



unitar

United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Hiroshima Office

Series on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites

“Conservation for Peace”



© Yushi Utaka

Executive Summary and Next Steps

April 2008

Acknowledgements

UNITAR would like to express its deepest gratitude to the following:

The Hiroshima Prefectural Government for its generous support of the Series since 2003

Hiroshima City, Hatsukaichi City, Itsukushima Shinto Shrine and Peace Memorial Museum for inspiring study tours

The main partners of the Series - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and its World Heritage Centre, International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), World Conservation Union (IUCN), Getty Conservation Institute (GCI), Universities of Hiroshima and Hyogo - for their commitment since the beginning of the Series and for making this year's workshop a reality

The Department of the Environment & Water Resources of the Australian Government for financial assistance to participants from the Pacific

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNESCO field offices for assistance with logistics

Special thanks go to our resource persons and participants who contributed their time, excellence and expertise to the workshop so graciously, and finally to our alumni and friends of UNITAR in Hiroshima and around the world, whose cooperation was indispensable for the realization of this workshop.

This Executive Summary is dedicated to the people of Hiroshima

Introduction

The Series on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites, one of the main programme pillars of the UNITAR Hiroshima Office (HO), aims to facilitate a better utilization of the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention through support to national policy making and planning, and information exchange on best practices and case studies. UNITAR workshops are designed specifically to train heritage site managers in a “values-based approach” to cultural and natural heritage resource management.



In the A-Bomb Dome, Hiroshima has a stunning example of a World Heritage site contributing directly to the promotion of peace and security – the Hiroshima Peace Memorial was inscribed on the UNESCO list as “it is a stark and powerful symbol of the achievement of world peace for more than half a century following the unleashing of the most destructive force ever created by humankind” (1996 Advisory Body Evaluation). And the heritage site is not uniquely a place to conserve memories of war and mourn the victims of the atomic bombing but also embodies the active stance of a population against nuclear arms and the deep transformation of a former military city into a city of peace.

Many World Heritage sites around the world contribute towards peace in a direct way, as with the A-Bomb Dome, or indirectly. Some remind humanity of the dark memories of war, some promote understanding, reconciliation or tolerance among different social groups, some provide a forum for dialogue among opposing parties towards a common goal to conserve heritage.

The 2008 workshop thus focused on the implications of natural and cultural heritage conservation for peace, based on the overall values-based World Heritage conservation approach.

The objectives of the workshop were to:

- Review the basics of the World Heritage regime and its implications for peace, incorporating available information, updates and current trends;
- Elucidate the underlying principles of “values-based heritage management”, with a particular focus on peacebuilding and reconciliation;
- Consider the role of heritage in war-torn, post-conflict or post-disaster situations;
- Examine leading policies and strategies, identifying best practices and lessons learned;
- Create management plans for sites, using nomination dossier or periodical-reporting formats;
- Enhance peer learning and exchange among the participants.

2008 Workshop – the Faculty, participants and format

The 2008 workshop once again benefited greatly from the UNITAR network created since 2001. The main institutional partners¹ all sent resource persons – the majority of whom were participating for the fourth or fifth time. Throughout the year these resource persons were involved in both the substantive and structural planning by means of an internet forum. UNITAR alumni, now counting over 800 members, were also key in identifying suitable candidates in their countries. As a result, the level of participants was quite high, as were the numbers: the workshop was attended by some 60 participants, resource persons and staff, representing 32 countries from Asia, Europe and North America.

¹ The main institutional partners are (in alphabetical order): the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI); Hiroshima University; the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS); the Japan Wildlife Research Centre (JWRC); Prefectural University of Hiroshima; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), its regional offices in Bangkok and Jakarta as well as its World Heritage Centre (WHC); University of Hyogo; and the World Conservation Union (IUCN).



Richard Engelhardt



Norioki Ishimaru



Duncan Marshall



Yushi Utaka

The training workshop employed four main training methodologies:

- 1) Interactive presentations and lectures;
- 2) Study tours and debriefings;
- 3) Practical exercise;
- 4) Sessions utilizing special training methodologies.

