the Interpretive Strategy. It came to be an “information hub,” a research and communication facility that focuses on national and international industrial history and heritage, including “industrial labour and workers’ lives.” A draft report which was submitted through the State Party and which was written by an international expert based on a visit of the IHIC, concludes that the themes derived from the Interpretation Strategy are presented in the IHIC “in a balanced and proportionate, and factual manner, using a credible evidence base.” (Gamble 2021, p. 25)

The full history and its components:
The full history of each site has repeatedly been established to comprise three time periods, depending on relevancy for the respective site: the OUV period (from 1850s to 1910), the period prior to 1850s and the period from 1910 to the present, the latter including the 1940s and Japan’s policy of requisition (Annex 7 Fig. 4).

Remember the victims:
No explicit reference has been made in the documents with regard to the terms “remember” and/or “victim.” Oral testimonies to be included in the IHIC are those of “Korean workers” and “workers’ stories” (2018) as well as “former civilian workers from the Korean Peninsula and others” (2020). The 2021 draft report states that testimonies include those of former workers from Japan, Korea and elsewhere, and that material related to “wartime conscripted workers” is continuously being evaluated.

Best international practices for interpretation strategies:
With regard to this matter, the 2019 SOC report states that interpretation has been implemented “properly based on the Interpretation Strategy.” The 2020 SOC report adds that the President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites and other ICOMOS experts had been consulted on international best practices.

Continuing dialogue between the concerned parties:
Discussions were carried on regularly with the relevant ministries, local governments, component part owners, managers, experts in and outside Japan, local communities, chambers of commerce and industry, as well as tourism associations.

3.2.2. Observations based on the visit of the IHIC, the exchange with staff and the information provided to visitors

• Interpretive strategy showing how each site contributes to Outstanding Universal Value and allows an understanding of the full history of each site (Decision 39 COM 8B.14)

From extensive presentations of the Cabinet Secretariat on the Interpretation Strategy established in 2017 and local authorities about the interpretation of
seven out of the eight component areas (due to time constraints) through online presentations, the following observations can be made:

- The comprehensive Interpretation Strategy covers the three industrial typologies addressed in the OUV (iron and steel, shipbuilding, and coal mining), their relation to various component parts and sites (both part of the World Heritage property and other industrial heritage sites in Japan), the links between those component parts and sites, as well as the three time periods for each of the component parts (before, during, and after the period of OUV) (Annex 7 Fig. 1–5).

- A coordinated approach is clearly visible from the presentations of the seven component areas. All of them base their interpretation on the Strategy presented by the Cabinet Secretariat (using some of the same charts). The implementation of the Interpretation Strategy in the component areas is a work in progress. Local interpretation centers have already or are planning to integrate information about the World Heritage property into their site-specific exhibitions.

It is clearly visible in the exhibition that the IHIC is based on the 2017 Interpretation Strategy as well. The same charts that show how the sites within the eight component areas are distributed throughout the chronological development of the three industrial typologies and the relevance of the three time periods for each component area are exhibited in Zone 1 of the Center (Annex 8 Fig. 13 and 14). The IHIC has three Zones, with Zone 1 providing an introduction to the Center and the World Heritage property (for further explanations to and photographs of the individual Zones see Annex 8).

![Fig. 1 – Floor plan of the IHIC with its three Zones. (Gamble 2021, p. 5)](image)

The industrial typologies, various time periods, and links between themes and sites are also reflected in other parts of Zone 1 and most importantly in the narrative flow of the main exhibition in Zone 2. The main narrative is divided into five parts, each considering pertinent sites of the eight component areas of the property. These are: (1) Early attempts under the Isolation Strategy, (2) Shipbuilding, (3) Iron and Steel, (4) Coal Mining, and (5) Industrialization. Zone 2 also includes interpretation through sound and vision of a number of the sites (such as Miike Port) which are still in operational use and therefore largely inaccessible to
visitors. Zone 2 concludes with an explanation why the year 1910 was chosen as the end of the OUV period.

The time after the OUV period (after 1910) is mostly considered in Zone 3 of the IHIC, or the Reference Room. It contains primary and secondary documents and information on the full history of the property (as well as books on industrial heritage worldwide), with a particular focus on Japan’s policy of requisition and workers’ stories from Hashima Island. A more detailed description of observations follows below.

A variety of interpretation tools that had been presented in the 2017 Interpretation Strategy have been developed. Among them are most prominently an Augmented Reality (AR) guide map and immersive multi-displays (Liquid Galaxy).

- The mission was informed that five out of eight AR guide maps for each component part have been produced so far (the other three are in preparation, see Annex 8 Fig. 5 and 6). They aim at building linkages between the 23 component sites. These area guide maps can be used in conjunction with a specifically developed multi-lingual application for smartphones and QR codes which create 3D animations of the sites. An integrated game with a points-system aims at enticing site visits as coupons for local services can be won. Other tourist destinations in the respective area are highlighted in the map as well.

- Two immersive multi-displays show information on each of the 23 component sites, including on the period after 1910 and working peoples’ lives for selected sites (Annex 8 Fig. 12 and 29). The mission was informed that, for example, information about Takashima goes until 1980. As new information becomes available, it will be integrated into the sites’ presentations. Information on other Japanese industrial heritage sites is also available on the displays.

Both the AR map and immersive multi-displays allow for the dissemination of information on sites not open to the public through virtual visits and digital reconstruction. Other interpretation tools are a table with integrated computer screens in Zone 2 that provides a comparative analysis and information on industrial heritage sites worldwide (Annex 8 Fig. 20 and 21), a website, brochures and leaflets, road signs, collaboration with the most widely used communication application for smartphones in Japan (Line), and digital signage (one is installed, more are planned).

