

# MODULE FOUR:

International Symposium



On October 4, 2019, the Fourth International Symposium on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation, Asia and the Pacific, Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage took place within the framework of the Tsukuba Conference 2019.

The Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation, University of Tsukuba, Professor Masahito Yoshida and the President of the University of Tsukuba, Professor Kyosuke Nagata gave respectively an opening address and especially welcomed the honoured guest speakers Dr. Mechtild Rössler, UNESCO, Dr. Webber Nodoro, ICCROM, Mr. Takahiro Okano, Ministry of the Environment of Japan, and Ms. Kumiko Shimotsuma, Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan, and the roundtable guests: Ms. Kristal Buckley, ICOMOS, Dr. Gamini Wijesuriya, WHITRAP/ICCROM, Mr. Tim Badman, IUCN, and Ms. Sophia Rabliauskas, Pimachiowin Aki Corporation. The achievements of the CBWNCL organized by the UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation based on the University of Tsukuba were acknowledged. It was pointed out that the University of Tsukuba, along with the Certificate Programme on Nature Conservation and the World Heritage Studies Program, has worked closely with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICOMOS, and ICCROM in the development of this novel curriculum.



*Professor Kyosuke Nagata, President of the University of Tsukuba, inaugurating the International Symposium.*



*Professor Masahito Yoshida, Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation, University of Tsukuba, inaugurating the International Symposium.*

Subsequently, Dr. Mechtild Rössler, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, gave a speech on ‘The challenges of nominating Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage sites to the World Heritage List.’ She began introducing that the World Heritage Convention is the only legal instrument in heritage conservation that covers both natural and cultural heritage, underpinning the existence of linkages between nature and culture already since 1972. However, the definition of mixed sites was only included in the Operational Guidelines to the WH Convention in 2005, following a major revision that took place over five years since 2000. She commented that after forty years, the World Heritage List only has 39 mixed sites, which points at a certainly underrepresented category and a challenge for State Parties. She explained that the reasons are detailed in a document presented to the World Heritage Committee on mixed sites in 2014, but one of them is that until 1992 there were cultural references under natural criteria. This explains, for example, why a number of natural sites today would be mixed or even mixed cultural landscapes. She commented that as shown by statistics, cultural landscapes outreached mixed sites almost three times since 1992, and only 10 cases are categorized as both of them. Moreover, as evidenced by a selected group of sites, some criteria are much more often used for mixed sites than in other cases, as noticed for the criteria (iii) and (vii); the latter relates to ‘beauty,’ a cultural concept inexistent for cultural criteria.

Dr. Rössler continued explaining the challenges of mixed sites by showing concrete cases from the World Heritage List. She first introduced the case of the recently inscribed **Ennedi Massif** in Chad (2016), a desert landscape with unique geological features and one of the most crucial rock art sites of the Sahara in the World Heritage List. She commented that due to the discovery of oil and gas in the area around, the State Party reduced the boundary of the site, leaving the essential rock art outside. She focused on seven points: early nominations, changes in the interpretation, extension, re-nominations, inscriptions that were not fully recommended, and the work with Indigenous peoples and local communities in understanding mixed sites and Outstanding Universal Value.

Dr. Rössler reflected on the notion of mixed sites in early nominations, which were foreseen in terms of using the articles 1 and 2 of the Convention, often with a similar composition to the one in Ennedi: a mixed site of geological features, natural features, and archaeological sites. She mentioned the case of **Tassili n’Ajjer** in Algeria (1982), where mixed is also a linkage between people and the landscape, as the rock art depicted

the diverse flora and fauna of the environment when the Sahara was still green, together with the ways of life of people. She further mentioned that on the other side of this area is located the natural site of Air and Ténéré in Niger, inscribed only under natural criteria despite the presence of rock art showing giant giraffes. She highlighted the importance of rock art for the scientific discovery of species, which inspired them. Next, she presented the case of **Machu Picchu** (1983), one of the most emblematic mixed sites, noting that natural and cultural were separate in early nominations. In Machu Picchu, the Inca archaeological site is well known, but the area is also a critical habitat for flora and fauna (e.g., spectacle bear). She mentioned a personal anecdote of her visit to the site in 1998, where she noticed one of the main problems when it comes to mixed sites: despite being one World Heritage property, the boards in charge of nature conservation and cultural heritage were not working under one property-based management. The site managers from the National Service for Protected Areas and the then National Institute of Culture, respectively, had never met before. Then, Dr. Rössler introduced another case of early nominations: **Göreme** in Turkey (1985). In the inscription of this site, which displays a spectacular landscape and rock formations, natural beauty predominated over geology, as the only criterion (vii) and not (viii), was used. Cases like this one, raise questions about the interpretation of the criteria: ‘would this be nominated today as a cultural landscape and not a mixed site?’ –she commented. She pointed out that, since 1984, the Bureau and the Committee’s discussions on the notion of mixed sites were linked to the question of rural landscapes. However, it was not until 1992 that the category of cultural landscapes was introduced, and, in 1993, **Tongariro National Park** (1990-1993) was extended to become the first cultural landscape. Inscribed as a natural site for its geological features in 1990, Tongariro was of utmost importance for Maori Indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples’ claims for the world recognition of their sacred mountain as a cultural heritage posed a challenge to the World Heritage Committee. However, they resulted in the inscription of the first mixed site and cultural landscape.

Afterwards, Dr. Rössler presented the case of **St. Kilda** in Scotland (1986-2004-2005), which entailed a re-nomination and an extension. Saint Kilda is an outstanding fossil or relict cultural landscape where the human-nature organic evolution stopped on 29 August 1930 when all the residents were moved out from the island. She explained that this site was extended to cover the marine area to include as well the marine biodiversity, which was the food source for birds that sustained the subsistence of local people. She then commented on the case of the **Ngorongoro Conservation Area**, Tanzania, a key natural area in Africa. This site was inscribed as early as 1979 and extended in 2010, in order to cover both natural and cultural criteria. Dr. Rössler proceeded to talk about another case of extension: **Maloti-Drakensberg** shared property between South Africa and Lesotho, which is also one of the few transboundary mixed sites. Inscribed first in 2000 and extended in 2013, the park shows an exemplary initiative in terms of interpretation, as the creation of the visitor’s centre involved local communities’ especially in the interpretation of the site. She then discussed the case of **Lake Ohrid**, which was an early inscription of 1979 by Northern Macedonia and was extended to Albania in the last session of the World Heritage Committee (2019). This is a threatened mixed site, but it was not immediately put on the List in Danger as recommended by the Advisory Bodies (IUCN and ICOMOS), given the adjustments needed due to the recent involvement of Albania in the property management. She then called attention to the case of **Wadi Rum**, Jordan (2011). This site was inscribed by the World Heritage Committee despite the two separate recommendations of referral and deferral by IUCN and ICOMOS, respectively. She mentioned that she visited the site after the inscription and found out that none of the recommendations of the WH Committee were implemented, not even the inventory of rock art sites that are exposed to threats like mass tourism, which is of critical concern. She commented that it is necessary for State Parties to know and get the data before the inscription, so the WH Committee would not inscribe sites that are not ready.



*Dr. Mechtild Rössler, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, during the International Symposium.*

Dr. Rössler continued her presentation with the case of the **Rock Islands Southern Lagoon**, Palau (2012), which is a testimony of different stages of life and contains values beyond its biodiversity, as it is crucial for the identity of people. She highlighted the importance of working with communities if nominated sites are of critical importance for them, their identity, and their spiritual life. She also commented that there are many associative values found in nominations of mixed sites, including mountain areas such as **Mount Wuyi** in China (1997-2017). She mentioned that in the 1990s, UNESCO organized a seminar in Wakayama prefecture (Japan) on sacred mountains, where they discussed how many mountains in the world have associative values. This explains why several mixed sites are mountain areas, as it is the case of different types of associative values in **Blue and the John Crown Mountains** in Jamaica, where people have strong spiritual links to the natural environment. She then talked about the case of **Papahānaumokuākea** in Hawaii, USA (2010), a mixed site inscribed due to its marine environment and the native Hawaiian culture. She mentioned that Hawaii shows how different parameters of nomination can happen in the same area. While this site was recognized as mixed, the natural site of Hawaii Volcanoes was inscribed just for the geological values despite the association with the Hawaiian culture and belief system. She then commented about **Chiribiquete National Park**, Colombia, inscribed in 2018, which is one of the critical biodiversity sites of this country. This is a case of a protected area where the government worked for many years with Indigenous peoples who considered this site a sacred place. Dr. Rössler highlighted that the leadership of Indigenous peoples and local communities also led to the inscription of **Pimachiowin Aki**, Canada in 2018, after a referral and lengthy process of consultations.

Dr. Rössler then commented about the case of the World Heritage cultural landscape of **Pico Island in the Azores**, Portugal (2004), in which nomination she collaborated with the Portuguese government. She explained that the uniqueness of this vineyard landscape was based on the *viñás* surrounded by volcanic stone walls; however, the nomination underwent a series of reformulations after a mission with IUCN and ICOMOS until the requirements for the inscription in the World Heritage List were met. She then focused on the case of **Easter Island**, Chile (1995), which was initially considered as a mixed site but inscribed by evaluating only its cultural values. She reflected this on retrospective, as today such inscription would not be possible because the system was formalized differently.