1) **Presentations and lectures**, systematically followed by Q and A sessions, included the following:

- **Introductory Comments by Norioki ISHIMARU** (Hiroshima International University)
Prof. Ishimaru made a brief presentation of Hiroshima's Peace Memorial at the 30 March get-together dinner. He revisited the Hiroshima townscape before and after the bombing and made an introduction to the memorial park concept after war. He also presented projects submitted at the architectural competition for the memorial park – won by Kenzo Tange.
- **World Heritage Regime: Objectives and Trends, Richard ENGELHARDT** (UNESCO Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia and the Pacific). The 1972 UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereafter the World Heritage Convention) reflects two underlying principles – (1) humanity has a joint responsibility to take care of the planet and the environment; and (2) acceptance of the idea that we are all responsible for everyone's heritage. The World Heritage Convention - with 185 State Parties and 851 sites in 141 countries on the list – is one of the most successful global conventions for that purpose, followed by a number of international treaties with similar objectives. The key to identify the global heritage is the Outstanding Universal Value (hereafter OUV). Mr. Engelhardt introduced the ten criteria for World Heritage nomination and then reflected on the relation between heritage and conflict (deliberate destruction of heritage at time of conflict), and between heritage and reconciliation.
- **Conservation for Peace, Duncan MARSHALL** (ICOMOS Australia). Mr. Marshall invited participants to reflect on two themes – heritage and peace, and heritage and conflict – to create a framework for the workshop. Mr. Marshall demonstrated some heritage sites portraying peace and conflict – starting from the A-Bomb Dome of Hiroshima and Waterton Glacier International Peace Park – to Auschwitz and the Old Bridge of Mostar... In line with the diversification of the types of conflict, the types of stakeholders also vary – therefore oppositions could be found at international levels as well as religious and community levels. Heritage could suffer from these conflicts, and could even be their target. However, on opposite side of the same coin is the fact that heritage can also be a tool for promoting peace and enhancing reconciliation.
- **Hiroshima Story: Challenges for World Heritage Sites in Japan and Hiroshima, Yushi UTAKA** (University of Hyogo). Following an introduction of Japan's legislation and administration for heritage conservation, Mr. Utaka introduced two World Heritage sites of Hiroshima – the Hiroshima Peace Memorial and Itsukushima Shrine. He presented contrasting views of the people of Hiroshima when they look at these sites and their different understanding of heritage. For example, the contrast between the Peace Memorial and the surrounding high buildings could be interpreted by some as disharmony, while others see the contrast a proof of Hiroshima's post-war development. All these complex, sad or humorous voices constitute the Hiroshima story, which also mirrors the cultural evolution of post-war Japan.



Jeffrey Cody



Han Qunli



Masahito Yoshida



Kim Seong-il



Vinod Mathur

- **What is Heritage? Values-based Management** *Jeffrey CODY* (Getty Conservation Institute) and *Duncan MARSHALL*. Mr. Cody and Mr. Marshall explained that heritage is “whatever you want to preserve for the next generations” and demonstrated a three-dimensional approach composed of subject (“you”), substance (“whatever”) and values. Then they went on to explain “values” upon which heritage management should rely. Values are intangible, they are created by society, they are mutable over time and new values may be brought into the heritage field by new stakeholders. Flynn’s Grave in Australia was taken as an example to study what the values were and how a site manager should effectively manage these at times contrasting values.
- **Conservation crossing borders – concepts and practices of cooperation in natural World Heritage and Biosphere Reserves,** *HAN Qunli* (UNESCO Tehran Cluster Office). Mr. Han asked participants why we should bother with transboundary sites. Borders are closely related to conflict and peace. According to IUCN, many protected areas are crossing borders and wildlife has no nationality, while the conservation maps of a country often stop at its borders. Mr. Han then introduced different instruments of transborder conservation, including World Heritage and biosphere reserves. Common resources (water etc.), or culture and human exchange could be unifying links – they constitute important elements to ensure integrity. Scientific cooperation can often be a good start when formal transborder conservation plans are politically difficult to achieve.
- **Potential and Possibility of Natural Peace Park in Japan,** *Masahito YOSHIDA* (Edogawa University) first reviewed the existing three natural World Heritage sites in Japan and explained the procedure for identifying and nominating potential sites. The recommended sites go through the test of integrity and the test of representativeness, and will be finally tested for OUV. Shiretoko, inscribed in 2005 on the World Heritage List for criteria 9 and 10, has a clear ecological similarity with neighbouring islands in Russia, and thus recommended by IUCN to be extended into a transboundary World Heritage Peace Park. The history of negotiation over the Kuril Islands was also presented.
- **Demilitarized Zone as a Peace Park: Current Status and Prospect,** *KIM Seong-II* (Seoul National University) The Demilitarized Zone lay over an area of average (4x) 238km, after the Japanese colonial rule and the war between two Koreas. Both IUCN (1979) and UNEP (1989 and 1992) have suggested a Peace Park in this area, gifted with a rich ecology. Several attempts to designate the area as a natural heritage – or a transboundary biosphere reserve have been hampered by oppositions at various levels and also by the fact that the area has not been officially designated as a protected area. In recent years, initiatives are taken to use it as a tool for rapprochement – as demonstrated in the Peace Belt Plan, a DMZ forum and the plans for ecotourism.
- **Nomination of properties for Inscription on the World Heritage List: Criteria for Outstanding Universal Value and Nomination Process,** *Richard ENGELHARDT* reviewed the process of preparing for nomination, tentative listing and World Heritage inscription - in order to assess the OUV, ten criteria are used. Case studies from Vat Phou (Laos) and Sydney Opera House (Australia) were presented. Mr. Engelhardt then explained the format and contents of nominations to help participants prepare their team exercises.

