



## Hiroshima Office for Asia and the Pacific (HOAP)

**Postal Address:**

Hiroshima Chamber of Commerce and Industry Bldg.  
5-44 Motomachi, Naka-ku  
Hiroshima 730-0011 Japan

Telephone : +81/(0)82/511 2424

Fax : +81/(0)82/211 0511

Email : [hiroshima@unitar.org](mailto:hiroshima@unitar.org)

Web : [www.unitar.org/hiroshima](http://www.unitar.org/hiroshima)

### *Training Workshop on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites Hiroshima, 8-12 March 2004*

#### Executive Summary

The UNITAR *Training Workshop on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites* was organized in Hiroshima, Japan, from 8 to 12 March 2004. 37 participants, resource persons and observers from 20 countries of the Asia-Pacific region attended the week-long event. The participants came from Government organizations such as Ministries of Culture, Environment and Tourism; from academia and research institutes; and from United Nations agencies. The workshop was the first in a three-year cycle (2004-2006), organized by HOAP with the support of UNESCO and its World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, the Getty Conservation Institute and other selected partners, aiming at a better use of the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) through national policy making and planning.

The 2004 workshop mainly focused on the nomination process for World Heritage Sites as well as their social impact. Some of the topics discussed were, for instance:

- concept of heritage and the value of natural and cultural resources viewed from cultural, philosophical and religious aspects;
- procedures for World Heritage nomination and designation;
- economic and social impact of the World Heritage designation;
- benefit (and burden) sharing;
- policy planning for a better use of the World Heritage Convention; and
- international cooperation.

Three main training methods were employed in the workshop:

- Plenary lectures followed by questions and answers and discussions;
- Working group exercises to create a nomination document for the inclusion of a given site in the World Heritage list (the nomination required the detailed description and evaluation of a site as well as institutional/physical management planning); and
- Study tours to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park and A-Bomb Dome and to Miyajima Itsukushima Shinto Shrine and debriefings thereof.

#### **Plenary Lectures and other Presentations:**

Mr. Richard Engelhardt (UNESCO), in his *keynote lecture* (morning, 8 March), observed the trends in World Heritage - in the past heritage was considered to belong mainly to princes/priests/politicians but since the early 1990's the movement is toward expanding the concept of heritage as belonging *also* to the public and the local community, thus activating a real grassroots movement for World Heritage nomination. New types of heritages have also emerged including vernacular, domestic, industrial and commercial heritages.



Before moving to the complex discussion on details, participants had a *brief description of the 1972 Convention regime* (afternoon, 8 March). Mr. Richard Engelhardt and Mr. Han Qunli (UNESCO) explained the basics of the Convention while Mr. Duncan Marshall (ICOMOS/ICCROM) presented the role of statutory (supporting) organizations of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

In his presentation "*What is Heritage*" (morning, 9 March), Mr. François LeBlanc (Getty Conservation Institute, based in Los Angeles) defined heritage as "whatever you want to preserve" and presented a scheme of heritage with relation to its 'ownership' and its type. Then he presented four case studies demonstrating the intricate relation of different values given to the same asset by different parties, and assigned participants to each analyze the situation and ask questions as to how one can prioritize and/or manage values.

Mr. Han Qunli (UNESCO) presented some of the recent *developments in natural heritage management in Southeast Asia* (morning, 9 March). The natural heritage protection in the region stands upon the premise that the value of the heritage depended on the inspiration of the people and that the protection thereof implied the protection of indigenous people's way of life and livelihood. Mr. Han presented five cases in the region from which he extracted guidance and tendencies: necessity of strong political will; need for effective governance; application of principles within appropriate and sustainable capacity and good understanding of heritage values.

*Japanese and Hiroshima heritage conservation* was presented by Mr. Yushi Utaka (morning, 9 March). Mr. Utaka (Hiroshima University) explained the structure of Japanese heritage conservation at the government, prefecture and municipality levels in light of current social trends such as an aging society, depopulation, natural disasters and economic downturn. Hiroshima heritage sites and specificities of management policies/methods were explained in the context of the social situation as well as contradicting value evaluations by different parties.

