



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

**2007 Workshop on the  
Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites**

**"World Heritage management over time – maintaining values and significance"**



15-20 April 2007  
Hiroshima, Japan

**Executive Summary and Next Steps**  
*May 2007*

***Acknowledgements***

*UNITAR would like to express its deepest gratitude to:  
Hiroshima Prefectural Government for its support of this Series since 2003*

*City of Hiroshima, City of Hatsukaichi, Itsukushima Shinto Shrine and Peace Memorial Museum  
as well as the people of Hiroshima for their cooperation and 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), Getty Conservation Institute (GCI), World Conservation Union (IUCN), Universities of Hiroshima and Hyogo - all of which have remained committed since the beginning of the Series and helped make this workshop a reality*

*Financial assistance for participants from the Pacific provided by the Department of the Environment & Water Resources of the Australian Government*

*United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNESCO field offices assisted with logistics.*

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

## Introduction

The Series on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites, one of the main programme pillars of the UNITAR Hiroshima Office for Asia and the Pacific (HOAP), 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.

Ten years have passed since the inscription of the Hiroshima A-Bomb Dome and the Itsukushima Shinto Shrine on the World Heritage list. To mark this occasion, the 2007 session focused on **the management of World Heritage sites over time in order to maintain their values and significance**. Values of particular resources are intangible and fluctuating, as interpreted and designated by different people over time. Similarly, heritage sites are surrounded by people and are very much part of society. Designation as World Heritage can potentially entail significant changes to a site’s tangible and intangible aspects. The two sites in Hiroshima have continually seen shifts in their significance over time and therefore provide living case studies to those experts tasked with safeguarding natural and cultural resources on behalf of the whole of humanity.

The 2007 training workshop was designed such as to expand upon a values-based approach to heritage management, with the following specific objectives:

- Review the basics of the World Heritage regime, available information, updates and current trends;
- Elucidate the underlying principles of values-based heritage management, with a particular focus on changes in values over time;
- Examine leading policies and strategies, identifying best practices and lessons learned;
- Utilize the nomination dossier format as the basis for exploring a range of issues relating to the identification and management of World Heritage sites;
- Enhance long-term learning and exchange among the participants.

## 2007 Workshop – the Faculty, participants and format

The 2007 workshop benefited greatly from the UNITAR network created since 2001.<sup>1</sup> The main institutional partners<sup>2</sup> all sent resource persons – the majority of whom were participating for the third or fourth time. Additionally, throughout the year these resource persons were involved in both the substantive and structural planning by means of an internet forum. HOAP alumni, counting over 900 members, were also key in identifying suitable candidates in their countries. As a result, the level was very high as were the numbers: the workshop was attended by some 47 participants, resource persons and staff, representing 26 countries from Asia, Europe and North America.

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Created by means of a pilot programme held prior to the establishment of the Hiroshima Office in 2003.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

