

UNESCO Regional Meeting on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention for Asia

Time: 7-10 December, 2011

Venue: Ramada Plaza Suwon Hotel, Suwon, Gyeonggi Province, Republic of Korea

Hosts: Cultural Heritage Administration (CHA), Gyeonggi Provincial Government, Suwon City

Organizers: UNESCO World Heritage Centre (Paris), Korean National Commission for UNESCO

Sponsor: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

● MINUTES

1-1. WEDNESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2011

1. Opening Ceremony (10:00-11:10 / Grand Ballroom 3F)

Mr. Sangkyoo Kang, Head of the Culture & Communication Team of the Korean National Commission for UNESCO, introduced **Mr. Chan Kim**, Administrator of the Cultural Heritage Administration. Mr. Chan Kim went forward to the podium and delivered his opening address. Mr. Kim extended gratitude for all those who travelled for the conference. He mentioned that the World Heritage Convention will have been adopted for 40 years by 2012, highlighting the meaning of this regional meeting on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting as a process for reviewing the system of the World Heritage Convention and an opportunity to discuss the unlimited potential of Asian countries regarding their Heritage sites. He then went on to say that the Korean Government is enthusiastic for cooperation with other countries in Asia to conserve World Heritage sites around the world.

Mr. Taeksoo Chun began his opening remarks by expressing his appreciation to those present for their attendance at the conference. He also said that it is an honor to organize this regional meeting on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting. He expected this meeting to be a milestone for reviewing the universal value of World Heritages, strengthening management capacity and networking among participants. He also mentioned the World Heritage sites and Samsung in Suwon to emphasize the significance of World Heritage for the development of cities. He finished his address with an additional request for participants to share their experience and knowledge for active application toward World Heritage.

The Welcoming addresses began with **Mr. Taeyoung Yeom**, Mayor of Suwon City. He expressed his gratitude for those who were attending the forum and noted the meaning of this regional meeting with expectations to share various levels of discussion among the participants. He also stressed Suwon City's aspiration to conserve and restore World Heritage, mentioning Suwon Hwaseong, which has been registered as a World Heritage site for 14 years. He continued to speak about the objectives of this meeting to establish further cooperation in Asia through each state party's periodic reporting. He finished his statement with a promise to meet everyone at the Welcome Dinner and Field Visit programs later. Following Mr. Taeyoung Yeom, **Mr. Feng Jing**, Chief of UNESCO World Heritage Center Asia-Pacific Unit,

started his welcome address with his thanks for all the participants present at the meeting. He expected to evoke many ideas through this regional meeting on World Heritage in Asia. He specifically mentioned how the World Heritage site in Suwon City has special meaning for Korean architecture and culture to promote similar cases in other countries. He then asked all the attendants to share each other's opinions and experiences for Heritage management. He also highlighted the significance of the World Heritage Convention since 1972 and said that it is important to discuss how World Heritage should be conserved in harmony with nature and human societies. He stated that the success of the Convention relies on each state party's local communities, governments, and all the stakeholders, therefore stressing the importance of this regional meeting to deduct effective and concrete action plans for World Heritage sites. He finished his remarks by expressing further thanks to the organizers and the Korean Government.

2. Session I . Assessment of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

1) Plenary Session (11:30-13:00 / Grand Ballroom 3F)

Presentation: Overview of the Current Periodic Reporting Exercise in Asia-Pacific

- Mr. Feng JING, Chief of UNESCO World Heritage Center Asia-Pacific Unit

Mr. Feng Jing was welcomed to the podium again to deliver his presentation on the overview of the current periodic reporting exercise in the Asia-Pacific region. The strategic objectives of the World Heritage Committee, he highlighted, are strengthening the credibility of the World Heritage List, ensuring conservation of World Heritage properties, promoting capacity-building in states parties, increasing public awareness through communication, and enhancing the role of communities.

According to his explanation, the Asia-Pacific region consists of 28 Asian state parties and 14 Pacific state parties. Out of 936 World Heritage properties, 205 are situated in Asia and the Pacific Region. He also mentioned some Heritage sites in the list of World Heritage in Danger in the Asia-Pacific Region. He also introduced main conservation issues at World Heritage properties such as development and infrastructure, management and legal issues, inappropriate human activities, and natural events and disasters. In this context, he pointed out the purpose of monitoring mechanisms which consist of periodic reporting driven by state parties and reactive monitoring driven by the World Heritage Committee.

Most of all, he stated that proposed approaches drawn up by previous meetings are reaffirmations of Outstanding Universal Value as the cornerstone of all World Heritage Processes, linkage of the different World Heritage processes, consolidation of data through retrospective inventory, integration of all databases to offer a complete documentation on each property, and simplification of the questionnaire and the process for competing it. He finished his presentation by clarifying the goals of the meeting in Suwon by reviewing the results of the questionnaires and the initial discussions on how to cooperate at the regional level to introduce formulated ideas to the committee in the near future.

Presentation: Outcome of the Periodic Reporting Questionnaires

- Ms. Kaori KAWAKAMI, Assistant Programme Specialist UNESCO World Heritage Center Asia Pacific Unit

Next, **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** presented the outcome of the periodic reporting questionnaires to the attendants. The second cycle of periodic reporting consists of 166 draft retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV), periodic reporting online questionnaires with section 1 by 41 states parties and section 2 on 198 properties in 31 states parties, and retrospective inventory on 96 properties out of 106 properties in 19 states parties. As a result, all 166 SOUVs have been submitted, of which 165 SOUVs were considered complete, and all the periodic reporting online questionnaires were submitted. However, considering the retrospective inventory, out of the 96 properties, only 6 properties have submitted cartographic information as of December 1, 2011. Kaori strongly encouraged submission by

the other countries.