Dr. Rössler remarked that since 2014, a document for the recognition of mixed sites was presented to

the World Heritage Committee, but there has not been much increase in the nomination of mixed sites. However, she mentioned that there had been a significant evolution in the preparation of nominations for mixed sites: Countries are working more closely between the cultural and the natural heritage sectors, Advisory Bodies (IUCN and ICOMOS) are interacting more on mixed sites through the Connecting Practice project, joint missions and Nature-Culture Journeys as shown by the IUCN Hawaii Congress and the ICOMOS Delhi General Assembly; and the recognition of the World Heritage Committee to the complexity of mixed nominations. She also commented that she has been discussing with the Advisory Bodies in the World Heritage Centre on upstream and on the changes in the nomination process. She believes that upstream is a great opportunity to identify the potential of mixed sites; early advice of potentials for mixed would be beneficial for State Parties but also in the review of Tentative Lists. She observed that at the national level, institutions could be encouraged to work more closely and to involve all stakeholders, including local communities, as they may hold the knowledge of these systems that may not be known by national authorities. Moreover, she strongly recommended working with local communities and Indigenous peoples, especially for the nomination of mixed sites. She asserted that integrated management plans and management systems in place are requirements for the nomination. In the future, she expects a joint resource manual on management of cultural and natural World Heritage with a strong component on how to manage mixed sites in terms of capacity building, presentation, and promotion of this heritage. Dr. Rössler finally said that mixed sites could also be an opportunity to present the genuine feature of the Convention, which covers both natural and cultural heritage.

Next, **Dr. Webber Ndoro, Director General of ICCROM**, presented “**Nature-Culture Linkages in World Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage in Africa.**” He first clarified that the focus of his presentation would be placed on the perspective of Africa and its diverse site-specific cultures and their links between culture and nature in general, rather than specifically related to World Heritage. He specified that the main focus was on the issues of governance and governmentality of cultural and natural heritage sites. He explained these starting with a historical perspective on the African context, elaborating on the emerging issues about values concerning World Heritage. He made a reflection on the African experience, especially on the implications for communities related to the identification of values and their involvement in management. Furthermore, he highlighted the place of communities in the framework given by the United Nations through the idea of wellbeing and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). To illustrate these ideas, he used two World Heritage sites: the mixed site Maloti-Drakensberg in South Africa and the cultural landscape of Matobo Hills in Zimbabwe.

Dr. Ndoro introduced the historical development of heritage management in Africa from pre-colonial times, where he locates a ‘traditional and customary heritage management.’ He commented that the conception of heritage management did not necessarily come with colonization, as there was cultural and natural heritage stewardship before. However, most sites were looked after from a religious point of view but also in an attempt to try and harness nature. As in the case of Mount Fuji, heritage management in Africa did not see a clear division between nature and culture or even religious heritage; there was a sense of wholeness, and many examples show this. He pointed out that, as addressed by the literature, the introduction of heritage management into the African continent brought a new administration, authorities, as well as the notions of national parks, protected areas, monuments, museums, and objects to be curated. These introductions happened after the Berlin Conference in 1884 and the division of the African continent among European empires. The idea in those days was to ‘save Africa from the Africans,’ and much of the protected heritage was not presented to the Africans but rather to foreign tourists. He stressed that some of these management systems had continued today, as shown by protected areas like Zulu and Kruger National Park, where animals were moved to certain areas in order to be protected, and barriers impede the inclusion of local communities into the management and the benefits from it. He called attention to the fact that most protected areas have cultural heritage, and this indicates the presence of people living in those areas. However, most natural heritage sites in Africa, Eastern, and Southern Africa particularly have no people living within.



*Dr. Webber Ndoro, Director General of ICCROM, presenting about Nature-Culture Linkages in World Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage in Africa.*

Dr. Ndoro highlighted the efforts of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and IUCN in order to move away from these approaches generated by a top-down scheme, trying to include much more effective and encompassing heritage management. He mentioned that since divisions between natural and cultural heritage in his continent are not clear, it is not always the case that what is referred to as a cultural site does not have any natural elements; they may not be of Universal Value, but their protection must be considered. To provide an example, he mentioned the case of South Africa, where almost all World Heritage sites are protected areas, and communities were left outside the national parks with no chance to benefit from them. He remarked that the situation is not the same in other African countries, as shown by **Ngorongoro Conservation Area** in Tanzania, which has a population living inside the protected area, although the challenge remains the same. He commented that issues like these and the concept of values need to be unpacked in Africa, as they also affect the management regimes and governance. He further reflected on the so-called 'Big Five,' which represents an attraction for tourists but not a concept most Africans identify with. He explained the origins of these protected areas, which were royal protected areas of the Zulu nations or King Chakra, with established taboos, rules and restrictions about animal hunting, and was preserved as a royal game. This situation changed with the introduction of guns as it increased the uncontrolled hunting, while a sense of protection of nature started to be promoted. More issues about the natural or cultural definition of a site can be evidenced by cases like the Victoria Falls, transboundary World Heritage property shared by Zimbabwe and Zambia, or the Zambezi River, which hold spiritual values for the communities around and are places for their ceremonies. Conversely, in some cases, natural phenomena are overlooked in cultural sites, as shown by **Robben Island**, World Heritage property in Cape Town, South Africa, which is mostly valued for having been the prison of Nelson Mandela. Nevertheless, it is also an important habitat for penguins.

Subsequently, Dr. Ndoro emphasized the issue of governance in heritage, which has various levels of non-uniform demands; the national level deals with political agendas, and then these have to be articulated with the local level and its demands. He stressed that the identification of values in these levels does not always coincide, as each can emphasize a different aspect. Although it differs from one country to another, he pointed out that different management systems are imposed on World Heritage sites by different government institutions with different mandates and priorities. He brought up the case of **Maloti-Drakensberg**, a transboundary World Heritage property, one of the best examples of effective

management in his opinion, but which also evidences some management issues. The governments of South Africa and Lesotho put in place systems for trans-frontier management; however, as the Drakensberg is largely understood as a natural site, there was no room for a cultural expert even though there is a relevant presence of rock art. He observed that the issue of identification of values is revealed here on the absence of cultural criteria, despite the well-known rock art; 'beauty is in the eyes of the beholders because we look at beauty from cultural lenses' - he said. He commented that it is necessary to discuss the recognition of rock art as universal in the World Heritage system, as in Africa, it is ubiquitous from Gabon to Mozambique. He pointed out that another contentious issue about rock art sites as heritage, particularly on the Drakensberg, is their function as sacred sites, which often lead to confrontations with science. Rock art sites are associated with the religion of the Zulus, and thus, it is a part of their living culture, while scientists tell that hunter-gatherers made rock art. Developing more on the same case, he then focused on the 'naming' as another issue of the dynamics of governance, where the local interests are sometimes sacrificed: As a tourism marketing tool, Maloti-Drakensberg changed its name from 'uKhahlamba-Drakensberg' to solely 'Drakensberg' after becoming a joint World Heritage, as the latter is well known worldwide. At the same time, uKhahlamba means the most religious place to the Zulus in their native language. Furthermore, he mentioned that the issue of governance here is multiple because of the number of institutions, structures, and perspectives involved. On the one side, in South Africa, the site is not governed by the Department of Environment as other World Heritage sites, but by the provincial authority of Ezemvelo, which looks after protected areas within the province. However, cultural values are not dealt with by Ezemvelo but instead by the provincial authority of Amafa. By culture, they do not mean sacred sites but only archaeological sites, including rock art sites. On the other side, in Lesotho, the protected area is governed by the Department of Environment, which is a national authority.

These governance structures reverberate on traditional practices of local communities. He commented that there is a notorious absence of considerations about the implications of the local community on the sacred site. If a ritual is to be performed at the rock art site, or in the river of this place, they have to consult the park manager who is in charge of monitoring the impacts. He reflected that issues like these need to be tackled in order to foster communication among government and local institutions. To add more to the complexity of this case, the provincial authority of Amafa in South Africa also has SAHRA, which is an overall umbrella body for sites nominated at the national level. The trans-frontier management system is trying to bring all together. However, these institutions are attached to different ministries and departments, and particularly for South Africa, it also involves a provincial authority. He commented that a similar case is represented by the **Matobo Hills cultural landscape** in Zimbabwe, where its conception as a national park overshadows the presence of rock art in the public perception. Paradoxically the site was nominated to the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape as its natural features could not justify the Outstanding Universal Value. The most sacred cave in Zimbabwe, related to the cult of the Shona God Mwari, is located outside of the national park but now is being incorporated into the park boundaries, as part of the World Heritage site. This means a series of constraints for the local communities that carry out ceremonies, as they would require the permission and supervision of the park manager who protects the natural heritage. As in the case of uKhahlamba-Drakensberg, there are various institutions involved in the Matobo Hills cultural landscape as well: National Museums of Zimbabwe look after the rock art sites, National Parks look after fauna and Forest reserves looks after vegetation. Dr. Ndoro emphasized that synergies and holistic management are difficult to ensure in these contexts as different mandates come from different legislations and governance structures.

Approaching the end of his presentation, Dr. Ndoro stressed the importance of considering the difference between the needs of local communities and what experts believe these needs are. There are particular structures and dynamics within the former that make a transparent negotiation necessary, as a heritage place for them must bring life, benefits, and cohesion. He pointed out that these encounters of views derive in a series of challenges. One of them is the issue of ceremonies and religious activities at heritage sites that are either mixed, cultural or natural, considering that the scientific community refuses to recognize the values of such practices for local communities. Another one is illustrated by areas of heritage values that are under agriculture, which management can include aspects of the agricultural practice. He remarked that ultimately, heritage sites might be looked at as places, as a resource for communities rather than just something to put on the World Heritage List. He pointed out that World Heritage listing is important, but it should be most beneficial for communities. He mentioned that it is important to look for more holistic

approaches to heritage management, as with the cultural landscape approach. He expressed the importance of making sure that nobody is left behind. Dr. Nodoro finally highlighted the need to engage communities and to overcome the centralization of decision-making on the government and the scientific community to ensure all the stakeholders see the benefits.