- **Preparation of World Heritage nomination dossier: Authenticity/integrity and management/monitoring, Vinod MATHUR** approached the OUV from two angles: authenticity and integrity. In order to be considered as World Heritage, properties should possess OUV which should be proven authentic. Integrity could be understood as the ability of a property to secure or sustain its significance *over time*. Authenticity and integrity both contribute to the analysis of OUV and could provide guidance to manage values. However these requirements sometimes cause complication to the nomination process. Dr. Mathur also explained the periodic monitoring and reporting requirements.



Marybeth Mensias

**Consultant on Tourism Planning and Environmental Management,
Cagayan Economic Zone Authority**

“It is like I have been given new sets of glasses to see the world. I am more exposed to biodiversity and natural heritage conservation, with more knowledge on cultural heritage. I will have more enhanced approaches to the tourism planning process.”



2) Study Tours

Study tours were organized to Hiroshima's two World Heritage Sites, the A-Bomb Dome and Itsukushima Shinto Shrine on Miyajima Island.

A-Bomb Dome

Norioki Ishimaru, after a brief introductory session guided the participants to the A-Bomb Dome. The group then entered the inner area of the Dome.

Mr. Takao KOBAYASHI of the Urban Development Bureau of the City of Hiroshima provided an explanation on the citizen's movement leading to the preservation of the Dome and the Peace Memorial Park as well as on the technical aspects related to the conservation of the Dome material. The group then continued through the Peace Memorial Park to the cenotaph and to the Peace Memorial Museum where they received an explanation from Mr. Norioki ISHIMARU and Mr. Yushi UTAKA. At the Museum, they received a briefing by Deputy Director **Mr. Toshihiko KUNISHIGE**.



Participants then visited the Museum. A visit was also made to the National Peace Memorial Hall before returning to the UNITAR offices for debriefings, led by Duncan Marshall.



During the debriefing three questions were asked:

- 1) How does the A-bomb Dome Site express the theme of conservation for peace?
- 2) How might the theme be better expressed at the site?
- 3) Are there any conservation problems with the site?

Theme of conservation for peace	How can the theme be better expressed?	Conservation problems?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The A-Bomb Dome site is preserved as it is (destroyed) and provides evidence of war. - The Dome is so intact, in totality and represents a collective group effort. - It is also a distinct landmark. - A good example of conservation for peace. - No more war. Keep peace = the simple message of the site. - The site represents a community process and the memory of the community. - Stands as a concrete, physical symbol, living relic of war. - Portrays the result of conflict. Stands as a reminder of peace and the need to avoid war at all costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better access? - better examination of the landscape. - the Chamber of Commerce and Industry building impedes the landscape. - maybe the site could be extended. - Buffer zone needs to be better enforced (regulations) - Need more control on periphery. - Buffer zone needs to be worked on. Should be more information presented at the site - LCD screens representing the current conflict zones on the world. - Is the current conservation too much? Should natural sense of "deterioration" be allowed? - What would exist at the site in 100 years time? 200? - Use records and images to conserve intangible memory of the site. Addition of more graphics could help develop the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape almost overpowers the Dome building. - Access issues need to be studied more. - Some steel members are corroded. - Building is isolated by the landscape. - CCI building remains a problem. - The topiary work is "elegantly beautified" and this detracts from the "dry" image of the post-bomb landscape. - Conservation issues with the buffer zone. - Structural and surface conservation problems. - Water damage to the site - efforts thus far seem to have been successful.