She also briefly explained the schedule of the second cycle of periodic reporting and then went on to introduce key players such as national focal points, site managers, mentors, advisory bodies, UNESCO field offices and the World Heritage Centre. She pointed out that in the second cycle, information will be provided by regions and sub-regions and by types of properties, and will use tables and graphs to facilitate reading and comprehension, and will also provide complete sets of results. Section 1 of periodic reporting is about the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Asia and the Pacific and deals with inventories, legal framework, financial resources, human resources, and training needs. Section 2 is about the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties in Asia and the Pacific, and 76 factors affecting the properties were grouped in 13 group factors. She pointed out that the same factors can affect the properties both positively and negatively through the result.

Presentation: UNESCO Regional Meeting on the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Asia

- Ms. Jane HARRINGTON, ICOMOS Director

The presentations from the advisory bodies followed. First, **Ms. Jane Harrington**, Director of ICOMOS was introduced to the podium. She assessed the completion and submission of the draft retrospective SOUVs and all the state parties' submissions of the relevant parts 1 and 2 for the periodic report highly. She also stated that tentative lists are important elements to provide a balanced and representative World Heritage list, and ICOMOS supports this approach and encourages a selection process that places a priority on addressing identified gaps. She then introduced ICOMOS thematic studies, which are to include the rich ethno-cultural diversity of the Asia-Pacific region, mentioning some examples such as the Silk Road and Water Management which are recently in progress. In regards to management issues, she stated that achieving foundational mechanisms at the national level and capacity-building should be considered high priorities. She then emphasized that ICOMOS helps all the processes to draw desired outcomes and actions.

Presentation: A Just World that values and conserves nature

- Mr. Timothy BADMAN, IUCN World Heritage Program Director

Mr. Timothy Badman started his presentation with a brief introduction of IUCN. IUCN consists of various members from 160 countries, government agencies, NGOs, and regional and national committees working to influence, encourage, and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable since 1948. IUCN's work process comprises knowledge, action, and influence. He then stated that the World Heritage Convention is one of the most important global conservation instruments, and potentially a total of 89 properties would be nominated to the World Heritage List within the next six years in the Asia and the Pacific region. As 25 potential properties for nomination will be located in the Pacific Island States, he said that there should be reactive monitoring instead of simple responding. He also asked for an additional approach at the national industrial level and the governmental level. He then expected that tourism and climate change would be key issues in the discussion, therefore stressing the need for relevant training programs.

Presentation: Moving from training to capacity development

- Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya, ICCROM Project Manager

Lastly, **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya**, ICCROM Project Manager, talked about capacity-building issues. He stated that the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy has been developed by ICCROM and IUCN with ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and a number of other partners and individual specialists in 2010 and 2011. The strategy combines both natural and cultural heritage sectors. In particular, in the 2001 Global Training Strategy, the changing situation and the need for a revised strategy led to a shift in

emphasis from 'knowledge transfer' to 'knowledge acquisition' through an analysis of State of Conservation Reports and other sources. He emphasized that SOC reports help us to clarify other critical aspects such as where the capacities that need strengthening reside, and what audiences can be targeted in order to make improvements in these critical issues. He finished his presentation by mentioning that capacity-building must be associated with audiences of practitioners, institutions, communities and networks in harmony with strategies at three different levels of national, regional, and global strategies.

2) Plenary Session (Cont.) (14:30-18:00 / Plaza Hall 2F)

Moderators: **Mr. Imran AHMED**, Deputy Conservator of Bangladesh Forest Department

Ms. Kaori KAWAKAMI, UNESCO WHC Asia Pacific Unit

Mr. Feng JING, UNESCO WHC Asia Pacific Unit

Panel: **Mr. Timothy BADMAN**, IUCN

Ms. Jane HARRINGTON, ICOMOS

Mr. Gamini WIJESURIYA, ICCROM

The first question was from the **UNESCO Office in Jakarta**. It was about how to consider action plans more in detail at the national level. **Mr. Feng Jing** answered this question by saying that this session is for brain-storming to suggest initial ideas on action plans. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** also explained that one third of World Heritage sites are located in Asia and the Pacific region, pointing out that the difference of the Asia-Pacific region from other regions is based on communities. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** also recommended all the state parties to actively clarify their own needs because action plans are actually for state parties themselves, not UNESCO.

Mr. Chahryar Adle asked whether there have been significant changes from 30 years ago and today. He also asked for relevant cases or certain countries that have tried new approaches. He then further suggested discussing to what extent the management of World Heritage can be comprehensive in light of the fact that there are difficulties in identifying core zones, buffer zones, and landscape zones. For example, if the sites have an explosion in population, most countries would face difficulties in implementing action plans properly. The **Delegate of Bangladesh** said that it would be desirable if other countries can share Bangladesh's successful experience on the main residing areas of core zones.

Ms. Radhika Dhumal noted that site management is still one of most important issues, the same as it was the main issue on the first cycle of periodic reporting. She asked whether any country can request re-nomination on the second cycle of periodic reporting. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** answered that the second cycle of periodic reporting would mainly discuss the common issues of sub-regions. He also explained that management plans were being dealt with deeply in the process of nomination itself. He took Europe as an example to show that 70% of the region already established their own management plans on every site and started them successfully. **Ms. Radhika Dhumal** asked again whether it is possible to set practical management plans for each country's sites in detail through the process of periodic reporting. She said that the management plans of many countries, including India's, usually end with one official's plan or outsourcing. **Mr. Sathyakumar Sambandam** agreed with this idea and said that financial support for national parks in India is based on action plans. So it would be more effective if there are specific guidelines for management plan. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** said that many experts have established guidelines and processes through several projects on management plans. **Mr. Timothy Badman** also pointed out the importance of translation regarding this issue. He also mentioned the importance of developing specific sites which can involve many communities and relevant institutions to formulate networking mechanisms and standards.