- 1) **Presentations and lectures**, systematically followed by Q and A sessions, included the following:
- **World Heritage Regime: Objectives and Trends**, *Richard ENGELHARDT* (UNESCO Bangkok Office, Thailand). By guiding the participants through the key concepts of the World Heritage Regime, Mr. Engelhardt introduced them to the objectives of the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention which now counts a total of 830 sites (175 located in the Asia Pacific region). The significance of a particular site is determined by the values of the story told by that site. The more these values are established to be “authentic” and their “integrity” intact, the greater will be the significance of the site. The significance of a site is defined by different stakeholders through cultural mapping allowing them to develop a “statement of significance”. Management policies are then developed to retain the heritage values set down in the statement of significance.
  - **What is Heritage? - an introduction to values based management**, *François LEBLANC* (Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, USA). Mr. LeBlanc defined the notion of heritage as “whatever someone wishes to preserve for future generations” and employed a three-dimensional analysis to explain this concept: i) the dimension of the subject (from individual to community, community to country and country to world); ii) the characteristics of heritage (natural heritage, built heritage, living, intangible etc.); and iii) the degree of values. Two existing cases from Grosse-Ile and the Irish Memorial (Canada) and Flynn’s Grave (Australia) were introduced and participants were invited to identify different values represented by the sites. Values represent the fundamental basis of any planning scheme for a heritage site therefore managers need to appreciate the full spectrum of relevant values through interaction with all concerned stakeholders.
  - **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)**, *Jeffrey CODY* (Getty Conservation Institute). Mr. Cody examined the criteria of OUV employed within the World Heritage Convention, taking Hadrian’s Wall in the United Kingdom as a case study. Guidelines for writing a statement of significance were introduced as follows: i) begin with one sentence which sets the geographical and historical context; ii) address each of the applicable criteria with its own sentence; and iii) conclude with a “statement of threats”. The participants were then requested to create a statement of OUV for their respective site and discuss them with other members. The statements were collected and received comments from the resource persons.
  - **Hiroshima’s World Heritage Sites**, *Yushi UTAKA* (University of Hyogo). Following an introduction of Japan’s legislation and administration for heritage conservation, Mr. Utaka introduced Japanese style community-based management which is called “machizukuri” (town-making). He then reviewed Hiroshima’s ten year experience with two sites on the World Heritage List. During this period both sites have experienced contrast due to the different values attributed to them by different stakeholders. The landscape surrounding the A-Bomb Dome continues to be the subject of considerable debate with regard to the nearby environment, part of which is seen by some people to be an obstacle to the World Heritage landscape and by others as representing Hiroshima’s post-war reconstruction and prosperity. Itsukushima Shinto Shrine, which is seen as being both a sacred and religious place, is also a major centre of tourism which has also led to debate about its future preservation and management.
  - **Changing Heritage Values through Time – a comparative study**, *Duncan MARSHALL* (ICOMOS Australia). Mr. Marshall described major changes in values that are taking place at Hiroshima’s two World Heritage sites – Itsukushima Shinto Shrine and the A-Bomb Dome. For example, the A-Bomb Dome was originally constructed in 1915 as a commercial exhibition building. It was one of the target buildings for the atomic bombing and after the war its preservation was hotly debated. It took almost 20 years before a decision was taken to conserve it as a memorial site and a total of 50 years before it was designated a World Heritage site. Mr. Marshall posed the question “does World Heritage listing freeze the values of a site?” He stated that values constantly change with or without World Heritage listing and that therefore conservation should be about managing these changes, sometimes acting in line with changes and sometimes deciding not to accept them.

- **Outstanding Universal Value of Natural Sites – a look into the process of evaluation, Kumiko YONEDA** (Japan Wildlife Research Center). Ms. Yoneda first introduced IUCN's structure. World Heritage questions are mostly handled by IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA). She explained the nature-related criteria of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and the guidelines developed by IUCN. She then presented Japanese cases of World Heritage nomination, including the Shiretoko case which was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2005. Japan currently has three natural World Heritage sites. Candidate sites were selected by a Review Committee from among a list of several thousand. Ms. Yoneda advised participants against rushing through site nominations and stressed the need for time to be taken to ensure that sites meet the specific criteria and conditions of integrity required for nomination. She stated that World Heritage nomination can be a powerful social process which can potentially facilitate better protection of a site.
- **Managing World Heritage values Over Time – from a natural perspective, HAN Qunli** (UNESCO Jakarta). Speaking about the values of natural sites, Mr. Han first revisited the concept of Outstanding Universal Value. He presented different tangible and intangible aspects of specific natural sites, for example: exceptional natural beauty, sources of artistic inspiration, the earth's history, ecological evolution, biodiversity, economic, scientific and other values. Integrity – the wholeness and intactness of a site – frequently contains intangible aspects such as 'sacredness'. In order to manage heritage sites more effectively over time, site managers need to overcome specific direct and indirect threats and challenges. They should also respond to underlying causes of change, such as population increase, economic development and politic processes.
- **Nominating Natural Heritage Properties on the Tentative List, Vinod MATHUR** (Wildlife Institute of India). Mr. Mathur considered the nomination process – especially that of tentative list making – as a valuable planning tool for state parties. A state party wishing to nominate a property for World Heritage inscription should include it in its tentative list at least one year prior to official nomination. So far 1371 properties have been placed on the tentative list. Mr. Mathur took the case study of the Indian tentative list, submitted to UNESCO in 2006. The Indian team identified natural heritage properties according to a specific set of criteria which included World Heritage values, habitat integrity and contiguity, representativeness and complementarity. The evaluation for Outstanding Universal Value represented the critical point where the team could decide whether the nomination should go forward or not. Three single sites and 39 serial sites have been selected for India's tentative list. The Western Ghats were presented as a case study for a serial nomination.
- **Preparation of a WH Nomination Dossier, Richard ENGELHARDT**: Preconditions for inscription on the World Heritage List are: authenticity, integrity and the presence of an adequate protection and management system. The Operational Guidelines revised in February 2005 provide the format and process of nominations, as well as guidelines for monitoring, reporting and application for international assistance. Different types of nomination such as those for trans-boundary properties and serial properties were explained. Mr. Engelhardt explained that the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee can be one of the following: "inscribe the site", "do not inscribe the site", "refer back to the state party" or "defer the nomination process".