Itsukushima Shinto Shrine

The participants took the private ferry connecting two World Heritage sites of Hiroshima - from the Peace Memorial Park to Miyajima Island. Mr. Yushi UTAKA, **Mr. Nobuyuki UEMURA** of Hiroshima



University and **Ms. Naoko KOIZUMI** accompanied the group. After being welcomed by the Chief Priest **Mr. Shigeru MIYATA**, the group visited Itsukushima Shrine, with its floating *Torii*. The Shrine Carpenters' Workshop was then visited and further explanation provided by the Craftsman **Mr. Shingo MIFUNE**. The participants then visited Senjo-Kaku



(the 1000 Tatami-mat Pavilion), the adjacent Pagoda which overlooks the Shrine and received an explanation of the measures utilised to preserve the townscape environment surrounding the Shrine from a local conservation association representative **Mr. Terumasa KIKUGAWA**. The programme continued with an explanation presented by **Mr. Tamaki OKAZAKI** of the administrative and tourism policies related to Miyajima Island pursued by the City of Hatsukaichi, (the local governmental centre which assumed responsibility for the island in 2005). The study tour concluded with dinner at a Japanese restaurant.

During the debriefing three questions were asked:

- 1) What kinds of values do you see reflected in Miyajima? Do they relate to peace? How?
- 2) What kinds of risks are there at this place that affect these values?
- 3) What sort of management responses would you suggest to mitigate the effects of these risks?

Values in Miyajima and relation to peace	Risks	Management responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuity of tradition; - Relationship between nature and culture; - Syncretism between Buddhism and Shintoism; - Aesthetic; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Architecture o Planning o Setting - Tangible vs. intangible parts of the setting; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Beauty of the structure vs. spiritual feelings - Historical values; - Peace in our minds bought on by the area; - Sacred fire – how should this be viewed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Spiritualism. - Economic value; - Traditional value; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clothing of carpenters o Architecture and buildings - Land- and sea-scape; - Ecological; <p>Do people come to Miyajima because of religious needs? Or because it is one of the 3 most beautiful places in Japan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism; - Natural threats; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landslides o Typhoons - Sect shrine on the axis; - Wood restoration; - Increasing economic growth; - Not enough information for visitors (or the municipality?); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If the visitor does not have enough information it can lead to inappropriate action on their part. - Loss of craft skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Control development (both on the island and the mainland); - Control the “carrying capacity”(number of tourists); - Land use controls regarding commercial activities; - Redesign tourist routes; - Pedestrianise the island? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Too severe. But a refocus on a traffic management could be an idea. - Visitor Information Center; - Better site interpretation; - Disaster Management Plan; - Do the religious organisations on the island have regular meetings regarding finding common ground on everyday issues? It does not seem so.



Ea Darith
Deputy Director, Preah Norodom Sihanouk-Angkor Museum, APSARA National Authority

“Please use UNITAR training to appeal to the world the use of heritage for peace. More case studies of the world could be discussed in the future.”

3) **Practical exercises** form an integral part of UNITAR workshops and this session was no exception. These consist of case-study analysis and are conducted by working teams. Five teams were formed, each assisted by a resource person. Teams were given approximately one day to formulate a World Heritage nomination document of a given and real (existing) site to present to the plenary. Teams were requested to prepare three sets of materials:

- a **tentative list form** using the Tentative List Submission Format;
- a **power-point** presentation of 20 minutes max, summarizing the nomination dossier; and
- a **one-page document** to be submitted by “Data Providers” on the process of work of each team.