Subsequently, Mr. Takahiro Okano, Deputy Director of the Biodiversity Policy Division at the Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment of Japan, presented “**Toward the integrated management of nature and culture in Natural World Heritage sites.**” He talked first about the characteristics of Japan’s environment: the Japanese archipelago runs along North to South with a variety of ecosystems, from subtropical to subarctic. There are mountainous areas for over 3,000 meters in altitude, precipitations, and forested areas that cover two-thirds of the land. Because habitation started in ancient times and the population became relatively large in the modern era, the utilization of natural resources was meticulously planned, so the second nature and the natural environment were formed with human involvement. Mr. Okano mentioned that because of the confluence of three crustal plates in the national territory, there is a strong sense of awe and worship towards nature, which becomes intertwined with the Japanese religion, as shown by shrines, temples and sacred places throughout Japan. National Parks, nowadays inscribed as Natural World Heritage sites, have from the onset been highly valued for its secondary nature and cultural scenery, featuring temples and shrines, with a backdrop of Japanese nature and culture. Mr. Okano commented that Japan’s National Park system started in 1931. National Parks aimed at protecting outstanding landscapes, which were not limited to primitive nature, and promoting their utilization. In the aesthetic atmosphere of these landscapes, not only the visual scenery is considered, but also invisible objects and non-permanent things such as the cleanness of air and bird songs. When shrines, temples, churches, remains, settlements, agricultural forestry, fishery, grazing, events, folk songs, and festivals occur, these are considered cultural landscapes. Mr. Okano pointed out that there are many temples and sacred places located within National Parks: Itsukushima Shrine, Shrines and Temples of Nikko, Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range, and the Mount Fuji Sacred Place and Source of Artistic Inspiration are all World Heritage cultural properties which cover partly or wholly National Parks.

Mr. Okano talked about the zoning system, another characteristic of Japanese National Parks. Regardless of the land ownership, whether national, public, or private, outstanding landscapes are legally designated, under the development of the area, and are restricted. In addition to the core area, the surroundings are designated as the buffer zone, allowing a wide range of areas in National Parks: from pristine areas to secondary forests, agricultural lands and settled villages. He said that one advantage of the zoning system is that there is no need to acquire the land when designating National Parks; therefore, a wider area can be protected, and cultural landscapes can also be included. Furthermore, landowners and surrounding communities are necessarily considered. Mr. Okano stressed that strict natural conservation could be difficult with multiple stakeholders and layers of land management. However, conversely, it may also be an advantage for both environmental conservation, use, and overall park management. In any case, the understanding and cooperation of the local community are essential. He remarked that the cultural values of the designated sites and the mutual relationship with the local community must always be taken into consideration. This is why cultural elements are incorporated in the management plans of National Parks, and local livelihoods and traditions or folklore are included in the visitor’s center exhibitions. Mr. Okano introduced the case of Taketomi Island, which is part of the **Iriomote Ishigaki National Park**, known for its traditional houses and culture. Here, the visitor’s center received the name of ‘*Yugafu*,’ which in native Okinawan language means a divine blessing of a good harvest, as proposed by the people of the island. The center introduces nature through the lives of the peoples of the island, and the exhibits use the local native language instead of standard Japanese. Its management is in charge of an NPO (non-for-profit organization) established to preserve local culture, and they promote a series of activities conducted by local people, such as guided barefoot walk tours and workshops for handicrafts.





*Mr. Takahiro Okano, Ministry of the Environment of Japan, presenting about the integrated management of nature and culture in Natural World Heritage sites.*

Mr. Okano also commented that there are four Natural World Heritage sites in Japan. Although these can be considered the most pristine nature found in Japan, the utilization of their natural resources and their conservation as sacred lands are also part of their history. He mentioned the case of **Yakushima National Park**, inscribed in the World Heritage List in 1993 by meeting the criteria of natural beauty (vii) and ecosystem (ix). In the evaluation of criterion (vii) for natural beauty, the old Jomonsugi cider forest of several thousand years played a crucial role. As for the criterion (ix), the vertical vegetation distributed from subtropical to subarctic according to the elevation of the land was highly valued. Mr. Okano, however, mentioned that while these are the values from the perspective of the World Heritage Convention, these mountains have a different set of meanings to the local residents. The central mountainous area called 'Okudake,' which is not directly visible from the village, is an important sacred place where deities live according to the mountain worship that has long been part of local peoples' lives. Mr. Okano explained the tradition of 'Takemairi,' or mountain worship, where representatives of the village purify their bodies with the ocean river water, bring offerings from their sea and land productions to their first climb to 'Maetake' and then 'Okudake,' and pray to the God of the mountain called 'Ipponhojudaigongen.' Mr. Okano said that such local views of nature had maintained Yakushima's nature pristine over the years. He further pointed out that the engagement of the island's people with nature mutually influencing, forming, and acquiring a set of awareness and life production styles can be called environmental culture. Some projects utilize this environmental culture for the preservation of nature and the activation of tourism. He mentioned that in Yakushima, the concept of environmental culture was formulated in 1992, before its inscription on the World Natural Heritage List, and it divided the island into three zones reflecting the traditional views of nature and the utilization of resources, therefore influencing the conservation policy. Mr. Okano also informed about the ecotours for learning environmental culture in the village at the foot of the mountain. In the planning of this tour, the people of the island relearned their environmental culture and confirmed the sense of gratitude and awe towards nature. This initiative also aimed at dispersing the tourist visits and its economic effects on the villages rather than just to the Jomonsugi forest.

Mr. Okano stated that currently, the Japanese government is nominating Amami Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa island, and Iriomote island to be inscribed as a Natural World Heritage site. This area's biodiversity is considered as of Outstanding Universal Value from the lens of criterion (x); there are unique terrestrial species, many of them endemic due to the geographic and historical background

of being small remote islands. Although only 6.5% of the forest is pure primeval rainforest, it is assumed that the diversity of endemic species survived because of the environmental culture, which worships and respects nature, or the sustainable harvesting and utilization of nature coupled with the regenerative part of nature. These islands have a vibrant community that has carried on traditional rituals and supported the continuity of this tradition; therefore, passed on from generation to generation, the value of World Natural Heritage. This mutual interaction between nature and culture is essential and should be protected. Mr. Okano commented that they conducted a survey about environmental culture in two villages of Amami Oshima in 2013, part of the nominated area for the World Heritage site. This survey was based on the handbook by the Nature Conservation Society, which focuses on communities and nature. Local residents participated and collaborated with questionnaires, events, site surveys, and interviews, to elucidate how traditional agriculture and fishery utilized nature and how people's livelihoods engaged with nature. He mentioned they were able to confirm that local residents fostered ways to use natural resources, including endemic plants and animals, over a very long period of time, which shaped their awareness of nature and landscape, the ways they interact with nature and the culture and lifestyles handed over generation to generation. He also said there is a strong sense of sharing the resources of the village and the forest in the community, which avoids any kind of monopolization and has led to the sustainable use of nature. In addition, there was a strong sense of gratitude and awe towards nature and ritual sites, mountains, and pathways, where Deities reside; they were held in high regard, and there was a belief that a Deity who brings both blessings and disasters appeared between nature and culture. According to Mr. Okano, such an environmental culture allowed the survival of many rare and indigenous species; thus, the cooperation with local communities is crucial for gaining a more in-depth understanding to integrate this culture in the protection and management of the National Park.

Mr. Okano continued explaining that environmental culture can also be a source of tourism. He considers that having local guides showing nature through their local daily activities could be very appealing for tourists. In the nomination document, they set a 'peripheral management zone' around the nominated area and the buffer zone to manage and maintain the value of the site. He commented that in the candidate site, rules and restrictions would be implemented to minimize the impacts on the heritage values, such as the control of visitors to enable a more profound experience of nature. In the case of the peripheral management zone, tourism for sustainable local development and the continuation of culture, such as walks in the village, historical and local experiences of local goods, will be promoted with proper consideration to residents. Mr. Okano commented that they hope these initiatives to reduce the burden on the natural environment would provide a highly satisfying tourism experience. He asked himself 'what is World Heritage?', 'what is the value of World Heritage to local residents?' For him, these are questions that managers always have to consider. He finally mentioned that in Japan, management plans are elaborated with the synergies of the scientific committee and the communication coordination committee in order to include not only the scientific values but also the cultural values or the natural values of the local community.

After this presentation, **Dr. Kumiko Shimotsuma, Chief of the Cultural Landscape Unit at the Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan**, presented "**Cultural Landscapes as an approach to local development.**" She introduced herself and commented that her presentation would center on the need for integration among cultural properties and the potential solutions provided by cultural landscapes, considering her experience in the protection of groups of traditional buildings and cultural landscapes in the Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan. In her presentation, she also aimed at showing how this issue can be tackled with the integration of culture and nature. She explained that the Japanese law for the protection of cultural properties entails the classification of six types of cultural properties: tangible cultural property, intangible cultural property, folk cultural property, monuments, cultural landscapes, and groups of traditional buildings. In addition, 'tangible cultural properties' are divided into buildings, crafts and arts; 'folk cultural properties' are divided into tangible and intangible; and 'monuments' include ancient sites, places of scenic beauty and natural monuments, the latter covering minerals, geology and also flora and fauna. Over the last two decades, they faced the challenges of integrating local communities, as it was necessary to manage cultural properties with multiple designations, to enhance the use of cultural properties for better development of local communities, and to involve more people in heritage conservation in the face of depopulation. She talked about Nijo castle in Kyoto as a representative example of multiple designations: the area is a special historic site; however, a garden is a special place of scenic beauty, the building is an important cultural property, and national treasure, the paintings in sliding doors inside the building are arts and crafts, and the sliding doors

themselves are also important cultural properties and national treasures. In cases like this, legal procedures become complicated for the owners, and explanations to visitors are fragmented.