**Kivil Nese AKDOGAN**  
**Urban Planner, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Turkey**

*"The presentations of the resource persons were beneficial to enhance my capacities. Even though I have been working in the UNESCO Coordination Unit of the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, I haven't prepared any nomination dossiers. I think that I have now gained all the necessary information for preparing appropriate dossiers and determining the outstanding universal value of the sites to be nominated."*

2) **Study tours** were organised to Hiroshima's two World Heritage sites, the A-Bomb Dome (and the Peace Memorial Museum and Park) and the Itsukushima Shinto Shrine on Miyajima Island.


- Yushi Utaka escorted the participants to the A-Bomb Dome where they entered the inner area directly beneath the Dome (not permitted to general public). He explained the measures that have been taken to maintain its structure since World War II and the risks that it still faces from natural disasters such as earthquakes. They were then guided through the Peace Park where they received an explanation of its design and construction from **Ms. Noriko YOSHIDA** (*Prefectural University of Hiroshima*). Finally, an introduction to the Peace Memorial Museum was received from its Director **Mr. Koichiro MAEDA**, after which participants visited the museum.
- Yushi Utaka, Noriko Yoshida, **Mr. Nobuyuki UEMURA** (Hiroshima University) and **Ms. Masako UNEZAKI** (Interpreter) accompanied the participants to Itsukushima Shinto Shrine on Miyajima Island. After receiving an explanation of its construction and maintenance from Head Craftsman **Mr. Yori-hisa YAMAGUCHI**, they visited the Shrine and observed Noh Theatre which was being performed within in celebration of the Tokasai (peach flower) Festival. The Shrine Carpenter's Workshop was then visited and further explanation provided by Assistant Chief Priest **Mr. Shigeru MIYATA** and Craftsman **Mr. Shingo MIFUNE**. The participants then visited Senjo-Kaku (the 1000 Tatami 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 policies related to Miyajima Island pursued by the City of Hatsukaichi, (the local governmental centre which assumed responsibility for the island in 2005) especially with regard to the management of tourism. The study tour concluded with dinner at a Japanese restaurant.

Each study tour was followed by a **debriefing**, led by Duncan Marshall and Jeffrey Cody respectively. The participants were given a set of questions prior to the study visits and held group discussions after. These debriefings are part of UNITAR Hiroshima's training methodology "After-Action-Review (AAR)", an attempt to transform what is seen, heard and experienced into learning.