Mr. Duncan Marshall (ICOMOS) provided guidance on national *policy and institutional planning* respecting different administrative structures and systems in different countries (morning, 10 March). He emphasized that policy planning should consider many aspects, namely legal planning, contractual planning and traditions – indeed management and planning need to take into account people, skills, resources and funding. He then presented three case studies to highlight the necessity of tailoring policy to meet the values and the existing framework (where possible). Different available options were then introduced.

Additionally a series of case studies of the Asia-Pacific region was presented by the site managers. These included: *Yakushima Environmental Culture Foundation* (Mr. Hirohide Wada, morning, 10 March), *Underwater Archaeological Heritage in Sri Lanka* (Mr. Mohan Abeyratne, morning, 11 March), *Ha Long Bay World Heritage Site* (Mr. Hung Ngo Van and Ms. Hien Thi Thu Bui, morning, 11 March) and *Onomichi* - a candidate for a tentative list (Ms. Takako Ogaki, morning, 11 March).

### **Working Group Exercise:**

Based on the pre-workshop questionnaire, four working groups were established. Each group worked on creating a nomination dossier of a selected site for the inclusion in the World Heritage list. Following two half-day group discussions, each group presented their nomination document to a panel composed of the workshop resource persons.

#### **Group 1      *Mullar Mountain Range (case data provided by Enny Sudarmonowati, Indonesia)***

Kamal Kunwar, Nepal; Vinod B. Mathur, India; Viengkeo Rouksavatdy, Laos; Enny Sudarmonowati, Indonesia

Resource person: Mohan Abeyratne



**Group 2** *Indus Dolphin (case data provided by Abdul Aleem Chaudhry, Pakistan)*

Hien Thi Thu Bui, Vietnam; Abdul Aleem Chaudhry, Pakistan; Ruzan Davtyan, Armenia; Hung Ngo Van, Vietnam

Vietnam

Resource person: Han Qunli

**Group 3** *City of Mumbai (case data provided by Abha Narain, India)*

Mohammed Yosof Al-Aidaros, Saudi Arabia; Nagtsho Dorji, Bhutan; Melva Java, Philippines; Abha Narain, India; Vang Rattavong, Laos; Tissa Sooriyagoda, Sri Lanka

Resource person: François LeBlanc

**Group 4** *Dmasi Archaeological Site (case data provided by Kakha Trapaidze, Georgia)*

Sovath Bong, Cambodia; Leyla Huseynova, Azerbaijan; Natsagbadam Myatraaz, Mongolia; Ramesh Thapaliya, Nepal; Kakha Trapaidze, Georgia

Resource person: Duncan Marshall

**Study Tours:**

Two study tours were organized, and each included an introduction by the local site manager. Each tour was followed by a debriefing session.

***Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Peace Memorial Museum, Park and A-Bomb Dome), 9 March***

In the debriefing of the study tour the participants discussed some key aspects regarding the site. The participants recognized the spiritual, historical, cultural and long-term educational aspects of the site. They discussed the specific management tools that were employed in Hiroshima, namely personal testimonies and oral tools; the policy decision with regard to the A-Bomb and its legacy, as compared to Nagasaki; educational efforts; the universality of the message delivered by the site; as well as practical aspects such as zoning and the overall integrity of the context, namely the original Kenzo Tange Plan.

***Miyajima and Itsukushima Shrine, 11 March***

In the debriefing session, the participants acknowledged the high level of conservation and maintenance and the precision of the craftsmanship. However in terms of interpretation of the heritage value, the zoning and the policy planning applicable to the site, different views were expressed. They pointed out the shift in the emphasis on the value of the site from a religious to a predominantly tourist one. The buffer zone was deemed too porous to protect the core area and the planning of the surrounding landscape on the mainland (opposite bank) was considered insufficient and of poor taste as it did not take into account the aesthetics and 'spirit' of the shrine. Commercialisation of the areas surrounding the shrine was noted by the participants, as well as the poor choice of souvenir shops and products for a sacred place.