The IHIC informed the mission that the translation of exhibits and interpretation tools is a work in progress. Wall panels are for the most part in Japanese. Information linked to the inscription are also exhibited in English, such as parts of the history leading up to the inscription and the Japanese statement at the time of inscription as showcased in the so-called celebration room in Zone 1 (Annex 8 Fig. 9–11) as well as parts of the Statement of OUV (Annex 8 Fig. 13). Guides and tablets lead through the exhibition in English. A Korean version for the use of the tablets is in planning. The AR app is available in Japanese, English, Korean, Chinese, and Vietnamese. Translations of the immersive multi-displays are in preparation as well.

The interpretation strategy includes a useful timeline for each of the components of the property, showing graphically the extent to which the history of each component extends into the time before and/or after the period representing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
Fig. 2 – Consideration of the full history of sites. (Cabinet Secretariat 2018, Appendix g-1)

The displays in the IHIC concentrate (deliberately, according to Mr Barry Gamble\(^2\)) on the industrial heritage of Japan, most prominently in the period relating to the OUV of the property, but also in the periods before and afterwards. Mr Gamble explained to the mission that this was because industrial heritage was not previously well recognized or valued in Japan. The mission noted that there was little or no reference in Zones 1 or 2 to the political or military history of Japan in the period following 1910, during which time much of the activity affecting Korea and other East Asian nations occurred, and in which the industrial establishment of Japan played a significant part. Given that the industrial heritage of Japan in the period relating to OUV and of each of the components of the property appears to be well interpreted at each of the component sites, according to the presentations made to the mission by representatives of seven of the eight areas containing components, it is the opinion of the mission that more could be done at the IHIC to present other aspects of the history and thus allow a comprehensive understanding of the full history of the property.

- Measures to allow an understanding of a large number of Koreans and others brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions, and the Japanese government’s requisition policy

The displays and information in Zones 1 and 2 of the IHIC include no reference to these issues. They are presented to a limited extent in Zone 3. Some of the information is displayed in panels (including the announcement of Japan’s requisition policy of 1944) and accessible by way of computer screens (Annex 8 29–30 and 33–34). Much of the information is included in the reference material held in Zone 3, in the form of books, government records, diaries and oral testimonies from former workers (Annex 8 Fig. 31 and 32). Photographs of some of those who have given testimonies are prominently displayed (Annex 8 Fig. 27); they are of Japanese and Koreans who formerly lived and worked on Hashima Island.

---

\(^2\) Barry Gamble is a World Heritage adviser who was involved in the preparation of the nomination file and has subsequently assisted the State Party with the interpretation of the property. He was present throughout the mission as an observer, as well as at the prior meeting between the mission and official representatives of Japan.
(also known as Gunkanjima). The guide who presented this material to the mission advised that from 1916, batches of 100 Korean people at a time came to work on Hashima, and that they lived and worked with Japanese residents as "one family sharing one island" (Annex 8 Fig. 28). The Director of the IHIC added that the numbers of Korean workers brought to Japan increased after 1939 in response to the mobilization of the Japanese military forces. In response to questions from the mission, the Director of the IHIC and others advised the mission that the display in Zone 3 had been focused on Hashima because of the publicity given to alleged bad treatment of Koreans and others who worked on the island; testimonies relating to other sites had been obtained and would be added to the display.

According to the guide, all of those interviewed stated that there had not been anyone forced to work at Hashima, and that all those living on the island (Japanese and others) shared both good and bad experiences. Moreover, statements about past conditions on the island made by people living in Korea had been compared with statements made by locals, casting doubt in the minds of Japanese on the veracity of the Korean accounts. Some of these statements are included in the written material on bookshelves in Zone 3 and were presented to the mission as "controversial" (Annex 8 Fig. 32). When the mission asked about "harsh conditions," the response was that coal mining is an arduous activity, and that the same harsh conditions were shared by Japanese workers and others. Testimonies presented at this stage in the wall panels supported this statement. Nevertheless, as previously mentioned by the authorities, the presentation of the material is still underway and will be updated parallel to research currently being carried out. Newspaper accounts of mining disasters are included in the research material in Zone 3.

This advice to the mission, delivered at the inspection of the IHIC on the first day, was reinforced in a presentation on the second day by Mr Kuon of the Gunkanjima Digital Museum, a private institution which is dedicated to recording the history of Hashima. The museum has collected numerous documents left behind when the island was abandoned. According to Mr Kuon, the adverse publicity given to Hashima is misinformation and propaganda, and the museum is working to correct false information and present a ‘true’ account of the history through an analysis of the documents collected and further oral testimony.

The mission was left with the strong impression that, despite the presentations of some aspects of the importation of workers from Korea and elsewhere, it seems difficult to acknowledge that Koreans and others – including prisoners of war – were brought against their will to work at some of the Meiji Industrial sites after 1910, and that the measures to allow an understanding of this aspect of the history have not been provided as part of the interpretation of the property at the IHIC.

- Incorporation into the interpretive strategy appropriate measures to remember the victims such as the establishment of information centre.

The clear implication of the statement from the Japanese delegation to the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription is that an important aim of establishing any information centre (while not necessarily the only aim) is to provide “appropriate measures to remember the victims.” This is particularly so when the centre is located well away from the World Heritage property, rather than being provided on or close to the property as is much more often the case.
In addition, the context of the statement concerning the victims implies that the victims were those “Koreans and others who were brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions.” The fact that this aspect of the history of the property is downplayed at the IHIC means that remembrance of the victims is still insufficient.