In the first debriefing in response to the study tour to the **A-Bomb Dome**, the participants were asked to form groups to identify three risks to the site and to propose a management strategy to tackle one of these risks. Their responses were as follows:

Group	Risks to the A-Bomb Dome	Management strategy
1	1. Structural integrity of the A-bomb Dome 2. Outstanding universal value of A-bomb Dome 3. Intruders	Improve signs around the Dome to strengthen the message
2	1. Gradual disappearance of the memory of war 2. Collapse of A-bomb Dome 3. Urbanisation	Use photographs from the museum to convey message
3	1. No risk preparedness strategy (earthquakes etc.) 2. Insufficient monitoring 3. Mgmt. framework - too dependent on City	Form an international body to maintain the Dome
4	1. Urbanisation (high-rise buildings) in vicinity 2. Declining numbers of Japanese visitors 3. No regulations in buffer zone relating to new buildings	Control and expand the buffer zone around the site
5	1. Diminution of symbolism of the Dome - tourism and commodification 2. Whole of Peace Park is not inscribed so this reduces its impact (values too narrowly defined)	Redefine values, realign boundaries and manage the whole site as one entity

	3. Non-definition of the use of the Dome - becoming irrelevant to the life of the city	
6	1. Negative natural influence on the site of earthquakes, climate change etc. 2. High-rise construction in buffer zone - negative visual impact 3. Decline in number of local visitors	Construct a special frame to protect the Dome
7	1. Structural integrity - danger of earthquakes 2. Declining number of local visitors 3. High-rise buildings in the surrounding zone – parkscape	Conduct research on how to protect and strengthen the Dome; bring in international maintenance expertise
8	1. Lessening historical value, park built upon former ruins 2. Land owned by National government, managed by the City leading to an ownership problem	Implement an integrated management plan



**Aziz Ali KHAN**  
**District Manager, Conservation Strategy Support Unit Chitral, Pakistan**

*“The study tour to the A-Bomb Dome was excellent and the explanatory presentation was quite comprehensive. The local authorities deserve congratulation for preserving this important building in its original form and shape which gives a strong message to the younger generation of how human knowledge and inventions had been used for the devastation of humanity. The second message coming from the Dome is how the people of Hiroshima tackled the situation and converted/transformed the devastation into opportunities for development.”*

In the second debriefing in response to the study tour to the **Itsukushima Shinto Shrine**, in larger groups the participants were asked to identify two risks to the site, link them to specific World Heritage values and then to suggest measures that could be taken to enhance these values. Their responses were as follows:

Group	Risks to Itsukushima Shinto Shrine	World Heritage Values	Opportunities to Enhance Values
1	1. Degradation of resources (timber), global warming 2. Increased number of tourists	Architectural value  Decreased sanctity (intangible) sacred, religious, spiritual	Implement a visitor management plan
2	1. Craftsmanship not being transmitted across generations (carpentry techniques etc.) 2. Lack of clarity in regulation / mgmt.	Architectural, built heritage (tangible), cultural (intangible)  All values	Implement a better management plan based on clear conservation principles
3	1. Sanctity of shrine being lost rapidly 2. Tides - damaging traditional materials, fabric of shrine	Spiritual value  Aesthetic and architectural values	Enhance sanctity of the Shrine through removal of shoes, controlling commerce, better explanations at the entrance
4	1. Lack of coordinated, integrated site management 2. Traditional preservation skills and practices in danger	All values  Cultural / natural balance, architectural value etc.	Implement a comprehensive, coordinated plan
5	1. Disappearance of traditional knowledge 2. Change in demographics - young people leaving Miyajima	All values  Social	Instigate an awareness programme (especially for young people)



3) The **practical exercise** formed an integral element of the workshop which employed case-study analysis and was 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 real (existing) site and to present it in plenary. Teams were required to prepare a Power Point presentation lasting 20 minutes (during which all members were requested to present) and a one page explanatory paper.

The members of the teams were as follows:

**Team 1 - Norfolk Island, Australia**

Resource person: François LEBLANC

Data provider : Jean RICE (Australia)  
 Nick ARAHO (Papua New Guinea)  
 Mutaaga ISARA (Samoa)  
 Prashantha MANDAWALA (Sri Lanka)  
 Priyaleen SINGH (India)  
 Ahmed THOLAL (Maldives)



**Team 2 – Shey Phoksundo, Nepal**

Resource persons: Vinod MATHUR and Kumiko YONEDA

Data provider : Khadga BASNET (Nepal)  
 Emil HASANOV (Azerbaijan)  
 Aziz Ali KHAN (Pakistan)  
 Mustaid SIREGAR (Indonesia)  
 Renee TALAVERA (Philippines)  
 Lin'an WANG (China)