Mr. Abdisafikhan Rakhmanov started his comment by saying that there have been many improvements on the process. He stressed the success of three previous regional meetings in preparation of the second

cycle of periodic reporting. He also stated that each heritage site requires different approaches and management plans. According to him, Uzbekistan has two different management plans for separate sites. He also mentioned that training workshops of the World Heritage Center were really helpful to state parties.

Mr. Kai Ube Prasad Weise spoke about the difficulties in filling up the report of session 2 regarding serial sites. He explained that one of the sites is composed of seven different monuments with different issues. **Ms. Jane Harrington** agreed with this opinion and admitted that there have been similar problems when planning management. She said that it is important to establish proper systems for each heritage site through constant periodic reporting. **Ms. Hyosang Jo** noted that the issue related to serial sites should be considered very carefully. In addition, she also raised the question of ambiguity in terms of the discussion. She added that there is a necessity to cover the issue of community participation. She said that the Korean government's top-down method has both advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Paul Dingwall said that it would be desirable to consider serial sites as 'one heritage site.' It would be more effective if there are specific institutions governing overall serial sites. He also suggested developing hubs through the internet as one of the action plans at the sub-regional level. If there is a global training institution in the Asia-Pacific region, specific regional issues can be shared and people would be well educated, which leads to proper mechanisms in the region. He also added his opinion that local communities are required to participate in the process from the initial stages.

The **Delegate of Indonesia** suggested that it is necessary to elaborate more on the exchanges between sub-regions. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** said that it would be more effective for each state party to share existing systems that have been already established for several issues, considering the financial and practical limitations. **Mr. Feng Jing** also emphasized the roles of many UNESCO field offices, which are located all around the region. For example, the Philippines and Italy have shared similar problems of heritage sites and developed very effective ways to solve those issues with each other's cooperation. Other countries would also be able to develop common issues and cooperate to deal with those problems together. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** agreed with his opinion and stressed the meaning of this meeting as an opportunity to notice the potential partners of each country.

Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya agreed with **Ms. Kaori Kawakami's** opinion and considered China's case of gathering all the stakeholders for site management. In the meeting, there were held training programs for climate change and risk management. In Rome, there is also similar program which provides several courses, but it is not easy for people in Asia and the Pacific region to apply for it. Therefore, he noted that it is very significant to solve this problem to make our own mechanism. **Ms. Jane Harrington** suggested unofficial networking as one way for innovative training. She spoke about inviting colleagues who face similar problems or developing hubs to promote communication as **Mr. Paul Dingwall** suggested.

The **Delegate of Pakistan** mentioned the necessity of local training since there has been a transfer of control of heritage sites in Pakistan. He said that Asia and the Pacific region lack overall training mechanisms despite the one center located in China. In addition, **Mr. Chahryar Adle** also highlighted the establishment of common management plans of serial sites and frontiers in terms of the nomination process. The **Delegate of the Philippines** noted that the experience of meeting site managers on each site in person was very helpful. Moreover, it was mentioned that there has been constant discussions on sustainable development in the Philippines recently.

After a short break, the **Delegate of the Philippines** continued to explain the country's training program as requested by the moderator. This program's objective was to monitor rice terraces endangered in 2001. The Philippines was able to share its experiences with Italy when ICOMOS and delegates from Italy visited the site. Later in 2009, delegates of the Philippines also visited Italy and all the sites, and they were able to see similarities and common issues. **Mr. Timothy Badman** also noted the importance of site management and relevant feedback with respect to each country's own approach. Especially in the case of the Philippines and Italy, a regional approach can provide various lessons to other countries. It is

recommended to develop good practices and share these with the support of state parties and the World Heritage center. He also mentioned the conference on 'Green List,' which will be held by IUCN in Jeju Island to share and analyze well-managed heritage sites together.

The moderator asked other countries to add different cases. **Mr. Sathyakumar Sambandam** mentioned India's case. In India, the federal government supports natural properties and sends teams to figure out how national parks are managed and how the values of sites are conserved. In the process, an assessment committee considers documents and different levels of issues.

Ms. Radhika Duhmal wanted to know the current state of re-nomination during periodic reporting. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** replied that the committee basically provides a 3-4 year grace period, and during this period, there are many issues, including changing buffer zones to re-nomination, changing the standards of heritage sites, and considering the results of periodic reporting. **Mr. Gaimini Wijesuriya** also stated that if there are changes and re-nomination is necessary, recommendations can be made. However, it has not yet been decided whether this can be made during the grace period. **Mr. Timothy Badman** explained it in more detail saying that at most two nominations can be made every year, and revisions can be made unless it affects the quota.

Mr. Delanghe Philippe talked about future strategies. He said that as **Mr. Timothy Badman** mentioned, there are many countries interested in their own national and local issues related to heritage sites. He suggested that it would be better if there were action plans that cover sub-regions. According to the results of the online questionnaires, he noted that we can notice certain common issues under each sub-region. **Mr. Kai Ube Prasad Weise**, pointed out that it would be desirable if we prepare regional strategies first and then apply them to each heritage site. She added her opinion on management plans and communication and networking, emphasizing the importance of communication between site managers and state parties and the necessity of sharing experiences and training programs beyond language barriers.

Considering the previous discussions, **Ms. Hanh Duong Bich** was in complete accord with the idea of developing national-level strategies. She added that it is necessary to have more discussions on how to make use of the results of this periodic reporting at a national level. She suggested that it would be easier to create synergy at the global, regional, sub-regional, and national levels.