The mission asked a number of questions on this aspect and was informed firstly that the overriding aim of the IHIC was to present and celebrate the OUV of the World Heritage property in the context of industrial heritage. The mission was however given conflicting information on this point: on the one hand, that the IHIC was not set up to be a gateway to the World Heritage property but was established in response to the World Heritage Committee decision, and on the other that the IHIC was not the place to deal with the prisoners of war who worked at the site. In response to questions from the mission about measures to remember the victims, the response from the Director was that information on events such as coal mining accidents (which affected Japanese and foreign workers alike) was included among the material available in the research centre. The Director added that display space within the research centre is limited and that the content of the displays is based on their research. The mission noted that, to date, there is no display that could be characterized as adequately remembering the victims.

• Best international practice for interpretation strategies on the interpretation of the full history of the property both during and outside the period covered by its OUV and in the digital interpretation materials

The World Heritage Committee in its Decision 42 COM 7B.10 from 2018 strongly encourages the State Party to take into account best international practices for interpretation strategies when continuing its work on the interpretation of the full history of the property, both during and outside the period covered by its OUV and in the digital interpretation materials.” (UNESCO WH 2018a)

As mentioned earlier the 2020 SOC report mentions that the President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites and other ICOMOS experts had been consulted on international best practices. The mission assessed if the interpretation strategy as materialized in the IHIC responded to the recommendations contained in the 2008 ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (in short the 'ENAME Charter'). Its purpose is to define the basic principles of interpretation and presentation as essential components of heritage conservation and as a means of enhancing public understanding of cultural heritage sites. Without having the time to enter into an in-depth analysis, it appeared to the mission that many of the recommendations contained in the Charter were taken into account at IHIC.

The Charter emphasizes that “interpretation should also take into account all groups that have contributed to the historical and cultural significance of the site” as well as that “cross-cultural significance […] should be considered in the formulation of interpretive programmes.” (ICOMOS 2008, paras. 3.3 and 3.6) In reference to the observations made by the mission on the “full history,” the mission acknowledges that IHIC, when providing information about workers from outside Japan, did take into account “groups that have contributed to the historical and cultural significance of the site.” However, the mission observed that the “victims,” as referred to in the statement of the delegation of Japan and as described before in this report, have not yet been taken fully into account. Best practices to “remember the victims” and acknowledge the darker side of industrial heritage do exist and are exemplified in other industrial World Heritage sites.
The mission also believes that IHIC could greatly benefit from good practices recommended in the recent study on Interpretation of Sites of Memory, commissioned by UNESCO. That study recognizes that “some World Heritage properties and nominated properties proposed on the basis of other criteria may have memorial associative values which need to be interpreted as part of or in addition to their Outstanding Universal Value” and “should be particularly taken into account when developing the interpretation of the property.” (ICSC 2018, p. 28) The mission has concluded that in relation to the full history the interpretation strategy, for the period after the OUV, falls short of international best practice, compared with other industrial World Heritage sites with similar histories where the practice of people being forced to work and the use of the sites for military purposes is fully acknowledged.

In relation to digital interpretation materials, the mission noted with appreciation that a variety of interpretation tools using attractive digital technology are presented in the 2017 Interpretation Strategy and developed at the IHIC. Among them are most prominently an Augmented Reality (AR) map and immersive multi-displays. The mission was informed that five out of eight AR maps for each component part have been produced so far (the other three are in preparation, see Annex 8 Fig. 5 and 6). Two immersive multi-displays show information on each of the 23 component sites, including on the period after 1910 and working peoples’ lives for selected sites (Annex 8 Fig. 12 and 29).

Therefore, in relation to digital interpretation materials, the mission is of the opinion that the IHIC exemplifies best international practice that could serve as a model for other World Heritage sites worldwide.

- Continuing dialogue between the concerned parties

In its Decision 42 COM 7B.10 from 2018, “the World Heritage Committee […] encourages continuing dialogue between the concerned parties.” (UNESCO WH 2018b)

Taking into account the context under which the above decision had been adopted, the mission understood that “concerned parties” were both inside and outside of Japan.

As to the concerned parties inside Japan, the mission was informed that for the preparation of the interpretation strategy and the development of the IHIC, discussions were carried on regular basis with relevant ministries, local authorities, managers of the various components of the property, experts, chambers of commerce and industry, the tourism sector as well as local communities. Special attention was given to the dialogue with some of these communities, namely the association of the former residents of the island of Hashima, one of these former residents being a guide at the IHIC. The Director of the IHIC informed the mission that IHIC has had continuing dialogue with a number of people of Korean and other origin, most of whom (so the mission was informed) are now resident in Japan. In addition, researchers involved in the study of the archive, an ongoing process, are Japanese nationals with multi-cultural backgrounds, including Japanese of Korean origin.

Although several international specialists were invited to advise on both the interpretation strategy and the establishment of the IHIC, it appeared to the mission that no experts from the countries which had expressed concern at the meetings of the World Heritage Committee had been involved or invited to advise. Before the mission, during the online meeting with Representatives of the Republic of Korea, the mission was informed that experts from the Republic of Korea were ready to start a regular communication channel with experts from
Japan. The Director of IHIC explained that the Centre involved several Japanese researchers of Korean origin as well as several Korean researchers residing in Japan in the research work on the archives.

On the basis of the information gathered in Tokyo, the mission concluded that while the IHIC was developed by looking at best practices worldwide through the involvement of nationals with multi-cultural backgrounds and international specialists, experts from some of the other States Parties concerned have not been included in the dialogue about the interpretation of the Property.

However, three weeks after the end of the mission, the mission team received on 30 June 2021 from WHC a document provided by the State Party of Japan listing meetings that had taken place between Japan and the Republic of Korea (Annex 10). Although the mission did not receive any information about the contents of these meetings, they appear to constitute a signal that a dialogue is actually continuing between these concerned parties. The mission considers that future dialogue is important and should be pursued.