Dr. Shimotsuma stressed that the methods for the protection of cultural properties could vary according to their values. While in the case of World Heritage, the attributes to be evaluated in a nominated property are defined in the Operational Guidelines, in the Japanese classification, the protection may show some particularities. She said that in case of the restoration of buildings that are tangible cultural properties and buildings that constitute historic sites, both give priority to the shape, design, materials, and quality of materials. However, they considerably differ in terms of location and settings. In the case of tangible cultural property, since the traditional technology shown by the components and joints are the foundations of values, when it becomes challenging to conserve it in the same location, the property can be dismantled and transferred to a different place as long as there is a license to change its status quo. However, it is not the same with historical sites, as their relationship with the history of the area is important; their values can be lost if they are dismantled and transferred to a different place. Dr. Shimotsuma also compared the houses that are tangible cultural properties with those that are folk cultural properties: the former is restored to the original form that best shows the building's most salient features; while the latter does not allow restorations because the conditions resulting from the continuous use by people are considered important. When considering such classification is very important to develop methods for protection according to the values.



*Dr. Kumiko Shimotsuma, Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan, presenting about the cultural landscapes as an approach to local development.*

Dr. Shimotsuma remarked that academicians did not establish the concept of classification; it was developed with a social background requiring heritage protection during the modernization and introduction of Western Culture in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century Japan. Dr. Shimotsuma explained that heritage protection emerged in this context in response to the loss of antiquities, the destruction of temples, and the threats to historical places and places of natural scenic beauty posed by the construction of railroads and roads. She commented that the first law for the protection of historical sites, places of scenic beauty and natural monuments was enforced in 1919. Due to an economic recession that happened in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the legal framework expanded the category of tangible cultural property from temples and shrines to modern houses. In 1950, after the Second World War, the previous legislation advances were unified into the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties. It first considered tangible cultural properties, then monuments and sites, and then intangible cultural properties. By 1975, the category of folk cultural property included traditional buildings,

villages, and townscapes, as people's values became more diversified amid the rapid development of urban areas, depopulation of rural areas, and developments on transportation and communication. Dr. Shimotsuma added that, as depopulation and aging are the major contemporary social problems in Japan, farming and fishing communities, as well as landscapes of primeval scenes of Japan, were left in a vulnerable condition. These issues were attempted to be solved by the creation of the category of cultural landscapes in 2004. She stressed that, compared to those of World Heritage, the Japanese cultural landscapes are based on historical background, and their scope is limited to continuous landscapes that have evolved organically. She explained that groups of traditional buildings and folk cultural properties were introduced in 1975 in response to a social trend that gave priority to spiritual, rather than material, fulfillment in the context of Japanese economic growth. These reactions of the public arose within a need to counterbalance the destructions and transformations caused by the large-scale development. Dr. Shimotsuma mentioned that in the last three decades, the depopulation and the reduction of people involved in the conservation of cultural properties prompted a revision of the methods for the protection of cultural properties.

Dr. Shimotsuma further talked about the future of the protection and administration of cultural properties. She mentioned that cultural properties mean that values are perceived; they can be recognized through a survey, objectively evaluated through comparison, designated through a screening process, and finally, few of them become subjects of protection. Despite the multiple valuations resulting from individuals or communities, this is a process where only a few become designated as the use of taxpayers' money needs to be justified with objective reasons. Dr. Shimotsuma said that although this is the current method, it should not be taken for granted. People involved in the protection of cultural properties should not identify only limited values and forget the values of the local community. She pointed out that the need for the protection of cultural properties in Japan is changing, but there is also an underlying problem of integration. She placed the questions: 'how to remove the negative effect of sectionalism of cultural properties with multiple designations?', 'how to successfully protect cultural properties with the surrounding environment?'; and 'how to link the varieties of cultural properties of the region?'. She commented that now local features are evaluated, and cultural properties are reevaluated in the regional scale through the lens of cultural landscapes. She brought up the case of the farming and fishing village of Kakehama, which is designated as an important cultural property by the government and is known because of the production of mandarin orange. Although there are no cultural properties designated by the national government in this area, it was declared an important cultural landscape as the limited number of other cultural properties comprehensively represent the local livelihood. Here, the beautiful landscape and environment are a result of a corporate strategy where the region is autonomously in charge of food, energy, and welfare, and a company fully manages the organic cultivation since 1970. Dr. Shimotsuma also showed the case of the Tsuji irrigation water system and rice terraces of Shiraito highlands, where a bridge of the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century is located. The irrigation system was designated as an important cultural property since the 1960s as it represented the local technology. However, problems of conservation arose after this designation as local farmers assumed the bridge could not be touched and stopped managing the area. After a revision of the management plan with the residents, their practices were also included as part of the essential cultural landscape. These local management and conservation methods proved to be crucial in the recovery of the area following the 2016 earthquake.

Dr. Shimotsuma commented that the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties was revised in 2018, and the revisions enforced a year after. She mentioned that one of the revisions contemplated that municipalities are now compelled to formulate a plan for the conservation and use of cultural properties. When cultural properties are listed, their management projects might motivate the involvement of organizations that can contribute to the conservation and use of the cultural property and the engagement of the local community. Dr. Shimotsuma stressed that the integration of heritage is an ideal that generates unanimous agreement, but its purpose requires reflection before making any plan. She asked herself, 'what is the purpose of integration, and what kind of social objectives should be made?' She expressed that the need for integration itself is changing alongside the changes in the era. If the integration of culture and nature, and securing integration of categories in cultural properties, are acknowledged on the challenges and objectives, this may lead to a good administration. Dr. Shimotsuma reflected that ultimately, the objective is to achieve the common interest of local residents and government, as well as the common interest among the relevant organizations of the government.

## PANEL DISCUSSION

Dr. Maya Ishizawa invited Professor Yoshida to chair the Panel Discussion. Professor Yoshida discussed the presentations of Dr. Rössler, Dr. Ndoro, Mr. Okano, and Ms. Shimotsuma. He first commented that under the World Heritage Convention, mixed heritage requires meeting at least one natural and one cultural criterion. However, there is no consideration of nature and culture interrelations. However, there is a category of cultural heritage that relates to ‘combined works of nature and man,’ but this applies only for cultural or mixed heritage, and not for natural heritage. He then reminded the Recommendation concerning the protection at the national level of cultural and natural heritage, which was adopted in the same General Assembly of UNESCO in 1972. In this recommendation, ‘combined works of nature and man,’ or nature and people, are both placed in natural and cultural heritage. In that sense, at the national level, there is no division between nature and culture. Based on these considerations, he formulated the question, how can we increase the number of Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage on the World Heritage List? Moreover, how can we improve the procedures of mixed heritage nominations? Professor Yoshida mentioned that some suggestions were made by the presentations of Dr. Rössler and Dr. Ndoro. He reflected that Mount Fuji could be thought already as a mixed site, considering that its protection as heritage at the national level integrates the National Parks system and the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties. Another question would be, how can we integrate natural and cultural values or elements in a domestic management plan, either at a national or a regional level? He remarked that Mr. Okano and Dr. Shimotsuma gave some suggestions.



*Professor Masahito Yoshida, UNESCO Chairholder on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation, University of Tsukuba, chairing the Panel Discussion.*

After the lunch break, Dr. Maya Ishizawa, coordinator of the UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation, University of Tsukuba, presented ‘Exploring Nature-Culture Linkages in Asia and the Pacific through Capacity Building: the CBWNCL Project 2016-2019’. Dr. Ishizawa first mentioned that the UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation was established at the University of Tsukuba, Japan, as part of a larger movement of heritage practitioners working on the exchange between nature and culture sectors in the context of the implementation of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. The UNESCO Chair was established with the collaboration of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS, which are the secretariat, and the advisory bodies to the World Heritage Convention. She stressed that their comprehensive approach to conservation looks for overcoming the division between nature and culture and implies a strong focus on rural areas where linkages between cultural and natural values can be identified in cultural landscapes. She explained that the objectives of these workshops were to contribute to the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy in developing new approaches towards integrated

conservation of cultural and natural heritage, to build capacities in theory and practice of conservation and management of landscapes, while exploring nature and culture linkages with heritage practitioners from Asia and the Pacific, from both nature and culture sectors, as well as with the post-graduate students of the University of Tsukuba. Dr. Ishizawa mentioned that the landscape approach was used in these experimental workshops. At the same time, the main core activities focused on visiting Japanese sites to look at the implementation and management of the conservation systems, by approaching local managers and communities and learn from the Japanese conservation system. She expressed that this series of workshops also aimed at creating networks among natural and cultural heritage practitioners, and among people from the region of Asia and the Pacific. However, it was also open to participants from other regions. She said that this programme was possible because the World Heritage Studies Programme of the University of Tsukuba has both faculty dedicated to natural and cultural heritage, and because this programme has a partnership with the Department of Life and Environmental Sciences with whom the Certificate Programme on Nature Conservation was created. Moreover, she mentioned that the Japanese conservation system is exemplary as it contains nature and culture interlinkages already in the designations of places of scenic beauty, cultural landscapes, satoyama, and National Parks.

Dr. Ishizawa continued explaining that this program started with four main questions: 1) How to adapt the nature-culture approach to international and national legislation?; 2) What are the skills required for heritage practitioners under this approach?; 3) How should this approach be applied in the protection, management, and conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites?; 4) How to develop a didactic curriculum for the training of heritage practitioners in this new approach? She commented that they created a curriculum composed of four modules: Module 1: 'Understanding Nature-Culture linkages' where theory and concepts were explored, as well as case studies from the participants of the workshops; Module 2: 'Management, implementation, and governance,' which consisted on the practical experience with a field trip to Japanese heritage sites; Module 3: 'Reflection on theory and practice,' where all lessons learned from the lectures and the field visits were distilled, and recommendations were elaborated, with ideas for applying a nature-culture approach in the Japanese heritage sites, and in the participants own sites. Finally, Module 4 corresponds to the International Symposium, where the organizers have invited renowned international and Japanese experts to share their experiences and contributions to linking nature and culture in their work.