Mr. Feng Jing answered that all the state parties can easily utilize the results and data, as this cycle of periodic reporting used online database from the beginning. He also stated that common issues must be discussed first, as resources are limited regarding action plans and national/regional plans. For example, he suggested selecting five sites that are endangered to seek practical solutions together to make cooperative actions on specific issues. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** also emphasized the fact that there are sub-regional issues and that we need to actively prepare mechanisms to minimize the dissipation of resources by identifying issues, whether they are at the national or regional level. **Mr. Gaimini Wijesuriya** noted that state parties should set clear objectives for capacity building and action plans, considering the additional issues that must be discussed at a regional level. Last but not least, we also need to formalize strategies for each heritage site as well.

The **Delegate of China** said that it is very critical to complete SOUVs, online questionnaires, and retrospective inventory in terms of site management at the governmental level. The Delegate also added that China has learned how to educate site managers and how to monitor heritage sites through several programs they developed for workshops and training. He mentioned the necessity for more research on specific factors such as environmental change, building, development, and pollution, which affect heritage sites of China. To be successful, it is important to enhance regional and national cooperation. For example, China and the Republic of Korea don't know much about each other's site managements even though they are geographically very close. Therefore, this concern needs to be reflected in action plans. **Ms. Jane Harrington** replied that all processes related to national and regional planning and implementation is important. Particularly in the second cycle, state parties have participated in assessed

meetings with their own management, which is a significant base to accumulate all the relevant information.

The **Delegate of Bangladesh** asked whether it would be possible to create concrete risk management action plans for sudden natural disasters. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** also added that the principle goal of this meeting is to set action plans for Asia and the Pacific region. He mentioned that all the results came from each heritage site even though the results are categorized at a more comprehensive level. Thus, we need to develop common regional issues and relate them to action plans so that we can establish new mechanisms. After that, state parties can comprehend and analyze their own results and prepare specific methods for their heritage sites.

Delegate of Bhutan

The **Delegate of Bhutan** said that Bhutan does not have any World Heritage sites yet. However, through the workshops, he was able to learn the importance of period reports and development of legislation at the national level. He then pointed out that it is still difficult to promote understanding the importance of cultural heritages for Bhutan as a nation. He asked whether it is necessary to be nominated before ratification of the World Heritage Convention. **Mr. Timothy Badman** highlighted that the objective of the World Heritage Convention is to conserve cultural and natural heritages comprehensively, not simply to compile a list. It is desirable to actively register sites if it is considered to be more effective as a national strategy. He finished his statement by recommending state parties to cooperate with partners in national planning and to implement the Convention. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** agreed with **Mr. Timothy Badman's** opinion. He also explained that IUCN will produce new reports on capacity building, and IUCN's new program, which would launch the following year, is also related to World Heritage registration. The **Delegate of Japan** agreed with **Mr. Paul Dingwall's** previous statement and wanted to emphasize it once more. He also said that action plans at every level are important and that we need to focus on common issues as meetings of this kind, with many experts from around the region, are quite rare and meaningful.

An official from the **UNESCO Office in Bangkok** asked how action plans in other regions are made and how to find additional problems not detected at the beginning stages. In addition, she asked how UNESCO can offer support, how funds for capacity building are used, and how monitoring mechanisms are processed. **Mr. Feng Jing** said that it is a good question regarding the management of data; all the results of questionnaires are already accessible on the web page made by UNESCO. He added that it would be efficient to include UNESCO field offices for resource distribution. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** also stressed the active attitude of state parties in terms of the monitoring process.

The **Delegate of Indonesia** agreed with **Mr. Paul Dingwall's** opinion and said that regional approaches can develop common solutions as well as play to each party's strength. He mentioned that some countries often go through national disasters, such as tsunamis, and suggested the idea that the experience of post-disaster recovery management can be helpful to other countries as well.

Mr. Richard Engelhardt said that all the participants agreed to talk about common issues. He then emphasized the issue of risk management for tsunamis, earthquakes and floods as well. He explained that there is nothing more site managers can actually do during disasters. Therefore, it is very critical to create a post-disaster recovery system, and this requires cooperation with other regions and the development of infrastructure. Moreover, he suggested transferring the top-down approach to a bottom-up approach to involve the community. He recommended assigning the responsibility of monitoring heritage sites to local communities and to make an effort to reflect the concerns of local communities. For this, it is necessary to prepare education for community on Outstanding Universal Values. He also mentioned that we need to check whether registration contributes to a diversity of culture and nature. In the process, we are required to examine sites that are not yet registered.

Mr. Feng Jing explained, when talking about future action plans, there are the 5Cs: Credibility, Conservation, Community, Capacity Building, and Communication. He also mentioned that heritage

protection and conservation need to be strengthened through the appliance of traditional knowledge, specific capacity building strategies and various training programs.

1-2. THURSDAY 8 DECEMBER 2011

1. Session II. Discussion on Priority Areas For Future Action Plan

1) Group Discussions (9:00 – 13:00, 14:30 – 18:00)

West and Central Asia (Plaza Hall A 2F)

- **Moderator: Mr. Asliddin RAKHMANOV**, Second Secretary of Tajikistan National Commission for UNESCO

In the group meeting of West and Central Asia, what to include in action plans was mainly discussed, and regional based future training to expand the knowledge of experts was suggested as a way to build capacity. Especially for capacity-building, the need for regular training was mentioned, and it was thought that increasing the training of site managers is necessary. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami**, who has taken the main role of making outlines for the draft action plan of the group, stated that we need to discuss tourism management and the external pressures on heritage sites as well. In addition, how to address the imbalance of natural and cultural sites was also argued. The moderator requested further discussion of ideas at the sub-regional level, and some opinions about sustainable development with cases of several city developments were shared.