**Team 3 - Kaiping Diaolou, China**

Resource person: Jeffrey CODY

Data provider : Jinhua TAN (China)  
 Paul MAHONEY (New Zealand)  
 Phu PHUNG (Vietnam)  
 Rebecca PRADHAN (Bhutan)  
 Winarni SISWODIHARJO (Indonesia)  
 Kai WEISE (Nepal)



**Team 4 – Jaisalmer Fort, India**

Resource person: Duncan MARSHALL

Data provider : Bindu MANCHANDA (India)  
 Mohammad Zia AFSHAR (Afghanistan)  
 Kivil Nese AKDOGAN (Turkey)  
 Yunus ARBI (Indonesia)  
 Safiullah BAIG (Pakistan)  
 Bayarmaa BATNASAN (Mongolia)  
 Hisano TOYOSHIMA (Japan)




**Team 5 – Mae Klong Canals Complex, Thailand**

Resource person: Qunli HAN

Data provider : Poon KHWANSUWAN (Thailand)  
 Kayarash EGHTESSADI (Iran)  
 Elnura KORCHUEVA (Kyrgyzstan)  
 Joycelyn MANANGHAYA (Philippines)  
 Phuc Van NGUYEN (Vietnam)  
 Haili ZHOU (China)



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.

	<p><b>Bindu MANCHANDA</b>  <b>Director, National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage, India</b></p> <p><i>“The most useful part of this workshop was definitely the exercise of preparing the World Heritage Site nomination dossier. Prior to this I had no expertise at all in preparing the dossier so it will have an enormous benefit for me and for Jaisalmer Fort. We intend to apply and convince the government to fast-track the site onto the Tentative List. This training will help me immensely to prepare the dossier in cooperation with the government.”</i></p>
---	---

## UNITAR Roundtable

### “Ten Years of World Heritage in Hiroshima” - international experts on World Heritage site management discuss the A-Bomb Dome and Itsukushima Shrine

In the framework of its regular roundtables<sup>3</sup>, UNITAR organised an interactive panel session open to the public at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Hall on Friday 20 April. Six workshop resource persons participated as panellists. It was moderated by Kumiko Yoneda.

**Nassrine AZIMI (UNITAR)** opened the session by stating that neither nature nor culture should be seen by modern society as representing *luxury*. They are in fact closely related to fundamental questions of human identity, peace and tolerance. She referred to the statement from the representative of Afghanistan, that “a nation is alive when its culture is alive”. It is to be hoped that all people can understand the importance of this statement, irrespective of nationality. In this respect, the experience of Japan represents a good example: its revival following World War II was also possible by the considerable efforts that were made to protect its unique natural and cultural heritage and identity.

**Norioki ISHIMARU (Hiroshima International University)** welcomed the participants from abroad and explained that 10 years since the inscription of Hiroshima’s two sites on the World Heritage List the city was facing many difficult questions related to them. One of the most pressing questions relates to the landscape surrounding the A-Bomb Dome: at present the core zone is quite well preserved but no enforceable restriction exists in the surrounding buffer zone. With regard to Itsukushima Shinto Shrine, it has been frequently damaged by natural disasters in recent years. Professor Ishimaru requested the roundtable attendees to engage in active debates about these issues.

**Richard ENGELHARDT (UNESCO)**, in response to the question “What is World Heritage?”, stated that the majority of human beings possess the important facility of memory. However, in order to maintain clarity in that memory, people have a need to hold on to something tangible, and that is what we understand as ‘heritage’. World Heritage is that which humanity inherits and passes on to future generations, whose values are timeless and common to all; these values are called “Outstanding Universal Values”, as recognized in the World Heritage Convention. Applied to Hiroshima’s World Heritage sites, the outstanding universal value of the A-Bomb Dome is the story of war and peace, and for Itsukushima Shrine it is the inspirational spirit of nature.