3.3. Summary of Actions proposed by the Director of the IHIC as identified in documents received after the mission

In response to the exchange that took place during the mission, the Director of the IHIC submitted a number of additional suggestions to the mission team on how to better integrate the theme of industrial labor and enhance the exhibition at the Center:

- Establish a platform for dialogue (either online or in person at the IHIC) between the Hashima Island community whose memories were recorded and are being or will be exhibited at the IHIC, with the Korean survivor of Hashima Island Yeon Cheol Koo, to consider alternative views in an open and scientific way;
- Monitor Display with 25 GHQ photos featuring Hakata Port and Hakata Station, including images on Korean repatriation;
- Close collaboration with Gunkanjima Digital Museum (GDM) as an interpretation hub in Nagasaki to supplement the material that has been curated and is exhibited at IHIC;
- Collaboration with Sakubei Yamamoto Collection of annotated paintings and diaries whose nomination and inscription as Memory of the World had been a direct outcome of the nomination process of the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution;
- Introduction of mine accident-related cenotaphs and monuments into the AR guide maps in the future;
- Several international collaborations including a future joint coal mining exhibition with the World Heritage property Nord-Pas de Calais Mining Basin, contributions to the content of the tablet by the Nord-Pas de Calais Mining Basin and other international experts who also contribute to the international industrial heritage database on the Liquid Galaxy.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The mission to the Industrial Heritage Information Centre in Tokyo was required by its terms of reference to consider a number of principal factors arising from the prior decisions of the
Committee and the undertaking by the State Party. In relation to each of these factors, the mission’s conclusions were as follows:

- **Interpretive strategy showing how each site contributes to Outstanding Universal Value and allows an understanding of the full history of each site (Decision 39 COM 8B.14):** The mission has concluded that the interpretation strategy as implemented at the IHIC clearly demonstrates how each site contributes to OUV, and the individual interpretation plans for each site are firmly based on a common theme. Although it is acknowledged that the history of some of the sites extends to the periods before and/or after the period covered by OUV (1850s – 1910), in the opinion of the mission some aspects cannot be described as a full history because they deal only briefly if at all with the period leading up to and during the Second World War.

- **Measures to allow an understanding of a large number of Koreans and others brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions, and the Japanese government’s requisition policy (Statement by Japanese delegation at the time of inscription):** The requisition policy of 1944 is acknowledged and displayed in the IHIC. The previous government actions to bring large numbers of Koreans and others to work in the industrial sites was explained to the mission during the discussions but is found only in written material within the research centre. The information displayed gives the impression that conscripted workers from other countries were considered to be Japanese nationals at the time and were treated as such. The oral testimonies displayed, which were all related to Hashima Island, convey the message that there were no instances of such people being forced to work there. The mission has therefore concluded that the interpretive measures to allow an understanding of those brought against their will and forced to work are currently insufficient.

- **Incorporation into the interpretive strategy of appropriate measures to remember the victims such as the establishment of an information centre (Statement by Japanese delegation at the time of inscription):** The information centre (IHIC) has been established since 2020, and although it contains a variety of research material relating to the lives of workers, including oral testimonies, the mission has concluded that, to date, there is no display that could be characterised as adequately serving the purpose of remembering the victims.

- **Best international practice for interpretation strategies on the interpretation of the full history of the property both during and outside the period covered by its OUV and in the digital interpretation materials (Decision 42 COM 7B.10):** The mission has concluded that in relation to the full history the interpretation strategy, for the period after the OUV, fails short of international best practice, compared with other industrial heritage sites with similar histories where the practice of people being forced to work and the use of the sites for military purposes is fully acknowledged. In relation to digital interpretation materials, the mission is of the opinion that the IHIC exemplifies best international practice that could serve as a model for other World Heritage sites worldwide.

- **Continuing dialogue between the concerned parties (Decision 42 COM 7B.10):** The IHIC has had continuing dialogue with concerned parties including a number of people of Korean and other origin, most of whom (so the mission was informed) are now resident in Japan, and also with several invited international experts. The mission has concluded that some dialogue has taken place between the concerned State Parties, notably the Republic of Korea and Japan, because on 30 June 2021,
the mission team received from WHC a document provided by the State Party of Japan listing meetings that had taken place between Japan and the Republic of Korea. Although the mission did not receive any information about the contents of these meetings, they appear to constitute a signal that a dialogue is actually continuing between these concerned parties. The mission considers that future dialogue is important and should be pursued.

In summary, the mission has concluded that while a number of aspects in the decisions of the Committee have been complied with, some in an exemplary way, and a number of the commitments by the State Party have also been met, the IHIC has not yet fully implemented the undertakings made by the State Party at the time of inscription, or the decisions of the World Heritage Committee both at the time of inscription and subsequently.
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ANNEX 1 – Terms of Reference of the UNESCO/ICOMOS Mission to the Industrial Heritage Information Center in Tokyo

Terms of Reference of the UNESCO/ICOMOS Mission to the Industrial Heritage Information Center related to the World Heritage property ‘Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding And Coal Mining’ (Japan) (C 1484)
May 2021

The mission shall:

1) Conduct a visit to the Industrial Heritage Information Center (annex building of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications located in Tokyo, Japan) related to the World Heritage property ‘Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining’ (Japan), inscribed on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015);

2) Review the information provided at the Information Center, with particular attention to the two Decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th (39 COM 8B.14) and 42nd (42 COM 7B.10) sessions respectively;

3) Exchange with staff of the Information Center on any other information provided to visitors (e.g. brochures and other material);

4) Provide a report on the visit, the information and material collected to UNESCO as soon as possible.