South Asia (Plaza Hall B 2F)

- **Moderator: Mr. Sathyakumar SAMBANDAM**, Wildlife Institute of India

Mr. Sathyakumar Sambandam, Moderator of the South Asia group meeting, summarized the previous day's meeting and the working documents in progress, referring to the book. The working documents' main points were about dealing with national issues at the regional level. Therefore, it is important to overcome national interests and find thematic issues that overarch the entire region in order to motivate cooperation. For this, bringing examples from the national level and applying them in the regional sense were thought to be very significant. The meeting was processed by reviewing the working documents one by one and by summarizing the main points and raising relevant issues such as a tentative list, legal issues, and impact assessment. Before going into the meeting in detail, the first stage of discussion was to reach a shared understanding of statistics in the working documents. Each delegate then presented the progress made by their home country. But it took quite a lot of time to find a specific theme that could be applied to everyone.

South-East Asia (Oak Room 2F)

- **Moderator: Mr. Retno SURATRI**, Director General of the Forest Protection and Nature Conservation of the Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia

The South-East Asia group meeting discussed mainly the 5Cs: Credibility, Conservation, Capacity Building, Communication, and Community. Discussants continued to discuss issues ranging from problems to priorities and action plans under the 5Cs, filling up the chart one by one. In regards to credibility, participants said that there is a need to identify OUVs of the properties on the tentative lists. As for action plans, they also suggested support for workshops at the regional level or adequate engagement of focal points at natural sites. In terms of conservation, there were suggestions for external development pressures that impact the sites and for risk management. Participants also discussed capacity-building and pointed out problems that include lack of knowledge of funding-preparation and lack of training for risk management. For action plans to address communication, recommendations and

good practices of previous and on-going public education programs related to World Heritage were included. Lastly, the necessity to develop various activities and programs which are in accord with the needs of local communities was raised, addressing the issue of community.

North-East Asia (Board Room 2F)

- **Moderator: Mr. Kazuhiko NISHI**, Cultural Properties Senior Specialist of Agency for Cultural Affairs

The North-East Asia group meeting continued in a comparatively calm atmosphere. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** and **Mr. Kai Ube Prasad Weise** often participated in the meeting to deliver ideas from other groups and to promote discussion. The moderator presented the first draft to the participants, and they made revisions one by one. They also discussed how to decide priorities among many regional issues. They paid particular attention to discussing conservation, and they also raised discussions on education opportunities or training programs during the meeting. In addition, all the participants shared the on-going management plans of each country regarding the involvement of communities.

2) Special Session (14:30 – 16:00)

- **Moderator: Ms. Wei TONG**, State Administration of Cultural Heritage, China

Presentation: Monitoring Exercise of World Heritage Properties in Korea

- **Ms. Hyosang JO**, International Affairs Division of the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea

The next session was for the presentation of monitoring exercises of World Heritage Properties in Korea to share experiences and information with other state parties. By focusing on monitoring activities, this session aimed to discuss how monitoring can interact with periodic reporting. **Ms. Hyosang Jo** from the International Affairs Division of the Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea was the presenter. She started her presentation by explaining that the Cultural Heritage Administration is responsible for the conservation and management of all designated heritages, including Natural Heritages.

She emphasized that the Korean government is making efforts to reflect all the factors that alter the current state of Heritage sites by means of an electronic administrative system. She then explained in detail about the layers of monitoring by developing a Heritage Geographic Information System. New monitoring indicators can be materials, landscape or boundaries according to her explanation. She stressed that cultural heritage impact assessment needs to be provided in the development stage as well as the planning stage. She finished her presentation with comments on this meeting of periodic reporting; she discussed how to enhance World Heritage works and plans for future usage.

Q&A

Mr. Richard Adams ENGELHARDT asked whether people outside the Cultural Heritage Administration also get involved in the process. **Ms. Hyosang Jo** replied that an internal system of site managers and local governments exists as the Korean government is focusing on experts for heritage zones. The **Delegate of India** asked whether there is only one system for GIS for all the heritages in Korea. To this question, she answered that the GIS system was established by the Cultural Heritage Administration, and this focuses only on World Heritage sites. **Ms. Jane Harrington** said that impact assessment is in the early stages of development and asked how often the monitoring is being done. An explanation to this comment was that monitoring is still done on an irregular basis, but the monitoring process would be incorporated into a five-year domestic assessment system within a few years. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** mentioned the case of Yellow Stone for reactive monitoring and explained that there a sophisticated monitoring program for natural heritage exists, called the 'Vital Signs Program.' He also asked whether the Korean system also incorporates this in its system. The answer was that the Korean system has a different type of check lists for heritage sites for individual factors even though indicators do not include

vital signs.

To this question of whether some of the new indicators such as Universal Value have been incorporated since 2001, **Ms. Hyosang Jo** said that 2007 was a significant year as it was the year for the inscription of Jeju Island on the UNESCO World Heritage List as this made the Korean government reflect indicators and categories that are closer to the World Heritage Convention standards. **Mr. Timothy Badman** also asked whether GIS is open to the public and whether there are problems regarding the validity of information with GIS. The Korean delegate explained that local and municipal officials from any public sector can access the information, therefore the validity can be checked by the public sector, not only by governmental institutions. **Mr. Timothy Badman** also asked how the system can be assessed in terms of its effectiveness. The answer was that the assessment of this program should be a long term assessment as there were only two cycles on 10 properties up to date, and there was no external assessment either.

Another question was asked regarding how the GIS system was created. The reply was that the system was developed over six years, and many actors, such as the government, a website-design company, the Cultural Heritage Administration, ICOMOS Korea Office, participated in the process.

1-3. FRIDAY 9 DECEMBER 2011

1. Session III. Adoption of Recommendations and Draft Action Plan

1) Plenary Session: Morning (9:00 – 13:00 / Grand Ballroom 3F)

- **Moderator: Mr. Asliddin RAKHMANOV**, Second Secretary of Tajikistan National Commission for UNESCO

Moderator **Mr. Asliddin RAKHMANOV** started the last session for the adoption of recommendations and the draft action plan by expressing thanks to all the attendants at the conference. The results of working group meetings of the previous day were presented one by one.