**François LEBLANC (Getty Conservation Institute)** explained the contribution that Japan has made within the field of heritage conservation. Japan has pioneered legislation in the fields of fine and applied arts, building and traditional (folklore) materials, and in 1965 it was the first country to draft legislation for the purpose of conserving *intangible* and *living* heritage. Japan also hosted a key conference on

<sup>3</sup> 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.



authenticity in Nara in 1994 which saw the creation of the ‘Nara Document on Authenticity’ which shifted the focus from conserving “fabric” to conserving “tradition”.

**Duncan MARSHALL (ICOMOS)** reported on the workshop debriefing session that was held following the study tour to the A-Bomb Dome. During this session participants discussed real and potential risks to the site and possible management responses to tackle these risks. The risks identified included those relating to both tangible and intangible aspects: the possibility of the collapse of the Dome; natural disasters such as earthquakes and climate change; also the loss of memory of the war; the loss of the symbolism of the site through intensive tourism; and narrow definitions of the values of the site which have been limited solely to the core zone and the building itself.

**Jeffrey CODY (Getty Conservation Institute)** reported on the debriefing session held after the study tour to Itsukushima Shinto Shrine. During the tour participants had had the opportunity to visit Miyajima Island and also to meet the Shrine’s head carpenter and Assistant Chief Priest, to experience a Noh Theatre performance and to discuss issues relating to townscape conservation with a representative of a local conservation association. The six major risks identified by the participants during the debriefing were: global warming, increasing numbers of tourists, a lack of an integrated management strategy, the loss of traditional maintenance skills, the departure of many young people from Miyajima and the loss of the sanctity of the Shrine.

**Vinod MATHUR (Wildlife Institute of India)** was asked his opinion about the major challenges and risks for World Heritage management in Asia and the Pacific, and also in Hiroshima. He explained that the most striking future challenge would be the trade-off between conservation and development. The need for urbanisation and industrialisation should be harmonised effectively with the need to conserve unique natural, cultural and traditional resources. He felt that Japan and Hiroshima have many lessons that they can share with heritage managers in the Asia Pacific region.

In response to the same question, **HAN Qunli (UNESCO Jakarta)** stated that most of the problems raised in Japan and elsewhere in the Asia Pacific region regarding World Heritage conservation, for example those of deforestation, pollution, tourism pressure, loss of biodiversity, climate change, were all specifically *human problems*. He stressed that in order to identify effective measures to tackle these problems, it is necessary to address the realities of human society in general. It is vital that people understand, recognise and appreciate the great value of their own heritage resources. Education will be key to promoting such understanding.

The roundtable was attended a total of by 122 people. Questions from Hiroshima citizens were mostly related to development plans within the buffer zones around Hiroshima’s two World Heritage Sites and also to the other sites in the Chugoku region such as Tomo No Ura and Onomichi.



## 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. A number of participants felt that the duration of the workshop should be increased, perhaps by up to one additional day. All 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: this reveals a high level of interest in peer exchange among World Heritage site managers in the region. Some participants suggested the establishment of a continuous forum of information exchange to facilitate this. UNITAR and its Faculty will seek to provide assistance to those participants planning to conduct national or sub-regional level training activities in the future.

Plans are to distribute by late May 2007 the following:

- Training modules containing all the presentations and other documents to be made available on the UNITAR Hiroshima website and on a CD-ROM distributed to all participants;
- 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 2007 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 represented); and iv) familiarity with the subject matter and workshop organisation on the part of UNITAR.
- The fact that two of Japan's thirteen 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 – was able to benefit from input received from international heritage experts.

UNITAR and the Faculty have begun the process of designing the 2008 workshop to build upon the evaluations of the 2007 event. It is expected to take place in Spring 2008.



## Summary of Evaluations from Participants

*The following is a brief summary of the responses submitted by the participants to the evaluation questionnaire. An attempt has been made to synthesize responses into key points in order to have a clear understanding of the analysis, impressions and suggestions of the participants for future improvements.*

Total number of evaluations: **31**.