Due to various health and safety restrictions and technical issues preventing Mr Clément and Mr Phillips from carrying out the on-site visit, Dr Judith Herrmann will, on behalf of the entire mission team:

5) Carry out the mission to Tokyo (travel Frankfurt-Tokyo-Frankfurt);

6) Report back to the World Heritage Centre concerning her visit and contribute to the aforementioned mission report, to be finalized jointly by Mr Clément, Ms Herrmann and Mr Phillips.
ANNEX 2 – Decisions of the World Heritage Committee as referred to in the Terms of Reference (relevant paragraphs are highlighted in yellow)

Document WHC-15/39.COM/19, Decision 39 COM 8B.14, pp. 177-180

The World Heritage Committee,
1. Having examined Documents WHC-15/39.COM/8B and WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Inscribes the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining, Japan, on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv);
3. Adopts the following Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:
   […]
4. Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:
   a) Developing as a priority a detailed conservation work programme for Hashima Island;
   b) Developing a prioritised conservation work programme for the property and its component sites and an implementation programme;
   c) Defining acceptable visitor threshold levels at each component site to mitigate any potential adverse impacts, commencing with those most likely to be at risk;
   d) Monitoring the effectiveness of the new partnership-based framework for the conservation and management of the property and its components on an annual basis;
   e) Monitoring the implementation of the conservation management plans, the issues discussed and the decisions made by the Local Conservation Councils on an annual basis;
   f) Establishing and implementing an ongoing training programme for all staff and stakeholders responsible for the day-to-day management of each component to build capacity and ensure a consistent approach to the property’s ongoing conservation, management and presentation;
   g) Preparing an interpretive strategy for the presentation of the property, which gives particular emphasis to the way each of the sites contributes to Outstanding Universal Value and reflects one or more of the phases of industrialisation; and also allows an understanding of the full history of each site1;
   h) Submitting all development projects for road construction projects at Shuseikan and Mietsu Naval Dock and for new anchorage facility at Miike Port and proposals for the upgrade or development of visitor facilities to the World Heritage Committee for examination, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Requests the State Party to submit a report outlining progress with the above to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2017, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018;
6. Also recommends that the State Party consider inviting ICOMOS to offer advice on the implementation of the above recommendations.

[1] The World Heritage Committee takes note of the statement made by Japan, as regards the interpretive strategy that allows an understanding of the full history of each site as referred to in paragraph 4.g), which is contained in the Summary Record of the session (document WHC-15/39.COM/INF.19).

Document WHC-15/39.COM-INF.19, Item 8B C.3.1., p. 222

The Delegation of Japan delivered the following statement:

Madame Chairperson,

Thank you for the opportunity to deliver this statement on behalf of the Government of Japan.
It is quite an honor for the Government of Japan that the "Outstanding Universal Value" of this property has been duly evaluated and that, with the support of all Members of the Committee, it has been inscribed on the World Heritage List by a consensus decision.

The Government of Japan respects the ICOMOS recommendation that was made from technical and expert perspectives. Especially, in developing the interpretive strategy," Japan will sincerely respond to the recommendation that the strategy allows an understanding of the full history of each site."

More specifically, Japan is prepared to take measures that allow an understanding that there were a large number of Koreans and others who were brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions in the 1940s at some of the sites, and that, during World War II, the Government of Japan also implemented its policy of requisition.

Japan is prepared to incorporate appropriate measures into the interpretive strategy to remember the victims such as the establishment of information center.

The Government of Japan expresses its deep appreciation to Chairperson Böhmer, all Members of the World Heritage Committee and everyone involved in the process for their understanding of the "Outstanding Universal Value" of the property, and for their kind cooperation towards its inscription."

Document WHC-18/42.COM/18, Decision 42 COM 7B.10, pp. 84–85

The World Heritage Committee,
1. Having examined Document WHC/18/42.COM/7B.Add2,
2. Recalling Decision 39 COM 8B.14[1], adopted at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015),
3. Takes note of the illustrated reports provided on conservation work carried out at various component sites, along with future priorities;
4. Commending the State Party on the details provided so far concerning Hashima Island, notes the substantial progress achieved in the development of a detailed 30-year conservation work programme for the island and the commitment of resources for the length of the plan and also notes that the programme will stabilise the island s retaining walls, conserve decaying remains and preserve the battleship form of its silhouette, and that priority will be given in the first phase to the retaining walls and researching conservation techniques;
5. Requests the State Party to submit the following information to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, as it becomes available:
   A. One or more study(ies) on those buildings made of wood, steel, and reinforced concrete which have collapsed or irreversibly decayed since 1974, and whether they can be conserved,
   B. Further archaeological studies,
   C. More research on historical documents, structural materials and visitor movements,
   D. An Action Plan, developed by Nagasaki City, covering project deadlines, implementation techniques for phased work, and setting annual goals;
6. Further notes that monitoring of the number of visitors is being undertaken systematically for all component sites, and that a visitor management strategy, including carrying capacities, will be formulated in 2018 on the basis of these results; and also requests the State Party to submit this strategy to the World Heritage Centre, once it is completed, for review by the Advisory Bodies;
7. Notes furthermore that interpretation is available for all component sites, and that digital communications have been developed, but that further improvements are planned, including Information Centre to be opened;
8. Further requests the State Party to provide an update on overall interpretation upon completion of Information Centre;
9. Strongly encourages the State Party to take into account best international practices for interpretation strategies when continuing its work on the interpretation of the full history of the property, both during and outside of the period covered by its OUV, and in the digital interpretation materials;
10. Encourages continuing dialogue between the concerned parties;
11. Requests furthermore the State Party to fully implement Decision 39 COM 8B.14[1] and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2019, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020.