<West and Central Asia>

(Presenter: **Ms. Natalya TUREKULOVA**, President of National Committee of ICOMOS in Kazakhstan)

The main points of the West and Central Asia group's meeting were management, capacity building, nominations, and regional cooperation. The group also specified details, regional and national actions, actors, resources, and timeframes under each issue.

Management issues, management plans, conservation, restoration/renovation, reconstruction, revitalization, and monitoring were mentioned as details. As action plans for this, a sub-regional workshop in Iran was mentioned. In regards to capacity-building, conservation, education, interpretation, visitor management, risk preparedness, and monitoring were raised as details. For this, translating the toolkit, short courses, and resource materials at the regional level and distribution of it at the national level to introduce the toolkit into the educational curriculum were suggested.

In regards to the nomination issue, ideas about on-going serial, trans-boundary nominations and natural properties were addressed. There was also an opinion to establish a database on the study and conservation of Timurid architecture in terms of regional cooperation. Moreover, a network of focal points and site managers was suggested as well. Following action plans were explained as updating the list of focal points and site managers and sharing information with state parties and making internet clubs as well as translating legislations into English/French.

Comments & Suggestions

Ms. Jane Harrington appreciated the first draft action plan of the West and Middle Asia group, emphasizing the nomination issue in particular, and she added that it would be useful to discuss in more

detail ways to utilize SMS such as Twitter whose role has been increased recently. **Mr. Timothy Badman** also highly assessed the presentation, noting that it would be more effective if there are concrete implementation guidelines for the toolkit and translation. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** expressed thanks to the group for its wonderful draft and agreed to the other mentors' comments. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** pointed out that not every country has access to the worldwide web regarding the 'hub,' which would lead to limitations of networking based on internet. Therefore, it is important to discuss other types of networking as well.

<South Asia>

(Presenter: **Ms. Radhika DUHUMAL**, Archaeological Survey of India)

Ms. Radhika Duhumal, presenter of South Asia group, started by mentioning nomination, management and capacity-building as the main issues to be dealt with.

First of all, she explained the nomination process and said that sub-regional consultations are required to ensure a balanced representation of natural and cultural heritage properties. There was a suggestion that South Asian countries should look collectively at relevant themes for potential World Heritage Properties. Regarding World Heritage site issues, major factors affecting the sites were mentioned such as local conditions, social and cultural uses of heritage, buildings and development, transportation and infrastructure, pollution, natural disasters, and biological resource modification.

In terms of capacity building, community outreach, education, risk preparedness, visitor management, and conservation were also raised to the discussion. Actions proposed were the launch of the World Heritage Education Program to enhance education opportunity and community awareness; production and dissemination of the ICCROM Training Manual, 'Managing Disasters and Risks at WHP,' with a focus on sites being particularly affected; promotion of UNESCO's recommendation of safe guarding historical urban landscape; and addressing the need for technical assistance for the development of legal frameworks. In addition, the participation of communities in monitoring, management planning, and benefits sharing was requested to be strengthened, and community outreach programs were discussed to be developed.

Comments & Suggestions

Mr. Timothy Badman said that specific national standards from the presentation were good and that it would be better to include more public sectors in the management planning stage. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** agreed with Tim's opinion and said that it was good to enumerate various elements which affect heritage sites. The idea to use existing networking systems was impressive, according to his statement. **Ms. Jane Harrington** mentioned ideas of balancing cultural and natural heritages, and networking as good points. She also emphasized the group's work, which suggested detailed sub-regional actions. However, she added that more discussion seems to be necessary for the distribution of manuals.

Mr. Paul Dingwall stated that risk management is very important to every heritage site. He suggested ICOMOS and ICCROM to cooperate to provide total guidelines for both natural and cultural heritages. **Mr. Timothy Badman** replied that the work is already in progress. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** also explained that the manual was already used in the previous workshop. **Mr. Kai Ube Prasad Weise** then suggested state parties to use expert networks such as the Scientific Committee of ICOMO for risk management. In addition, he emphasized the need for mechanisms to involve many trainees who have experienced various training programs.

<South-East Asia>

(Presenter: **Ms. Kerya SUN**, APSARA National Authority of Cambodia)

South East Asia group's presentation was based on the 5Cs: Credibility, Conservation, Capacity Building, Communication with Education, and Community.

In regards to the **credibility** issue, support workshops at the regional level on tentative lists, and identification of common issues with regards to trans-boundary sites in the tentative lists were arranged. In terms of **conservation**, many ideas were suggested: review of management plans based on approved retrospective statements of OUV, establishment of time bound action plans to implement management plans, inclusion of HIAs and measures to mitigate external pressures in world heritage sites, and inter-governmental and/or stakeholders' collaborative actions for dialogue. Regarding **capacity-building**, training was recommended to state parties in preparation of nomination dossier, including management plans, preparation of work plans and budgets, and proper implementation of risk assessment, risk monitoring mechanisms, disaster mitigation plans, and post-disaster recovery plans.

For **communication with education**, workshops were suggested to increase awareness of different levels of stakeholders on the impact of external pressures to World Heritage sites to ensure protection of its integrity and authenticity. It was also mentioned to share and circulate materials, recommendations and good practices of previous and on-going public education programs related to World Heritage. There were also many ideas proposed for **community** issues: mechanisms that involve local communities in the management process, inclusion in management plans of income-generating activities, awareness campaigns for the ownership of local communities living in and around World Heritage sites, and the creation of protocols for consultation and a two-way dialogue between site managers and local communities/stakeholders.

Comments & Suggestions

Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya highly assessed the South-East Asia group's presentation, which included actual action plans by wording most of the ideas with recommendations. He also pointed out that the idea relevant to SOUV as most impressive. **Ms. Jane Harrington** also continued to mention SOUV and highly recommended the details of involving communities into the process. **Mr. Timothy Badman** said that specific mentions of natural heritages and the idea to make use of previous good practices were desirable. However, he added that issues like legislation, fund raising, and capacity building need to be discussed in more detail later.