Dr. Ishizawa further introduced the four themes selected for this first series of experimental workshops: Agricultural Landscapes in 2016, Sacred Landscapes in 2017, Disasters and Resilience in 2018, and Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage in 2019. She also mentioned the sites visited in Japan during the field trips: Shirakawa-go and Gokayama, and Noto peninsula in the first workshop, the Kii Mountains in the second workshop, Tohoku region in the third workshop and Mount Fuji in the fourth and last workshop. The focus in these areas was satoyama and satoumi systems, National Parks, and the interlinkages of nature and culture in historical sites, temples, places of scenic beauty, and natural monuments. She pointed out that after every workshop, they published the proceedings in a special issue of the Journal of World Heritage Studies of the University of Tsukuba, where they reported the outcomes of the workshop and the case studies of the participants.

Following in her presentation, Dr. Ishizawa commented about the perception of the problems of depopulation and aging population in rural areas where the interlinkages of nature and culture exist. She said that in these workshops, they tried to create a community of heritage practice of nature and culture. Participants represented different stakeholders, from academics to representatives of government agencies, international organizations, grassroots, or local-level heritage management, and these multiple perspectives enriched the discussion on how to bring together nature and culture for the better management of heritage sites. Dr. Ishizawa said that the results of the people trained in these four years reveal an equal number of participants from nature and culture sectors, and participation from not only Asia and the Pacific, but also Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean, North America and Europe. She further presented the numbers: 50 heritage practitioners representing 18 different countries from Asia and the Pacific, eight practitioners from other regions, who shared their work on 29 World Heritage sites, eight sites in Tentative Lists, 12 sites protected under national legislation and nine sites protected under other types of systems. From the University of Tsukuba, 20 students from 13 different countries participated as observers.



*Dr. Maya Ishizawa, coordinator, UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation, University of Tsukuba, opening the session focused on Key Issues on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation: Progress and Challenges.*

Dr. Ishizawa remarked some of the lessons learned from these years: First, that the separation lies at institutional levels, as the community level shows a holistic vision that includes times, seasonality, and their practices. Second, the links between nature-culture are people and their practices, where there is a strong role of local leaders; the conservation of nature and culture is grounded in everyday life, and sometimes, cultural practices and nature conservation do not go well together as in the case of pilgrimage and over-tourism. Third, Indigenous and local knowledge, traditional knowledge, and community-based conservation systems are fundamental for sustainability and the integrative understanding of heritage. Fourth, the landscape approach is important for both natural and cultural heritage practitioners as it helps to identify and analyze the interrelations of values. Fifth, interdisciplinary work is essential to think about heritage conservation, and sustainable development, based on the exchange between heritage practitioners, managers, and locals as all of them are related to the management of a heritage site. Finally, the exchange between professionals and students framed in a university benefits the disciplinary and cultural diversity but also brings a constrain because of the language of different countries, disciplines, and roles, and therefore the need to share some concepts and terms is evident. She added a reflection on a fragment of a report from a student of the university that summarizes well the fundamental interlinkage between nature and culture:

*'In some tribes of DRC Congo, the use of cola acuminata nuts for traditional weddings as a symbol of hospitality gives cultural importance to this tree; in case the tree is in danger, it would mean for those tribes that their culture is in danger as well. The tree is at the same time an element of nature and culture, and villagers do not really make a difference; their culture has been shaped by that natural element' (from the report of CBWNCL 2018 by Yllah Okin).*

Dr. Ishizawa presented some conclusions related to the first questions mentioned before. First, she mentioned that international and national systems could not be changed easily; therefore, it is necessary to work at the local level and site level. Second, that since these nature-culture emerges from the local understanding, trained natural and cultural heritage practitioners can be facilitators in site management; and therefore, instead of creating a curriculum, a facilitation guide to help practitioners to develop this role would be more appropriate. Third, a nature-culture based conservation is people-centered and transdisciplinary. It relates to seasonality, time, and cycles and emerges from the local, requiring a territorial and ecosystems perspective that integrates the Indigenous, traditional, and local knowledge. It also calls for the reinforcement of local-based management and local leadership, investing in resilience, and developing

a comprehensive approach to vulnerability and risk preparedness. Moreover, she highlighted the need for an integration of bottom-up and top-down approaches and to develop a base for intersectoral cooperation. Furthermore, she said that this approach needs to be integrated at the policy level in order to allow these heritage sites to be managed more effectively. Dr. Ishizawa added that an interdisciplinary network is being created in this process in order to foster exchange and mutual learning and introduced some of the initiatives of former participants that are multiplying the experience they had in Japan.

Dr. Ishizawa finally added the next steps, as this is the last workshop of a series of four. She commented that an evaluation phase and the creation of a connecting platform of former participants and students would be on the agenda of next year, besides the publication of the special issue on the Journal of World Heritage Studies with the case studies of the participants of this year. This ultimately may lead to the creation of the facilitation guide or an instrument that can help practitioners to continue their work at local or national levels. She said next year is an important one because of the IUCN World Conservation Congress and ICOMOS General Assembly and Scientific Symposium, where Nature/Culture and Culture/Nature Journeys will happen, and they hope their results can be shared if they participate and hold sessions there.

After her presentation, Dr. Ishizawa invited Professor Nobuko Inaba, from the World Heritage Studies Program. Professor Inaba was in charge of chairing the panel discussion with partner institutions titled 'Key issues on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation: Progress and Challenges.' Professor Inaba first introduced herself and commented that the 4-year program of Capacity Building Workshops on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation was a plan approved by the UNESCO Chair system. She continued explaining that what follows is a year of reflection on the outcomes and balances, intending to make these experiences on nature-culture linkages into a contribution to the works of the international arena. She reflected on the questions: What is the role of universities in the future? Moreover, how can we work with other international organizations and institutes? These aspects were going to be discussed together with representatives of partner institutions that are also Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee: Tim Badman from IUCN, Kristal Buckley from ICOMOS, and Gamini Wijesuriya from ICCROM. In an attempt to locate the activities of the UNESCO Chair at the University of Tsukuba within their system, Professor Inaba requested the representatives to comment on the ways the Capacity Building Workshops on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation contributes to their work, as well as to provide their observations. She further asked them to share their current activities as well as the personal and institutional projects framed in the international nature-culture linkage initiatives.



*Professor Nobuko Inaba, University of Tsukuba, chairing the session on Key Issues on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation: Progress and Challenges*



Mr. Tim Badman, Director of IUCN Nature-Culture Initiative, first thanked the University of Tsukuba and the organizers of the workshop on behalf of IUCN. He commended the efforts for the four-year cycle of workshops, for engaging international organizations represented by IUCN, ICOMOS, and ICCROM, with heritage practitioners from diverse backgrounds and experiences on the field, and students from the University. In response to Professor Inaba's question, Mr. Badman mentioned that the way to help is to continue making these connections. According to him, the workshops were able to transmit and discuss the global concepts on nature and culture among practitioners from Asia and other regions. He remarked the importance of tackling the problem of the lack of connection between the global and the local system, by including the diverse understanding by countries, societies and communities from the ground. He reflected on the importance of working on the interconnectedness, following the example of Pimachiowin Aki that became a significant catalyst for a better connection between nature and culture, and between Indigenous perspectives and the World Heritage system in recent years. Mr. Badman referred to all of these efforts as momentum. He called attention to continue the role of the University of Tsukuba in contributing to these initiatives, as universities are capable of achievements that Advisory Bodies and UN organizations are not.

Ms. Kristal Buckley, Lecturer at Deakin University and ICOMOS World Heritage Advisor, also first thanked the organizers and sent greetings from the President of ICOMOS International, Professor Toshiyuki Kono, and the International Secretariat in Paris. She commented that it was a privilege to be involved in the programme and asked the organizers not to stop their initiatives there. She mentioned that it is essential to mark how far the shared agenda has come over four years and how these workshops have contributed and built from that progress. She commended the efforts for integrating different places, ways, people, and programmes. From her point of view and ICOMOS, some of the strong elements of the programme are the focus on emerging professionals and scholars, and the platforms for learning and echoing voices from colleagues, site managers and local communities in the field. She recognizes a catalyst on what they have done together by learning in place and from a place, as they have not only been in a classroom but meeting people, listening, experiencing, using their bodies and senses entirely to appreciate what was needed to learn. She highlighted the learning experiences through networking, bonding, and encountering each other in different opportunities, but also the lessons learned from Japan. Moreover, she stressed that Japan's unusual, remarkable, and inspiring system and experiences are sources for learning. Ms. Buckley also mentioned the work that ICOMOS is involved with, such as the Connecting Practice Project, which has some resonance with these workshops.

Dr. Gamini Wijesuriya, a Special advisor for the Director-General of ICCROM, thanked the organizers for their work and for inviting him to participate and help on the design of the four workshops. He commented that he met Professor Inaba for the first time at a meeting where the topic of nature and culture was addressed. He mentioned that in his keynote speech at the meeting of sacred mountains in Wakayama, he had a long-term expectation of overcoming the division of nature and culture in future generations of heritage practitioners. He also aimed for new generations to bridge the gap created by the misconception that nature and culture were divided because of the implementation of the World Heritage system. Dr. Wijesuriya further added that these concerns about the division of nature and culture were already present in 2001 and 2002 when he made a joint contribution with Dr. Rössler on a chapter about culture for the Millenium Ecosystems Assessment, a publication mainly oriented for the nature sector. He said that when he entered ICCROM in 2005, another element that was ignored in the main international heritage discourse was the communities or people. In his first years in ICCROM, he worked with Dr. Nodoro in a programme focused on communities in Africa, and with Professor Inaba and Dr. Shimotsuma in the living heritage sites programme.

Dr. Wijesuriya pointed out that since 2011, as part of the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, they worked collectively with people from nature and culture sectors and fostered the exchange of ideas between them. He added that in 2013, they started developing this curriculum on the theme of linking nature and culture, being the first time for ICCROM to organize this, and the University of Tsukuba then took the initiative to implement it. He remarked that programmes like this one are needed. This is because it is important to bring heritage practitioners from both nature and culture sectors to address issues of cultural landscapes, communities, people-centered approaches, the use of traditional knowledge systems, and to reflect on case studies from Japan and Asia. He also said that from the current themes on Agricultural Landscapes, Sacred Landscapes, Disasters and Resilience, and Mixed Cultural and Natural Heritage, perhaps the latter stressed more the promotion of nature-culture linkages. In conclusion, he highlighted that

the issue of interlinkages is not about World Heritage, but about people, understanding their creations and holistic management. He reflected that what can be done is to understand these aspects and try to incorporate them in the perspective of management.