[1] The World Heritage Committee takes note of the statement made by Japan, as regards the interpretive strategy that allows an understanding of the full history of each site as referred to in paragraph 4.g) of the Decision 39 COM 8B.14, which is contained in the Summary Record of the session (document WHC-15/39.COM/INF.19).
ANNEX 3 – Composition of the mission team

Étienne Clement  UNESCO
Peter Phillips  ICOMOS
Judith Herrmann, Ph.D.  Researcher
ANNEX 4 – Programme of the mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme of the mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1 (June 7th)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings, Overview of the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 ~ 17:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Day 2 (June 8th)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Interpretation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 ~ 17:00 (including 1-hour lunch break)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Day 3 (June 9th)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tour of the IHIC (second visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 ~ 17:00 (including 1-hour lunch break)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNESCO/ICOMOS Mission to the Industrial Heritage Information Centre Programme (Draft)
ANNEX 5 – List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNESCO/ICOMOS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Heritage Information Centre (National Congress of Industrial Heritage)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister's Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Industrial Heritage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Industrial Heritage Information Centre is operated by National Congress of Industrial Heritage*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Hagi</td>
<td>Hagi City Cultural Properties Protection Department, World Cultural Heritage Office</td>
<td>Tatsuya NAKAMURA</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kagoshima</td>
<td>Kagoshima City Board of Education, Cultural Assets Division</td>
<td>Hiromi SUEYOSHI</td>
<td>Section Chief of Cultural Assets Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nirayama</td>
<td>Izenokuni City Cultural Properties Division</td>
<td>Takahiro AKIYAMA</td>
<td>Section Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kamaishi</td>
<td>Kamaishi City World Heritage Office</td>
<td>Kazuyoshi MORI</td>
<td>Assistant Section chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Saga</td>
<td>Saga City History and World Heritage Division</td>
<td>Kousuke KITAMURA</td>
<td>Mietsu Utilization Section Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nagasaki</td>
<td>Nagasaki City, Office Department of Culture and Tourism, World Heritage Office</td>
<td>Yoshiro KURIWAKI</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean and Environmental Policy Division, Ports and Harbours Bureau, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism</td>
<td>Toshimasa KAWASAKI</td>
<td>Director for Environmental Policy Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Miike</td>
<td>Omuta City Coal Industry and Science Museum</td>
<td>Yoshiya SAKAI</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fukuoka Prefectural Office Prefecture Soil Maintenance Division Harbor Section</td>
<td>Yosuke MIZOBÉ</td>
<td>Senior Technical Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Yawata</td>
<td>Kitakyushu City Planning and Coordination Bureau Policy Department World Heritage Division</td>
<td>Daisuke KANEKO</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Technical Staff List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameraman</td>
<td>Norimasa MIYAKE</td>
<td>Videographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 21 (Audio and Visual)</td>
<td>Isamu KAKIHISA</td>
<td>Section Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takuya IWASAKI</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guest Speaker List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Heritage Information Centre (National Congress of Industrial Heritage)</td>
<td>Ryuji KWON</td>
<td>Archivist, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Workers (Gunkanjima Concierge / Gunkanjima Digital Museum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Congress of Industrial Heritage</td>
<td>Yuki OGAWA</td>
<td>MAP Team (Student Intern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryota TATAKASHI</td>
<td>MAP Team (Student Intern)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 6 – Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining

Source: Document WHC-15/39.COM/19, Decision 39 COM 8B.14, pp. 177-179

Brief synthesis
A series of industrial heritage sites, focused mainly on the Kyushu-Yamaguchi region of southwest of Japan, represent the first successful transfer of industrialization from the West to a non-Western nation. The rapid industrialization that Japan achieved from the middle of the 19th century to the early 20th century was founded on iron and steel, shipbuilding and coal mining, particularly to meet defence needs. The sites in the series reflect the three phases of this rapid industrialisation achieved over a short space of just over fifty years between 1850s and 1910.

The first phase in the pre-Meiji Bakumatsu isolation period, at the end of Shogun era in the 1850s and early 1860s, was a period of experimentation in iron making and shipbuilding. Prompted by the need to improve the defences of the nation and particularly its sea-going defences in response to foreign threats, industrialisation was developed by local clans through second hand knowledge, based mostly on Western textbooks, and copying Western examples, combined with traditional craft skills. Ultimately most were unsuccessful. Nevertheless this approach marked a substantial move from the isolationism of the Edo period, and in part prompted the Meiji Restoration.

The second phase from the 1860s accelerated by the new Meiji Era, involved the importation of Western technology and the expertise to operate it; while the third and final phase in the late Meiji period (between 1890 to 1910), was full-blown local industrialization achieved with newly-acquired Japanese expertise and through the active adaptation of Western technology to best suit Japanese needs and social traditions, on Japan’s own terms. Western technology was adapted to local needs and local materials and organised by local engineers and supervisors.

The 23 components are in 11 sites within 8 discrete areas. Six of the eight areas are in the south-west of the country, with one in the central part and one in the northern part of (p. 178) the central island. Collectively the sites are an outstanding reflection of the way Japan moved from a clan based society to a major industrial society with innovative approaches to adapting western technology in response to local needs and profoundly influenced the wider development of East Asia.

After 1910, many sites later became fully fledged industrial complexes, some of which are still in operation or are part of operational sites.

Criterion (ii): The Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution illustrate the process by which feudal Japan sought technology transfer from Western Europe and America from the middle of the 19th century and how this technology was adopted and progressively adapted to satisfy specific domestic needs and social traditions, thus enabling Japan to become a world-ranking industrial nation by the early 20th century. The sites collectively represents an exceptional interchange of industrial ideas, know-how and equipment, that resulted, within a short space of time, in an unprecedented emergence of autonomous industrial development in the field of heavy industry which had profound impact on East Asia.