Mr. Paul Dingwall also highly praised the 5Cs approach. However, he also said that there are more 'whats' than 'hows' in the presentation. **Mr. Chahryar Adle** said that some of the ideas overlap, so it would be clearer after categorizing similar topics into several groups.

<North-East Asia>

(Presenter: **Ms. Hyosang Jo**, Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea)

The North-East Asia group's presentation mainly covered issues such as funding, inappropriate urban development and urbanization, tourism, climate change, natural disasters, monitoring, cooperative approaches for the nomination process, and management.

For **funding**, it is necessary to take note of the difference between the attraction of money to the heritage and allocation of budget to address the problems. It was also suggested that training programs for budget planning and fund raising should be developed. In terms of **inappropriate urban development and urbanization**, issues of defining buffer zones, heritage impact assessment and the impact of physical extraction of resources such as mining were discussed. With regards to **tourism**, regional case studies and assessment of tourism benefits to the local communities need to be followed to solve problems.

In regards to **climate change**, workshops on climate change and monitoring indicators were suggested. In terms of general **natural disasters**, identification of the most common disasters and sharing

experiences to mobilize rapid sub-regional actions in dealing with natural disasters were proposed. For **monitoring** systems, enhancing the existing monitoring systems and integrating them with administrative framework were discussed. Conducting thematic studies within the region to make use of the common cultural and natural context was listed in cooperative approaches for the **nomination process**. For **management** issues, various training programs and good practices need to be developed as well.

Comments & Suggestions

Mr. Jane Harrington said that it was interesting to mention the fund-raising issue, and she also highlighted the buffer zone issue, taking concerns related to airplanes as examples. She added her opinion on the assessment of the tourism industry and visitor management as well. **Mr. Timothy Badman** also mentioned funding as an interesting idea. He also further explained the pressures that industries such as mining can bring about using cases in Africa. He briefly mentioned climate change and the monitoring process at the end. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** emphasized that action plans on capacity-building contain strategies for both site managers and focal points. He also said that it was interesting to hear about various research approaches in terms of risk management at the sub-regional level.

Mr. Imran AHMED said that some of the issues proposed in this group's presentation can be applied to other sub-regions as well. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** also suggested that state parties discuss 'heritage impact assessment' more as he thought this approach can be very helpful, further requesting to share existing relevant guidelines if possible.

2) Plenary Session: Afternoon (16:00 – 17:45 / Plaza Hall 2F)

- Moderator: Ms. Joycelyn MANANGHAYA

Moderator Ms. Joycelyn Mananghaya expressed thanks to all the working groups. Then **Ms. Radhika Dhumal**, **Ms. Hyosang Jo**, **Ms. Natalya Turekuloca**, and **Ms. Kerya Sun** each explained the issues of conservation, capacity-building, credibility, communication and community in order briefly.

Comments

Mr. Chahryar Adle asked to shift the wording of the first action plan in conservation to 'translation of legislations in English/French into local languages.' The **Delegate of UNESCO Office in Almaty** explained that this idea was intended to share content written in local languages by translating them into English or French. **Mr. Timothy Badman** shortly said that this draft is a wonderful work. The Moderator then asked the attendants to suggest opinions on issues at the sub-regional level. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** also stressed that the result of this draft is an action plan which would be applied to all the state parties.

An **official from the UNESCO Field Office** pointed out that the terms need to be unified. And the moderator admitted that there are some problems with the work as this draft was done in a short period of time and said that it would be revised later. **Ms. Hyosang Jo** also said that 'adequate assessment for buffer zones' needs to be added to actions for rural/urban conservation and cultural/natural properties under the conservation issue. Then, the moderator suggested reviewing the draft from the first C, step by step.

CONSERVATION

The **Delegate of Malaysia** suggested adding 'with provisions' at the end of 'develop legal frameworks' in another action relevant to the indicators needs to be added to 'effective management plans' under the conservation issue. **Ms. Hyosang Jo** maintained that 'to formulate monitoring indicators for climate change' needs to be added in the chart. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** requested more detailed wording for actions of enforcement in 'improve legislations and enforcement' under conservation issue. **Mr. Timothy**

Badman also pointed out that the use of good practices and the addition of global standards regarding industries such as mining are overlooked and needs to be added as well. **Mr. Kai Ube Prasad Weise** said that ideas related to enforcement need to be discussed to determine whether they go under capacity-building or under other Cs. The Moderator promised to add some overlooked contents which were suggested at the previous meetings.

Another attendant asked whether 'social and cultural uses of heritage' should be categorized as conservation or communication issue. **Ms. Jane Harrington** explained the context of the idea that it was about the ambiguity of the conservation issue. Moreover, **Ms. Radhika Dhumal** stated that thematic studies need to be discussed first and **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** agreed with her opinion. The **delegate of UNESCO Office in Jakarta** suggested deleting the word 'improve' which was mentioned above. **Ms. Hyosang Jo** said that 'vulnerability of the site' needs to be added to 'risk preparedness and disaster reduction management.'

Ms. Jane Harrington then suggested adding corporate/private sector cooperation in budget planning and management action plans. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** also pointed out that it should be clarified who will do which action plan in terms of resources. The **delegate of UNESCO Office in Jakarta** also agreed with this opinion and noted that not every national focal point works as site managers, so it is important to add on-going plans for programs to the draft action plan. The Moderator asked Iran to explain more about its workshop. The **Delegate of Iran** said that Iran's workshop is closer to capacity-building.