Professor Inaba thanked the panelists for their comments and asked them to talk about their current and future projects.



*Dr. Gamini Wijesuriya (ICCROM/WHITRAP), Ms. Kristal Buckley (ICOMOS/Deakin University), and Mr. Tim Badman (IUCN) taking part of the session on Key Issues on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation: Progress and Challenges.*

Mr. Tim Badman expressed that the collaborative programs among IUCN, ICOMOS, and ICCROM are recent, and two of them are the Connecting Practice developed by ICOMOS and IUCN, and the World Heritage Leadership Programme by ICCROM and IUCN in partnership with Norway, Switzerland, and Korea. He commented they are working on a Knowledge Framework that they would like many partners to use and join, as well as the IUCN Nature-Culture Initiative, where they are seeking to overcome the limitation and fragmentation in the understanding of culture in the nature conservation sector. He mentioned that the World Heritage Leadership Programme aims to be a place where people can build links and empower others to act, just in the same way as the initiative of the University of Tsukuba. He said that the University of Tsukuba in the future could be actively a part of the World Heritage Leadership Programme, concretely networking participants, both practitioners and across the university sector. Mr. Badman further added that it is important to translate out the work and lessons learned in these spaces to the administration of the national and subnational levels. While they have been learning from the leadership and inspiration that comes from Japan, there are also challenges and issues at the international level that need to be addressed. Mr. Badman pointed out there are two other spaces to mention: the forthcoming Nature-Culture Journey and Culture-Nature Journey to be held during the IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020 and the ICOMOS General Assembly in October 2020.

Mr. Badman further indicated that two other events not necessarily related to World Heritage and nature conservation provide a broader picture of how nature and culture linkages started to become the primary concern. First, the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) produced a global scientific assessment responding to major challenges and threats for natural places, the Aichi targets, and the Sustainable Development Goals. According to Mr. Badman, the report by IPBES speaks about

the transformative change to place-based approaches that are integrative, informed and inclusive, giving importance to the diversity of what a 'good life' involves: values, people's values in taking action, justice, inclusion, education, and knowledge. He stated that culture is central to any diagnosis of the challenges and solutions in nature conservation. Second, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is promoting natural and cultural places in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework towards the 2020 UN Biodiversity Conference in Kunming, China. Mr. Badman mentioned that they expect a culture-nature summit at that event. Moreover, they are working towards the integration of UNESCO, the Convention of Biological Diversity Secretariat, the IUCN, and other international organizations into more extensive international plans of nature conservation. These plans will support the connections of nature and culture, and the solutions needed to scale up with some urgency (International Alliance for Nature and Culture). Mr. Badman stressed this might be an opportunity of much bigger partnerships where ICOMOS, ICCROM, and representatives of the Ministry of the Environment could directly participate.

**Ms. Kristal Buckley** stressed that ICOMOS as an organization has more to do than just World Heritage, as it has a comprehensive programme. She expressed that the World Heritage system gives a platform to develop inspiring initiatives, but change can be slow. She said that change certainly does not emerge from inaction and complain, but from self-change; otherwise, we would still be part of the problem. Regarding this, she commented that the Connecting Practice Project originated following such idea, as an initiative from representatives of advisory bodies to provide a space to think, experiment, make mistakes, and learn from the place and colleagues, and much similar to the work of the UNESCO Chair at the University of Tsukuba. She said that the Connecting Practice Project is now on a third phase, where they started to work with a greater diversity of partner organizations, such as FAO's GIAHS, and to focus on terminology such as resilience. She further remarked that ICOMOS is looking at growing a family, not just numerically to get more people in, but also on the diversity and collaborative dimensions, ensuring many other voices inform the directions of the organization. Ms. Buckley added they are working much more with Intangible Cultural Heritage and rights-based approaches, which just thrived from the nature-culture issues to find new ways to achieve multiple outcomes. In conclusion, she stated that even though we live in an imperfect and rapidly changing world, individuals and organizations can be prepared on approaches, mindsets, and practices. She pointed out that a perfect World Heritage system would have to acknowledge that the collection of cultural landscapes and mixed heritage is far too small. In the face of this, more creative and courageous reflection is required.

**Dr. Gamini Wijesuriya** commented that World Heritage-related activities are just a small portion of ICCROM's programs. He pointed out that while working in the field in the global picture, heritage and people need to be looked differently as this is the first time that there are people representing other worlds and lands, as well as informing the vision of the new Director-General. A focus on Sustainable Development is placed entirely in the strategic directions of the organization which have been established in such a way to work for people. Dr. Wijesuriya said that Dr. Ndoro, the Director-General of ICCROM, would explain more details.

Professor Inaba thanked the panelists and reflected on current collaborative initiatives. She expressed that institutional synergies are necessary and that she is learning from them. She invited the attendees to join the general discussions of the session after the coffee break.

#### ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

**Professor Inaba** invited the roundtable guests to join the general discussion. She first introduced three questions that would address important discussion points. The first one was about the fragmentation or separation between nature and culture, its origins, consequences, and expressions, as this is evidenced in areas of expertise, heritage conservation, and institutions at the national and international levels, but not necessarily in local settings. The second one was how these issues can be tackled, and who might be the target groups and what would be the methodology if the contribution comes from capacity building programmes such as the one of the University of Tsukuba. The third question would be if the number of mixed heritage sites should be included in cultural landscape projects, considering that before 1992 the natural heritage also had cultural values in the World Heritage criteria. Professor Inaba invited Ms. Sophia Rabliauskas to comment on her experience in working with local communities and adapting to the World

Heritage system in the nomination of Pimachiowin Aki.

Ms. Sophia Rabliauskas, a representative of Pimachiowin Aki Corporation, thanked the invitation to speak about her experience in working with their communities in the nomination of Pimachiowin Aki. She first commented that they opted for the designation as a mixed heritage site based on their intention to have the area recognized for both its cultural and natural values, and their culture that believes these two aspects are inseparable. This project was decided on for the generations to come, in agreement with the community's beliefs about taking care of the land as a sacred responsibility, and their intentions to continue their millenary traditions adapted to modern ways. Many community members had not heard of World Heritage when the works for the nomination started and, therefore, it was necessary to assume that the time and process until the fulfillment could be lengthy because of their understandings of the world and the mechanisms involved in this initiative. The communities joined and committed to protect the traditional territories in the vast area of boreal forests where they live in isolation and to preserve them from any development. One of their main goals was to seek support and recognition of their network of protected areas in the form of UNESCO World Heritage site listing. She said this would give them a unique international opportunity to demonstrate the value of the traditional knowledge of First Nations in protecting and caring for the land, and open venues to work with other First Nations and countries. She mentioned the starting point was the IUCN's call for proposals for potential World Heritage sites within the boreal forest. They invited other First Nations who live around the area, speak the same language and have the same values and beliefs, and developed a proposal. However, considering that, at the same time, the provincial governments of Manitoba and Ontario were preparing their proposal for the provincial parks, and these were partially in the communities' traditional territory, they managed to reach an agreement to submit a joint single preliminary proposal for a natural and cultural site. In 2004, with the release of the Report of the 2003 IUCN workshop in Saint Petersburg, Russia, and the Saint Petersburg Declaration, they supported the Manitoba declaration on the First Nation's nomination for the World Heritage. In April of the same year, the Canada Ministry of Environment endorsed the First Nations' nomination for the World Heritage by including it on Canada's Tentative List.

Ms. Rabliauskas said this partnership between the government and First Nations was a crucial point in their work, and they were fortunate to receive funding from the Province of Manitoba to complete the project. She explained the nominated area was conceived as a cultural and natural site, integrating traditional territories from five First Nations and two provincial parks. She further mentioned that they have a board in their Pimachiowin Aki Corporation representing each of their communities, and the structure allows all partners to have a say. She explained that Parks Canada advised their nomination bid. Consequently, they considered that Pimachiowin Aki qualified as a World Heritage living cultural landscape, as it encompasses fully the tangible and intangible elements of the living Anishinaabe cultural landscape that is resilient but vulnerable to irreversible changes.

Ms. Rabliauskas also talked about the difficulties in understanding some concepts of the documents of the World Heritage nomination due to language issues and conceptual barriers. She explained that they translated these documents for the communities and that the elders had a pivotal role in giving guidance and direction to the project. She remarked that one of the terms that demanded more time to understand was 'Outstanding Universal Value' and to explain the 'special' about the area they were trying to nominate. She commented that defining what was 'exceptional' for them in comparison to other Indigenous groups was problematic as they do not conceive themselves as being better than other people. They had to change the wordings to define Pimachiowin Aki as exceptional because of what it has to offer and has been done and recognized, that is, the pristine boreal forest and the healthy ecosystem cared for thousands of years by the people that lived there. These evidenced the challenges of translations of the wording, but also reminded how different their worldview was from the World Heritage system. Ms. Rabliauskas said that they look at the world holistically: everything is interconnected, everything has a purpose in life, and the sacred place they call home is a gift from the Creator. Moreover, she mentioned that Pimachiowin Aki translates as 'the land that gives life,' therefore the land is the origin, it covers from animals to trees, and everything is a living thing according to their cosmovision. For them, the land is also sacred, essential to their lives, and they would not survive as a community without it. Because of these conceptions, the communities kept in mind that while doing the nomination work, they would not separate nature and culture.