The case studies and members of the teams were as follows:

Team 1: Silk Road (transboundary project)

- 1 Basanta Bidari
- 2 Batsuuri Jamiyan
- 3 Abdusafikhan Rakhmanov
- 4 Darith Ea
- 5 Jane Britt Greenwood

Resource person: Jeffrey Cody

Data provider: Wang Dan



Team 2: Baalbek and Tyre (Lebanon)

- 1 Bouadam Sengkhamhoutlavong
- 2 Nimet Hacikura
- 3 Peou Hang
- 4 Jude Nilan Cooray
- 5 Abdul Khalil Minawi

Resource person: Han Qunli

Data provider: Jean Yasmine



Team 3: Golden Temple (India)

- 1 Md. Mokammal Hossain Bhuiyan
- 2 Vane Koroï Seruvakula
- 3 A. R. S. K. Bakmeedeniya
- 4 Milan Torralba
- 5 Thanh Tran Van
- 6 Shahbaz Khan

Resource person: Duncan Marshall

Data provider: Sangha Rai Gurmeet



Team 4: Chief Roi Mata’s Domain

- 1 Connie Ping Kong
- 2 Marybeth Reyes Mencias
- 3 Karina Arifin
- 4 Maneerat Sompoch
- 5 Madhu Chetri

Resource person: Kim Seong-il

Data provider: Douglas Kalotiti



Team 5: Northern Area of Pakistan

- 1 Seher Turkmen
- 2 Bo Wen
- 3 Sathyakumar Sambandam
- 4 Wangchuk Leki
- 5 Kang Shua Yeo

Resource person: Vinod Mathur

Data provider: Karim Sheraz Faral



After the presentation of the practical team exercises – World Heritage nomination dossiers in Power Point form – the panel of resource persons delivered their comments on the documents created. UNITAR then gave a briefing on the next steps for the team. The workshop concluded with the submission of evaluation forms and presentation of certificates.

UNITAR Roundtable

“Conservation for Peace” - Can World Heritage Sites contribute towards peace?

In the framework of its regular public roundtables², UNITAR organised an interactive panel session open to the public at the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Building (Hiroshima City) on 4 April. Some 100 people attended the roundtable.

Nassrine AZIMI (UNITAR) thanked the attendees and introduced the UNITAR workshop to the public. The topic of conservation for peace is relevant to Hiroshima as it has a stunning example of heritage conserved and utilized for peace – the A-Bomb Dome. She hoped that the public in Hiroshima could also learn from the world cases of heritages used for or dedicated to promoting peace.

Richard ENGELHARDT (UNESCO) noted that the Constitution of UNESCO stipulates the “wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace”. The World Heritage Convention of 1972 aims to protect and transmit to future generations heritages belonging to all of humanity. He then presented some World Heritage sites embodying messages for peace: Borobudur (Indonesia) represents aspirations for peace, Hiroshima reminds us the consequences if we do not make peace a priority, Jerusalem continues to be contested, the Old Bridge of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) represents reconciliation and reconstruction.

² In addition to its training work, the UNITAR Hiroshima Office periodically holds roundtables to present the views of internationally renowned speakers, experts and key figures in the fields of politics, economics, sciences and the arts.



Norioki ISHIMARU (Hiroshima International University) said he was happy to see a training course hosted in Hiroshima. Hiroshima's two World Heritages still have many problems. The A-Bomb Dome and the Hiroshima Peace Memorial have questions of management of their core zone and buffer zone. Itsukushima Shrine suffers from high tide due to climate change and the landscape on the opposite bank. The enthusiasm at time of their inscription to the World Heritage List has calmed down. We have to think about a social system to conserve what is really important, even if they attract less attention. The conservation of the World Heritage sites should be considered not as a shackle for urban development but as part of sustainable urban planning.

Masaru MAENO (ICOMOS Japan) If the people of Hiroshima had decided to demolish the A-Bomb Dome, their history could have faded. In Tomo-no-Ura, though historic areas are conserved, the landscape behind – which is also an inseparable part of the heritage - is neglected. Historic heritage is the testimony of life. We all need to build the capacity to read history from heritages and landscapes. The spirit of heritage conservation is love and respect of the other. In the case of Tomo-no-Ura, for example, the collective work to conserve heritage – such as the research on the Korean Emissary (to Japan) will allow us to jointly read history and understand/respect each other.

KIM Seoung-il (Seoul National University) Demilitarized Zone between North and South Korea is a civilian control zone in which military activities and equipments are prohibited. IUCN and UNEP proposed a peace park in 1979 and 1982/3. With South Korea's Sunshine Policy, hope is growing in the land of tension and hostility. The land once devastated by war is now becoming a natural sanctuary with migratory birds delivering the message of peace. Lessons from Hiroshima – peace and sustainability as ultimate goal – will also help us shape the DMZ peace park for the future.