CAPACITY BUILDING

Ms. Hyosang Jo explained developing good practices and promoting the exchange of experts briefly. The **Delegate of China** also said that budget planning can be educational as well. **An officials from the UNESCO Field Office** asked how to reduce the gap between countries that have regional centers and those that don't have. **Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya** answered that one of the centers is located in China, and this would actively participate in periodic reporting relevant to capacity-building issues. **Mr. Kai Ube Prasad Weise** suggested adding the word 'risk' in between 'disaster' and 'reduction' to clarify the meaning. The **delegate of UNESCO Office in Jakarta** also asked the exact meaning of short courses and **Mr. Chahryar Adle** said that it means short courses of capacity-building. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** suggested putting short courses under the education program. **Another attendant** asked to revise the word 'tool kit' to 'resource-kit.' **Another attendant** requested an explanation on why nominations are under the issue of capacity building. **Mr. Sathyakumar Sambandan** replied that this idea was driven in the context that some state parties lack guidelines for the nomination process. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** then asked to revise the wording to 'develop expertise on nomination dossier.' **Mr. Hyosang Jo** agreed with **Ms. Kaori Kawakami's** opinion and said that nomination is not a regional issue but is equivalent to other 5Cs.

CREDIBILITY

The **delegate of UNESCO Office in Phnom Penh** said that the enhancement of awareness on tentative lists is missing in the draft. **Ms. Kaori Kawakami** asked whether this issue is relevant to communication or credibility. The **delegate of UNESCO Office in Phnom Penh** said that tentative lists are more related to the issue of credibility. **Mr. Timothy Badman** agreed with the **delegate of UNESCO Office in Phnom Penh**. Another attendant stated that intangible heritage should be concerned with regards to tentative lists. **Ms. Jane Harrington** said that this is an important opinion. **Mr. Timothy Badman** added his thoughts that intangible heritages are more relevant to conservation or capacity-building issues. **Mr. Richard Engelhardt** also suggested adding intangible heritage under 'conservation' or 'community' issues. **Mr. Paul Dingwall** agreed with **Mr. Timothy Badman** and said that this issue also can be categorized as a credibility issue considering its necessity to cooperate with other conservation institutions.

COMMUNICATION

Ms. Hyosang Jo pointed out that global standards need to be discussed in terms of communication based on desirable cases. She then mentioned adding 'on-going nominations' relevant to serial and trans-boundary sites. In addition, the **Delegate of Japan** said that any question is welcomed regarding Japan's FIT. The **Delegate of Malaysia** noted that it would be better to comprehend common regional issues so that we can find possible domains for further cooperation such as internet clubs for site managers. An **official from the UNESCO Field Office** suggested revising the wording to 'Common heritage such as Timurid architecture.' It was also requested to move 'sharing experience on heritage sites' to the West and Middle Asia's sub-regional action.

COMMUNITY

Mr. Paul Dingwall suggested revising the wording to 'ensure the engagement of local communities including residents and indigenous people in the management of decision making process and sharing benefits' under community issues. **Mr. Richard Engelhardt** agreed with this, adding that it would be better with 'traditional managers' included.

After various comments from the floor, **Mr. Feng Jing** also commented on the overall session. He appreciated all the feedback from the attendants and lots of ideas proposed by different sub-regions. He explained that this result would be reported to the World Heritage Committee after integrating the results of the Pacific region. If the delegates of state parties and advisory bodies make additional comments until next July, all of them would be also reflected before submitting the final report. Especially for the resources, each state party is recommended to clarify and identify what type of resource can be provided at the national level regarding action plans we have agreed. He further explained that it is being considered for five representatives from Cambodia, India, Japan, Malaysia, and Thailand to attend the meeting in Paris the following year.

Adoption of the document

Before the adoption, the moderator asked again for further questions. The **Delegate of Malaysia** wanted to talk about revising the word 'Endorsement' into 'Legalizing.' After several other comments, using 'Endorsement or legalization' to contain all the cases and this wording was agreed upon. Hereby, the Action plan and Timetable were adopted.

3) Closing Ceremony (17:45 – 18:00)

Final Remarks

Dr. Taeck-soo Chun, who first took the floor for the final remarks, thanked all the attendants for the adoption of the action plan. He also appreciated the active participation of all the states parties in Asia through online questionnaires and their enthusiastic discussion. He expected the result of this meeting to be reflected in the final report which will be submitted in the following year. He also briefly introduced Namhansanseong, Suwon Hwaseong Fortress, Chandeokgung Palace and Jongmyo Shrine to all the attendants for the following day's field visits. He finished his remarks by mentioning international conferences which will be held in Gwang-ju and Jeju Island.

Next, **Mr. Feng Jing** appreciated the successful achievement of the regional meeting held in Suwon and expressed his sincere thanks to all the attendants. He also praised the organization of the meeting and excellent working environment during the meeting. He then summed up the process of the three-day meeting and thanked everyone again for organizing the meeting. He recommended that all the delegates and mentors give feedback until successful submission next year based on the discussions made in this meeting.

For the last remarks, **Mr. Kyung Hoon Yi**, director of Cultural Heritage Administration thanked all the attendants and celebrated a successful result produced from the meeting. He especially mentioned that this meeting was useful for establishing cooperation among Asian countries in accordance with efforts to implement the World Heritage Convention. He finished his address by wishing all the representatives to enjoy their last days in Korea and visit again later if possible.

1-4. SATURDAY 10 DECEMBER 2011

Field Visit

As planned, all the attendants of the meeting were invited to field visits to Namhansanseong (enlisted on the tentative list of World Heritage) and Suwan Hwaseong (UNESCO World Heritage Site) after the three days of the conference. They looked around the North Gate, West Gate, West Commanding Post, and South Gate of Namhansanseong mountain fortress. Next, they moved to Suwan Hwaseong and looked around, taking the Hwaseong trolley. They also enjoyed watching Korean traditional archery shooting. They went back to the hotel for a farewell dinner after all was done.