*Ms. Sophia Rabliauskas, Pimachiowin Aki Corporation, commenting in the Roundtable.*

Ms. Rabliauskas continued commenting about the discordances they experienced with the national and international levels in their efforts for the protection and recognition of their land. The government had conflicting views towards the space, as the traditional territory of the communities is seen as prime land and, therefore, as a ground for extractive or infrastructure projects. She stressed that they had to conduct scientific studies in order to prove their occupation there long before any treaties and the continuity of their cultural tradition of Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan. According to her, Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan, or ‘way of life,’ represents for them what in other languages can be referred to as culture; it has more meaning and makes more sense in their language. She then focused on their nomination package that was completed and delivered to the World Heritage Committee in 2012. They hosted a three-day visit to their territory by IUCN and ICOMOS evaluators. To foster a mutual understanding of the community’s history and values, the nomination project, and its consequences, the elders took part in the process. They expressed their hopes and dreams for the World Heritage designation. During the visit, there were misunderstandings between the communities and the evaluators. This derived in the deferral of their first nomination. She expressed they understood that more information was needed as the report they received evidenced a considerable degree of misunderstanding and misinterpretation of their cultural identity. However, the ICOMOS report did consider that First Nations do not want to see their property as exceptional or make judgments about this relationship. The nomination was presented again, but this time it was supported by more work and research. However, the result was a referral. The communities did not understand the reasons behind this decision. Determining the continuity of their project was challenging. This was because some partners proposed to just proceed with a nomination as a natural site, even though they thought there was a mutual understanding already about Pimachiowin Aki as a mixed site based on their beliefs and values of nature and culture being inseparable.

**Professor Inaba** thanked Ms. Sophia Rabliauskas for her intervention. She pointed out that ‘outstanding’ and ‘exceptional’ are also tricky words for them in Japan, and she said that particularly for her, it does not mean better nor worse from others.

**Dr. Mechtild Rössler** also thanked Ms. Rabliauskas for sharing her perspective. She observed that several points are crucial. One of them, as confirmed by Ms. Rabliauskas, is the recurrence of the complexity of the translation of some terms. She commented from her experience how the word ‘cultural landscape’ does not exist in many cultures. When she was working in Iran, during a debate about cultural landscapes, the interpretation from Farsi was ‘Panorama,’ which, to her, is not the meaning of cultural landscapes, as it is understood in the World Heritage context. The other point was, as mentioned by Professor Inaba, the complexity of understanding Outstanding Universal Value as a linkage between the local and the universal. She stressed that in the case of Pimachiowin Aki, there is an exceptional linkage of over thousands of years

between people and their land. However, the local understanding does not see this exceptionality in the global comparison.

**Professor Inaba** thanked their efforts and patience. She mentioned the World Heritage system is a catalyst and stressed that without the inscription of Pimachiowin Aki, we would not further hear or learn from their experience. She then gave the floor to the Japanese experts: Dr. Shimotsuma and Mr. Okano, representatives of agencies working as an interface between the international and local levels.

**Dr. Kumiko Shimotsuma** first observed that there is a complexity in understanding terms like ‘outstanding’ and ‘exceptional.’ She said that in the Japanese conservation system, the concepts of ‘designation’ and ‘selection’ are used. The first contemplates heritage elements considered of high significance and in need of preservation, without necessarily having the agreement of the owner. The second refers to heritage elements valued and managed locally, which can also be considered significant at the national level, involving villages, protected districts, and cultural landscapes.

Dr. Shimotsuma asserted that if we think about the origins of the protected townscapes and landscapes in Japan, it all began in a context where state-led development projects and rapid urban development emerged. The Japanese conservation system, therefore, originated when local people felt compelled to raise their voices to protect the heritage places that were important to them but had no chances to survive amid the fast-pace development. She commented that, at some point, the conservation of these heritage elements as a whole was not a possibility if it was based solely on the efforts from the state: it had to start with valuing and planning at the local level, to then be elevated to the state level.

Dr. Shimotsuma also remarked about the difference between the World Heritage and the Japanese cultural landscape concepts. She said that the first relates to an assessment based on the standards of culture, and from there, the classification as a cultural landscape and the outstanding or exceptional features are discussed. In regards to the second, she commented that the Japanese system evaluation considers from the beginning if these landscapes are important to understand the cultural diversity of Japan. Their designation is not solely based on comparisons. She stressed that these designations happen because of the importance given to these landscapes by local communities. She pointed out that the number of cultural landscapes designated will increase as long as they show the diversity of Japan, and this is a fundamental difference despite the usage of the same term of ‘cultural landscape.’ She further said that because of this gap, it is important to increase the designation of cultural landscapes not only in the World Heritage system but also in each country or each region, recognizing and valuing them.

**Professor Inaba** thanked the intervention and highlighted that the decision-making power given to local communities in Japan, shows the need for working with different layers in the system.

**Mr. Takahiro Okano** first acknowledged the differences in the selection of natural heritage or World Natural Heritage by the Ministry of the Environment or the Ministry of Forestry. National Parks and were conceived to protect critical natural landscapes and for the use of national citizens. The decision-making was entirely in the hands of the state, and the experts pointed out what was important to conserve. He said this system had strong regulations, and the designation historically did not depend on the ownership of the land. He mentioned that the government developed policies in that context to promote international tourism, and thus accelerated the designations. Due to changes in time, the current legal system allows designations without the agreement of the landowner. However, designations happen after discussions and exchange of ideas among representatives of the Ministry of the Environment and the local community, and sometimes villages or municipalities. He noted that the participation of the community is considered in the process of designation of National Parks. Their opinions are included in the elaboration of management plans. He used as an example the nomination of Amami Island in Okinawa, where he took part in the process of creation of the National Park five years ago. Ten years ago, the locals expressed their rejection for the National Park proposed by the Ministry of the Environment. However, now they are supportive of the nomination to the World Heritage List. They understood that through a designation as a National Park, they could protect a place highly important to them.

Mr. Okano then observed that if we go back to the talk of World Heritage and think about Outstanding

Universal Value, the assessment is based on the criteria of UNESCO. At the national level, Japanese sites are evaluated in a comparative analysis with other protected areas from around the world by a panel of experts from the Ministry of the Environment or the Ministry of Forestry. Then it is defined if they meet the conditions of the OUV. This is how sites are selected. They cannot become candidates based on the report of values by local communities. Mr. Okano said that in the case of Amami Island in Okinawa, the panel selected it first, and then, considering the support and acceptance of the local community, the viability of designating a National Park was assessed. From his point of view, the site does meet the criteria of Outstanding Universal Value for World Heritage from the natural heritage point of view. However, he considers that cultural values could also be taken into account. For Mr. Okano, if natural criteria for Outstanding Universal Value are absent, but instead there are notorious potential to fulfill cultural criteria, there is still consideration of the sites in the Japanese system. However, the definition of the Outstanding Universal Value may need to be critically assessed together with the Agency for Cultural Affairs.

**Professor Inaba** thanked the interventions and noted that the World Heritage system could not accommodate all the wishes from local peoples. However, as she has been working on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Japan, she finds that it is a critical catalyst for learning processes. She then presented follow-up questions on this issue, to continue the reflection, such as, how to find a balance between the World Heritage Convention and local systems, and what becomes the best model among local sites. She observed that each government and every governance process is crucial to create a bridge between the World Heritage Convention and local systems. She then called attention to the next point: capacity building. She asked about the role of international and local institutions, and she asked to clarify which are the target groups and what would be considered as an effective methodology. She requested Dr. Gamini Wijesuriya to start with his reflection as an expert on capacity building.

**Dr. Wijesuriya** referred first to the importance of continuing capacity building and talked about the perspectives of World Heritage and ICCROM. He recalled that back in 2011, two important themes emerged: a unified vision for nature and culture and the inclusion of capacity building for different stakeholders that support heritage conservation. He mentioned that for the design of a strategy, they highlighted the need to address these different audiences and layers. However, while the practitioners themselves are currently receiving more attention, the ways the concerns of other actors can be addressed by the capacity building strategy and the World Heritage Leadership Programme is still being defined. He pointed out that there are emerging issues, like the Disasters Risk Management (DRM), that are being included in the curriculum. Then, he said that these capacity-building programs relate to the activities of the University of Tsukuba since the UNESCO Chair on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation picked up important themes and brought together practitioners and academics to address heritage issues from the perspective of the curriculum developed. He remarked that the publications of the participants' case studies contributed enormously to building the capacities of people as they learned from the rich traditions of Japan. He considered that such workshops need to be continued.

**Dr. Webber Ndoro** first commended the organizers for their efforts on the capacity building workshops and commented on the capacity building issues and the role of ICCROM from his experience. He said he has worked with universities and capacity building in Africa since 2009. He mentioned a ten-year capacity-building program in Africa, carried out by Sweden that connected both academics and practitioners, which worked on the topic of aboriginal archaeology. Trained alumni, included him, are now working in different important positions related to the archaeology of Africa. He stressed that this is the reason why he thinks the capacity building programme of the University of Tsukuba is essential and is in the right direction even though it is not sure if four years is enough as this is a long term process. He further remarked that one of the significant issues of capacity building is the intergenerational approach, as the same trainers cannot last for ten years. He thinks that the people trained need to graduate to become trainers as well, in order to continue the capacity building process. He asserted that for capacity building is also important to take into consideration the place of academic research in addressing issues, such as management; it is not only about passing on information into others but also working on publications. Dr. Ndoro also elaborated on what Ms. Rabliauskas said in her presentation. He also experienced how local people are not listened to when evaluations for nominations take place: He thinks evaluators must gain capacities for their work in the field, especially to understand the dynamics of heritage in those places. He referred that in many evaluations in the African context, the first recommendation is to grow trees in order to cover the erosion of the land, but

growing a tree in Africa takes 50 years. Because of issues like that need to be understood in that context, he again highlighted the significance of capacity building at multiple levels.