Gurmeet Sangha RAI (Cultural Resource Conservation Initiative, India) stated that Hiroshima gave her a great learning experience, in particular through the visit of the A-Bomb Dome. Revisiting the site reminds us that human beings continue to make the mistake of war. An example is also found in the Golden Temple in India, which was a place/target of conflict. At the separation of India and Pakistan, more than 1000 people lost their lives in this heritage which was otherwise embodying the message of peace and equality. The Hiroshima Peace Memorial has a circular system, that allows the visitors to better understand it. The A-Bomb Dome is a symbol; the Museum provides information and the possibility of public participation; the national monument offers a place for contemplation. They all complement each other.

Basanta BIDARI (Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Civil Aviation, Nepal) presented Lumbini, the birth place of Buddha. It is part of a series of places commemorating Buddha such as Bodhgaya and Sarnath (both India). The then Secretary-General of the United Nations Mr. U Thant visited the site and saw its tragic condition. The UN General Assembly then asked the world to do something to save this site. The memorial site was designed by Kenzo Tange, the architect who also designed the Hiroshima Peace Memorial. Both sites symbolize peace, compassion and humanity.

The short presentations were followed by a questions and answers session. To a question – how to integrate heritage preservation and peace, **Mr. Maeno** answered: it is necessary to draw out local people's pride regarding their heritage. Even without any specific system, some heritage sites have

been conserved. It is necessary for the public administration to learn how they have survived and support their conservation. *Mr. Engelhardt* said that heritage is different from ordinary tourist sites,



and it requires and promotes knowledge. To a question regarding religious conflicts, *Mr. Bidari* answered that heritage could promote reconciliation. Lumbini is a sacred site for Buddhists but also Islam and other religious people visit the site. About the public education (DMZ not known to Japanese people), *Mr. Kim* answered that the Japanese government is already contacted to include the issue in its education scheme. Also, DMZ tourism is contributing to increase public awareness. About the significance of the Peace Park as a place for condolences, *Mr. Ishimaru* said that the separation from the daily life of people could also bring other kinds of problems such as vandalism. Coexistence of memories and lives would be significant.

Workshop evaluation and next steps

A summary of the evaluations submitted by the participants is attached to the present document. The evaluations were on the whole highly positive, except for some difficulties regarding the intensity of the events and language. A number of participants felt that the duration of the workshop should be increased, perhaps by up to one/two additional day(s). An impressive 100% of participants reported that the workshop was relevant to their professional responsibilities. The practical exercise was rated as the most useful element of the workshop, followed by the lectures given by the resource persons and study tours: this reveals a high level of interest in peer exchange among World Heritage site managers in the region. While many of them appreciated the learning of the nomination process, a small number of people suggested that the workshop include in the future World Heritage management planning.

Three items are being distributed to the participants:

- Training modules containing all the presentations and other documents to be made available on the UNITAR Hiroshima website;
- Case studies for World Heritage nomination prepared by the five working teams;
- Future trainers identified and partnership requirements shared through guidelines prepared by UNITAR.

The 2008 workshop benefited from two major factors:

- Its continuity (Series developed since 2001) which has created: i) a strong and dedicated Faculty; ii) a large alumni network which resulted in identifying high-calibre participants; iii) strong institutional partnerships (all major actors in World Heritage management were represented and a formal agreement has been concluded with UNESCO World Heritage Centre); and iv) familiarity with the subject matter and workshop organisation as well as the identification of relevant focus “Conservation for Peace” on the part of UNITAR.
- The fact that two World Heritage Sites are located in Hiroshima. These sites provided living case studies and a powerful stimulus to the workshop discussions. Furthermore, the host of the Series – Hiroshima Prefecture – provided material and moral support and was at the same time able to benefit from input received from international heritage experts.

UNITAR and the Faculty have begun the process of designing the 2009 workshop to build upon the evaluations of the present event. It is expected to take place in Spring 2009.

Summary of Evaluations from Participants

Editor's note: The following is a summary of the responses submitted by participants to the evaluation questionnaire. An attempt has been made to synthesize responses into key points, to provide a clear understanding of the analysis, impressions and suggestions for future improvements.

Total number of evaluations: **30** (100% response).