Criterion (iv): The technological ensemble of key industrial sites of iron and steel, shipbuilding and coal mining is testimony to Japan’s unique achievement in world history as the first non-Western country to successfully industrialize. Viewed as an Asian cultural response to Western industrial values, the ensemble is an outstanding technological ensemble of industrial sites that reflected the rapid and distinctive industrialisation of Japan based on local innovation and adaptation of Western technology.
Integrity
The component sites of the series adequately encompass all the necessary attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. In terms of the integrity of individual sites, though the level of intactness of the components is variable, they demonstrate the necessary attributes to convey Outstanding Universal Value. The archaeological evidence appears to be extensive and merits detail recording research and vigilant protection. It contributes significantly to the integrity of the nominated property. A few of the attributes are vulnerable or highly vulnerable in terms of their state of conservation. The Hashima Coal Mine is in a state of deterioration and presents substantial conservation challenges. At the Miike Coal Mine and Miike Port some of the physical fabric is in poor condition. The physical fabric of the Repair shop at the Imperial Steel Works is in poor condition although temporary measures have been put in place. In a few sites there are vulnerabilities in terms of the impact of development, particularly in visual terms. At the Shokasonjuku Academy, the visual integrity of the setting is impacted by the subsequent development of the place as a public historic site and experience. However, this development does not adversely compromise its overall integrity. The visual integrity of the Takashima Coal Mine is compromised by small scale domestic and commercial development, while at Shuseikan, the Foreign Engineer’s Residence has been relocated twice and is now located in the proximity of its original location. The residence is surrounded by small scale urban development that adversely impacts on its setting. The setting can only be enhanced if and when the surrounding buildings are demolished and any further development is controlled through the legislative process and the implementation of the conservation management plan.

Authenticity
In terms of the authenticity of individual sites, though some of the components’ attributes are fragmentary or are archaeological remains, they are recognisably authentic evidence of the industrial facilities. They possess a high level of authenticity as a primary source of information, supported by detailed and documented archaeological reports and surveys and a large repository of historical sources held in both public and private archives. Overall the series adequately conveys the way in which feudal Japan sought technology transfer from Western Europe and America from the middle of the 19th century. And adapted it to satisfy specific domestic needs and social traditions.

Protection and management requirements
A number of existing legislative protection instruments, both national and regional, provide a high level of protection for the sites and associated buffer zones. The relationship between the different types of legislation is provided in the conservation management plans for each area. The most important of these instruments are the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties that is applied to the non-operational sites, and the Landscape Act that applies to the privately owned and still operational sites that are protected as Structures of Landscape Importance. This applies to the four components owned and operated by Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd. at Nagasaki Shipyard, and the two components owned and operated by Nippon Steel & Sumitomo Metal Corporation at Imperial Steel Works. The Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties is the primary mechanism for regulating any development and change of the existing state of a designated place and under this law permission must be granted by the national government. Similarly, under the Landscape Act permission must be sought to change any Structure of Landscape Importance and owners of such structures must conserve and manage them appropriately. The control of development and actions within the buffer zones is largely controlled by city landscape ordinances that limit the height and density of any proposed development. Conservation management plans for each of the components have been developed that detail how each component contributes to the Outstanding Universal Value of the series. “Basic Policies” in the plans provide an overarching consistent conservation approach though there are variations in the level of detail provided for the implementation of work in each component.
The Japanese Government has established a new partnership-based framework for the conservation and management of the property and its components including the operational sites.
This is known as the General Principles and Strategic Framework for the Conservation and Management of the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Kyushu-Yamagachi and Related Areas. Japan’s Cabinet Secretariat has the overall responsibility for the implementation of the framework. Under this strategic framework a wide range of stakeholders, including relevant national and local government agencies and private companies, will develop a close partnership to protect and manage the property. In addition to these mechanisms, the private companies Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd., Nippon Steel & Sumitomo Metal Corporation and Miike Port Logistics Corporation have entered into agreements with the Cabinet Secretariat to protect, conserve and manage their relevant components. Attention should be given to monitoring the effectiveness of the new partnership-based framework, and to putting in place an on-going capacity building programme for staff. There is also a need to ensure that appropriate heritage advice is routinely available for privately owned sites. What is urgently needed is an interpretation strategy to show how each site or component relates to the overall series, particularly in terms of the way they reflect the one or more phases of Japan’s industrialisation and convey their contribution to Outstanding Universal Value.
ANNEX 7 – Graphical material from the 2017 Interpretation Strategy for the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution

Fig. 1  Hierarchy of values and themes (p. 43)

Fig. 2  Interpretation flow at each local visitor centre: Hierarchy of interpretation (p. 43)

Fig. 3.  Relationship of Meiji Sites within each of the three industrial typologies (p. 48)
Fig. 4 Consideration of the full history with regard to the 8 component areas of the World Heritage property of the Meiji Sites as well as other industrial heritage sites in Japan (p. 44)

Fig. 5 Hierarchy of physical interpretation and presentation (p. 46)
Fig. 6  Chronological development phases of three industrial typologies in relation to the 8 component areas of the Meiji Sites (1850s to 1910) (p. 47)

ANNEX 8 – Photographs of the Industrial Heritage Information Centre in Tokyo

Outside and entrance

The Industrial Heritage Information Centre (IHIC) is located in the Shinjuku district in Tokyo, in the Annex of the Statistics Bureau of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications.

Fig. 1 – Entrance to the Annex and sign/logo of the IHIC.

Fig. 2 – Annex of the Statistics Bureau and entrance to the IHIC.
Fig. 3 – Entrance to the IHIC with sign/logo.

Reception

Fig. 4 – Reception desk with AR Guide Map.
Fig. 5 and 6 – AR Guide Maps.
ZONE 1
Zone 1 consists of four areas, the so-called “celebration room,” an audio-visual theatre, and two areas providing introductory information about the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution.
Fig. 9 – “Celebration room” showing timeline leading to the inscription of the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution.