### 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: 42% (13 participants) mentioned the practical exercise, 29% (9 participants) the presentations given by the resource persons and 16% (5 participants) having the opportunity to interact with other experts in the field.
- 65% (20 participants) reported that they considered none of the activities to be “least useful”. 13% (4 participants) noted that due to the tight time schedule some lectures and other activities were somewhat rushed leaving insufficient time for Q & A.
- All participants responded that they could benefit from the combination of culture and nature presentations for the following reasons: they could appreciate the interrelationship between World Heritage sites and their cultural and natural contexts, 45% (14 participants); both cultural and natural sites are facing similar challenges, 19% (6); they had the opportunity to learn about the rich cultural and natural heritage of the Asia-Pacific region, 6% (2).
- 94% 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 51% (16 participants); 39% (12) reported that they would have preferred to have additional time during the workshop, especially for the presentations of the resource persons and the practical exercise; 3 reported that they would have preferred at least an extra day. 80% (25) reported that the material provided for the workshop was sufficient.
- A variety of topics were suggested by the participants which could complement and develop the workshop in future (see below).
- 73% (22) reported that they would be interested in future partnership with UNITAR, especially with regard to the organisation of national or regional workshops.

### Suggestions for additional topics

- Preparation of a World Heritage management plan for a specific site
- Linking management of cultural and natural sites with community development and poverty reduction
- Underwater heritage management
- Economic and environmental valuation of cultural and natural resources
- Political aspects of the nomination process
- Risk management
- Intangible heritage
- Anthropological and economic factors relevant to World Heritage management
- Case studies illustrating specific criteria of Outstanding Universal Value
- Management of spiritual values
- Global challenges to World Heritage sites
- Traditional maintenance and restoration techniques for architectural sites
- Understanding, negotiating and evaluating social and political meanings of landscapes
- Documentation, cultural mapping
- Urbanisation

## **2. Study Tours**

### **A-Bomb Dome, Peace Park and Museum**

The reaction to this study tour was generally positive but some participants (7) expressed the view that they would have preferred additional time at the Museum. Most felt that the Dome, Park and Museum communicated a very powerful message of peace, allowing a strong understanding of the tragic legacy of Hiroshima. Three participants commented that the Dome represented an important example of living World Heritage and that it had given them a new perspective on the importance of intangible values.

### **Miyajima Island**

Reactions to this tour were almost universally positive with participants appreciating the multi-dimensional nature of the site. They drew attention to the spiritual and architectural values of Itsukushima Shrine and its traditional system of maintenance, the involvement of community groups in the conservation of the surrounding environment and the overall management of tourism on the island. Two participants expressed the view that they would have liked some specific information on the island's architecture beforehand.

## **3. Organisation**

Participants were very complementary about the organisation of the workshop with over 90% viewing it as either very good or excellent.

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

- Complicated travel arrangements (3)
- Language problems before Hiroshima arrival
- Tight time schedule, both during the workshop sessions and private time (8)
- Communicating with participants from different cultural backgrounds
- Data provider needed more time for preparation
- Range of English ability amongst participants.

## **4. Workshop venue – Hiroshima and its vicinity**

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

a beautiful and peaceful city (9); an ideal location for this training series due to its two World Heritage sites (6); friendly, helpful people (4); a safe and secure environment (3).

Regarding the hotel, 81% (25) said that it was either good or very good; participants particularly appreciated the distance between the hotel and the office which provided an opportunity to see and get a feel for the city and also for exercise. Difficulty was expressed at the lack of computer facilities/work place in the evenings (5).

## **5. General comments**

Many participants stated that the knowledge they had gained was very valuable and that they would use it in their own professional contexts. Much tribute was paid to the dedication of UNITAR staff and leadership.

Participants made various suggestions regarding improvements for future workshops:

- Increase the overall time allotted to the workshop by at least 1 day
- Data provider for the practical exercise should be notified earlier to allow more preparation time
- Participants should have contact with their group members and know the cases prior to the workshop
- Additional country presentations could take place during tea/lunch breaks
- National-level workshops in participants' home countries should be organised to capitalise on progress made



- Continued contact between participants via the internet will support the conservation of cultural and natural heritage
- Future interaction with resource persons requested.



Hiroko Nakayama and James Short  
Geneva and Hiroshima  
May 2007