1. Workshop Content

- All participants (100%) reported that the workshop was useful in the light of their professional responsibilities.
- Participants found the following workshop activities as the most useful:
 - 18 participants mentioned the practical exercise;
 - 6 participants mentioned the presentations given by the resource persons; and
 - 6 participants mentioned the study tours.
- Explanation of the criteria to state the outstanding universal values (OUV) for World Heritage nomination was considered useful and was mentioned by 4 participants.
- 63% (19) reported that they considered none of the activities to be “least useful”. Four mentioned one topic (each) which deemed to them least useful, including the study visits to Miyajima and Itsukushima Shrine, nomination process and management plan. Others (3) made comments on the process of work – not everyone had the chance to talk about his/her country (1); some lectures did not address methodology issues; and team exercises when the discussion didn't go well (1).
- 83% (25) explicitly reported that they benefited from the combination of culture and nature presentations. None reported that the combination was not useful. Four said that culture and nature are inseparable. Two said that it was an unusual experience for them.
- 86% (26) of participants considered the workshop's structure, content, resource persons and other participants to be either very good or excellent.
- The workshop's timing and duration was considered to be appropriate by 66% (20). Others reported that they would have preferred to have additional (1/2 days to a week) time during the workshop.
- A variety of topics were suggested by the participants which could complement and develop the workshop in future (see below).

Suggestions for additional topics

- Preparation of a World Heritage management plan for a specific site (6 comments);
- Monitoring (2 comments);
- Evaluation (2 comments);
- The Silk Road (2 comments);
- Conflict resolution;
- Arts and crafts;
- Intangible heritage;
- Conservation, rehabilitation, restoration of humanity and its heritage;
- Conservation of historic townscapes;
- World Heritage in danger;
- Tourism in heritage sites;
- Outstanding universal values, authenticity and integrity.



Wen Bo

Program Director, Pacific Environment, China

“Hiroshima is a place of peace, a window of Japanese culture for people who visited Japan for the first time. It is a place of remembrance and tolerance for the peace and war; it’s also a city of tragedy and tragic memories.”

2. Study Tours

A-Bomb Dome, Peace Park and Museum

90% (26) said that this study tour was very informative and useful. Others expressed some ideas for improvement:

- it could have been longer (1) or shorter (1);
- more explanation about the conception (1);
- group could be divided in smaller numbers (1).

Miyajima Island

60% of the participants said that this study visit was very informative and useful. Five said that the duration was too short. Two said that small groups could have been created. Two wished to have a different mode of circulation. One suggested holding a workshop in Miyajima.

3. Organisation

Participants were very complementary about the organisation of the workshop with 100% viewing its organization as either very good or excellent.

Participants listed the following problems they had encountered prior to and during the course of the workshop:

- Language and communication (6);
- Very tight and heavy schedule (4);
- Additional PC equipments needed (3);
- Meeting room for team exercises (2).

Others commented on the difficulty in the practical exercises mainly due to the communication and interaction problems.

4. Workshop venue – Hiroshima and its vicinity

Participants expressed highly positive opinions about Hiroshima, drawing attention to the following features:

- Good place for training (especially in the context of the present workshop) (13);
- Place of peace, remembrance and tolerance, peace and war, city of tragedy and tragic memories (3);
- Impressed by people who built the city from zero (4);
- Good training facilities (2);
- Impressed to see that the people of Hiroshima used their experiences to be against nuclear weapons (1);
- Good sample of urban development (1);
- Clean, well organized and beautiful (1);
- Very strong symbol (1);
- A place of peace but it is in the middle of a busy avenue – quite contrasting (1);
- Its memory must not be lost to the future generations (1).

83% (25) of participants reported that the hotel and the workshop venue were good to excellent. Two preferred to have a short distance between the accommodation and the workshop venue.

5. General comments

Many participants stated that the workshop was very valuable and used this part of the questionnaire to thank UNITAR for the dedication of its staff.

Also they sent various suggestions regarding the future workshops and outreach of the series:

- UNITAR to organize national workshops (2);
- Bring back one or two members from this year to help with next year (1);
- Assign case studies (for practical exercises) in advance and resource persons should speak to the data providers in advance (1);
- Case studies of the participants for presentation should be selected by votes by the participants (1);
- Have a smaller group for the workshop (1);
- Have an association of UNITAR participants (1);
- E-group should be formed for networking between participants (1);
- Continuous interaction with a selected number of sites over a long period (1).



Hiroko Nakayama
Berin McKenzie
Sergei Shaposhnikov

Hiroshima and Geneva
April 2008