Fig. 10 – Nomination Dossier of the Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution.
Fig. 11 – Statement of the Delegation of Japan at the time of inscription (English original and Japanese translation).

Fig. 12 – One of two immersive multi-displays (Liquid Galaxy) showing information on each of the 23 component sites.
Fig. 13 – Brief synthesis, Criteria (ii) and (iv), authenticity and integrity descriptions (in English and Japanese). Chart from the 2017 Interpretation Strategy showing the full history for each of the eight component areas of the Meiji Sites (before, during, and after OUV period).

Fig. 14 – Chart from the 2017 Interpretation Strategy showing the chronological development phases of three industrial typologies in relation to the 8 component areas of the Meiji Sites within the period of OUV (1850s to 1910).
Fig. 12 – Brief introduction to the emergence of Industrial Japan (seen from the reception area in Japanese).

Fig. 13 – Brief introduction to the emergence of Industrial Japan (seen from the reverse side in English).
Zone 2
Zone 2 is the main exhibition. It is divided into five parts: (1) Early attempts under the Isolation Strategy, (2) Shipbuilding, (3) Iron and Steel, (4) Coal Mining, and (5) Industrialization. Figures 14 to 26 guide through the main exhibition.
Fig. 20 and 21 – Table with integrated computer screens that provides information on industrial heritage sites worldwide.
Fig. 26 – Zone 2 closes with an explanation for why the year 1910 was chosen as the end of the OUV period.

Zone 3

Zone 3, the Reference Room, is mostly dedicated to the exhibition of curated primary documents about workers’ lives, and particularly former Hashima Island residents.

Fig. 27 and 28 – Selected photographs of testimonies and Chief Guide Mr Youichi Nakamura.
Fig. 29 and 30 – Video screens, wall panels, Liquid Galaxy, book shelf, and reading area.
Fig. 31 and 32 – Book shelf and testimonies with books about the dark side of industrial history and the Meiji sites.
Fig. 33 and 34 – Digitalized library with primary documents, including texts about the first half of the 20th century.
Fig. 35 – Four testimonies (videos) of former Hashima Island residents.
ANNEX 9 – List of key documents which have informed the mission and list of meetings with delegations of States Parties

Key documents

A number of documents have been received and read by the mission team. The following list is non-exhaustive and presents some of the key documents that have informed the mission and mission report.


WHC (2021), Chronology of decisions and Summary Records of the World Heritage Committee related to the World Heritage property “Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining” (1484, Japan).

List of meetings

20 April 2021 – Online meeting with Japanese experts

List of participants:

Mission team
• Mr Étienne Clement, UNESCO
• Mr Peter Phillips, ICOMOS

Cabinet Secretariat
• Mr Naoki Kimura, Counsellor, Department of Industrial Heritage
• Mr Tetsuya Shimomura, Senior Deputy Director, Department of Industrial Heritage

Industrial Heritage Information Center
• Ms Koko Kato, Managing-Director
• Mr Barry Gamble, World Heritage Consultant

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
• Ms Yukiko Matsuda, Director, Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division
• Mr Koichi Warisawa, Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO

10 March 2021 – Online meeting with experts from the Republic of Korea

Participants

Mission team
• Mr Étienne Clement, UNESCO
• Mr Peter Phillips, ICOMOS

Korean experts
• Mr. SUH Kyung-ho, Honorary Professor, College of Liberal Studies in Seoul National University
• Ms. JUNG Hyekyung, Leading Researcher, Peace Research on Forced Mobilization under Japanese Colonialism in Korea
• Ms. LEE Hyun Kyung, Senior Researcher, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Institute for Cultural Heritage

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
• Mr. KYUN Jong ho, Deputy Director-General of Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs
• Ms. KANG Pilho, Director of UNESCO Affairs
• Ms. LEE Juwon, Deputy Director of UNESCO Affairs

A second online meeting with the newly enlarged mission team (Mr Clement, Mr Phillips, and Dr Judith Herrmann) took place on 26 May 2021.
ANNEX 10 – Document listing meetings between Japan and the Republic of Korea

The Government of Japan has made active efforts to provide opportunities for dialogue with a wide range of concerned parties, including Japanese and foreign experts, local government officials, and tourism operators. Dialogue with government and management of component parties, such as relevant ministries, local government organizations, and managers of component parties, is highly required from the point of preservation and management of World Heritage sites. The site, placed under threat in 2010, has been designated under the World Heritage Convention. Since then, Japan and the Republic of Korea have continued to exchange dialogue on the conservation and management of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 14, 2020</td>
<td>Japan-ROK Foreign Ministers’ Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2020</td>
<td>Director-General of Cultural Affairs (Japan) and Director-General of Cultural Affairs (ROK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2020</td>
<td>Director-General of Cultural Affairs (Japan) and Director-General of Cultural Affairs (ROK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Visit of the Industrial Heritage Information Centre by the Embassy of the ROK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Visit of the Industrial Heritage Information Centre by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Visit of the Cultural Affairs Bureau (ROK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Visit of the Industrial Heritage Information Centre by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Regular telephone/e-mail communications between officers of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Other exchanges that took place in Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Meeting between Ambassador of Japan to the ROK and 2nd Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of the ROK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>Meetings between Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan and Director-General of Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Information sharing before the submission of State of Conservation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>Advance notification of the opening of the Industrial Heritage Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2020</td>
<td>Regular telephone/e-mail communication between officers of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the ROK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The Sits of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution: Responses to World Heritage Committee decision

6. Recent major dialogue on this issue between Japan and the Republic of Korea

7. The site also took place on a regular basis including Director-General of Cultural Affairs meeting on cultural affairs.