Dr. Rössler also had a brief comment on capacity building. She asserted that for her, it is about listening to the other and mutually learn. She mentioned that when she started working in World Heritage in 1991, they could only count on two schools focused on natural heritage: Mecca and Garua in Africa, and ICCROM. She commented that today there are a variety of workshops on the ground, different practices, Connecting practice, the Leadership programme, UNESCO Category 2 Centres, different Chairs that were created after the first one inaugurated in 1998. She called attention to the fact that even though they have come along a long way, it may not be enough for today's needs. She highlighted that their discussion needs to be taken into account when evaluating the global capacity-building strategy, as new skills are needed, especially on nature-culture. She also recommended that in this continuously evolving system, site managers need to have new skills to work with communities and Indigenous peoples.



*Dr. Webber Ndoro, ICCROM, commenting during the Roundtable.*

Professor Inaba thanked Dr. Ndoro for his comments. He agreed that capacity building is 'training the trainers.' She asked the participants of this year for their opinions on capacity building and the needs of local communities, considering their positions as site managers and experts and their prospects of leadership in their home countries.

Mr. Anuranjan Roy, World Heritage Assistant of the Wildlife Institute of India, India, introduced his case study in the workshop: the Kailash Sacred Landscape, a cultural landscape, which extends across India, China, and Nepal. He commented that not only the heritage professionals or site managers should be the focus of capacity building programs but also local people, as in the case of Lake Ohrid in Albania. He remarked the importance of opening the doors of what is taught, learned, and shared with local people so that World Heritage would be helpful for them.

Professor Inaba thanked the intervention and mentioned that the UNESCO Bangkok Office once worked on awareness among monks, considering that monks and priests have an important role in the societies in many Asian countries. She said this was conducted in the local language, not in English, and this is what should be done in the local institutions.

Dr. Kimberley Wilson, Historic Heritage Coordinator of Parks Victoria, Australia, mentioned that she presented the Alpine National Park and the sacred mountains in Australia. Following the previous



intervention, she asserted that it is necessary to listen to colleagues in different disciplines as their interest is on transdisciplinary sharing. From her perspective as a heritage professional working on interpretation and site management, she said that while there are many responsibilities, it is also necessary not to forget to share the expertise in cultural and natural heritage management with colleagues from those fields who can help and work as one team.

**Dr. Wijesuriya** clarified the programme in Lake Ohrid in Albania referred to previously, as it was organized by ICCROM and supported by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. He thanked the comments and agreed on the need to bring all other stakeholders and not only practitioners.

**Mr. Badman** added a comment about the language and target audiences. He pointed out that two different things need to be done in terms of language in the capacity-building strategy. First, for World Heritage, it is to find a way to make contacts and have discussions at the site level in the local language. He stressed that the World Heritage Convention has only two working languages, which is very limited compared to UNESCO that has six, and about 85% of the local realities of World Heritage sites speak neither English nor French. For him, even if people have a good understanding of English or French, words do not convey what people feel about their places. He then highlighted that if the gap between the Convention and global places is big, it shows the current strategy is not sufficient and makes evident the need to not only translate but to interpret practice. Second, Mr. Badman called attention to the fact that the words used in the international languages of the World Heritage system do not necessarily correspond to how particular countries or cultures work. He commented that he discussed with Ms. Kristal Buckley about the four categories of cultural landscapes in the World Heritage system. While reflecting on the effectiveness of the term, they concluded that in some cases, they mean cultural landscapes, but in others, they mean something else. He asserted that it is necessary to discuss the next steps on cultural landscapes, in how it is understood as a term to describe a particular heritage site or as approaches for work. He reflected that a better international understanding of the words used in English is needed in order to give more options to interpret in different languages and to understand why some concepts make sense in particular countries and cultures, as it is demonstrated by the applicability of landscape approaches in English or place-based approaches in other languages.

Moreover, regarding the target audiences, Mr. Badman mentioned that the World Heritage Leadership Programme focused on two target audiences and in different ways of mediating the World Heritage system and the action on the ground. One of them is the nature-culture focal points at national levels, who sometimes do not know each other, and the other is the people at the site level, i.e., site managers, coordinators, or communities. He further remarked that in doing capacity building programs for years, it had been acknowledged that in working with site managers, it is not about teaching or training, but mutual learning and enhancement of the system. Mr. Badman stressed that the World Heritage has to serve the sites rather than vice versa, and to see the outcome in the real world, it is important to discuss this with site managers and national focal points. He reminded us that the capacity building strategy made a change for nearly ten years. However, one of the next practical challenges is to develop capacities not only of practitioners and institutions but also of networks.

**Dr. Wijesuriya** also made a point on the language issue mentioned by Mr. Badman. He said it is important to emphasize that it is just translation and that other languages can enrich World Heritage concepts. He then stressed that it is not just one-way traffic, but an issue of dialogue and enriching experiences with World Heritage. He further pointed out that also fragmentation and separation militates in the end against proper effective management or local communities. According to him, in the case of the latter, sometimes they take advantage of the separation and fragmentation for political means. He particularly reminded the audience that it is important to understand that people are not static, unaware, or uncritical about international organizations like IUCN or ICCROM.

**Professor Inaba** commented that it is necessary for people to understand all those issues, what is behind communities, the power balance in communities, the power balance in the politicians and international organizations, and how to connect them and communicate. She added that what is in front of us are all things, either natural or cultural, but it is the people who have voices. She further asked about the World Heritage system and the number of mixed sites. She reminded the audience that from Dr. Rössler's presentation, it was noticed that until 1992 some natural sites had cultural values, but after 1992, cultural

landscapes have been very influential in the world; however it is located in cultural heritage. She asked what shall be done from now and requested Ms. Kristal Buckley to start the discussion on cultural landscapes.

**Ms. Kristal Buckley** first noted that World Heritage and heritage designations at the national level, in general, would always present a tension. She said this tension is located between a standardized universal set of ideas that may or may not resonate at the local level, but recognizing it is very important for finding a way to accommodate a localized expression on culture and nature. She called attention to the awareness of the division of nature and culture as part of the Western culture, which may not apply to other cultures. She commented that the introduction of the cultural landscapes category in 1992 was a courageous and serious attempt to build a bridge. At that moment, there was already an acknowledgment that the World Heritage system was not as inclusive as it was meant to be, and it was not representing the diversity of the world. However, cultural landscapes showed that there was a desire to repair the problem. She stressed that the development of different types of cultural landscapes, embedded today in the Operational Guidelines, was meant to be an enabling, stimulating and inviting way to recall the different meanings of cultural landscapes for people: It attempted to be an opening for the cultural diversity and the many ways in which people experience special places to be recognized in the World Heritage List. She asserted that reviews on the situation are important but have not been done since 2004. She pointed out that the criteria are still stuck on one side of a very tall fence, which has not helped to make the bridge as expected. In her opinion, now is an excellent time to look again at how the cultural landscapes category is servicing our needs in order to make the bridges. Ms. Buckley further made a point on the landscape approach, which should apply to all heritage, not just the ones in the landscape category. She remarked the applicability of the landscape approach to urban areas, to urban sites and pieces of cities that count half of the World Heritage List today, and the massive challenges they are presenting to all the people interested in those places. She observed that the landscape approach might not mean the entirety of the World Heritage List and everything classed as heritage, but somehow it makes it clear that the language needs to be renovated. She concluded that conservation management plans and cultural landscapes are needed.

**Professor Inaba** thanked Ms. Buckley for her intervention and recalled that at the introduction of cultural landscapes, they called it rural landscapes. She said 'rural landscapes' is a typology while cultural landscapes are everything and means place. She then asked Dr. Rössler to share her perspective as a geographer and as an expert involved in the history of the inclusion of cultural landscapes in the World Heritage system and the revision of the Operational Guidelines.

**Dr. Rössler** said that this type of heritage aimed to solve one of the biggest problems in the mid-1990s: the overload of nominations from Europe and the underrepresentation of different areas of the world. She commented that the first nominations for cultural landscapes were from Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific, and the Philippines, and they thought it would go in the right direction. Still, then the Europeans proposed one vineyard landscape after another, however increasing the diversity of landscapes that are more than 100 at the moment. She stressed that the category of cultural landscapes made a greater awareness about the integrated management of natural and cultural values: While in cultural landscapes the Outstanding Universal Value lies in the interaction between people and their environment, other site managers became aware that there are natural values in cultural sites and vice versa. Then, she reminded the audience that for the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention, there was a review and evaluation in a workshop in Ferrara. She asserted that one of the biggest questions revolves around the need for categories in urban areas. Currently, Annex 3 of the Operational Guidelines has a traditional definition of cities, or urban ensemble, which is not adapted at all to what is needed today, and does not integrate the Historic Urban Landscape Approach (HUL) adopted in 2011 by the UNESCO General Conference.

Based on the questions made by Ms. Buckley, Dr. Rössler reported on two other issues. One was about the results of a meeting in Oman about the management of large-scale archaeological sites and landscapes, where she participated with Dr. Ndoro. She commented that a document is under elaboration to help site managers, especially under the current climate crisis, as cases have been reported on coastal archaeological areas washed away in the Arctic. The second issue was concerning the comments made by Mr. Badman on the biodiversity crisis and the search for different approaches in terms of connectivity and area-based conservation. She stressed this is the big debate happening outside the World Heritage and other heritage discussions, which congregates results of the meeting of 8 biodiversity-related conventions leading to

COP 15. She observed that there is a whole world out to be considered and to be linked-up with, while the cultural landscape debate has a critical role to play, as there are areas with traditional practices for biodiversity protection.

**Professor Inaba** thanked Dr. Rössler and commented that cultural landscapes are combined in different discussions, not only in those of World Heritage issues.

**Professor Masahito Yoshida** commented on two points: First, the distance between the protected areas of international level from those at national and local levels; and second, the landscape issue. He said that regarding the first, the separation between nature and culture at the site and institutional levels had been discussed. However, there are big gaps between the international and national designations to be considered. As mentioned by Ms. Rabliauskas, the local communities do not separate nature and culture. However, according to the rules and the categories of the Convention, it is necessary to identify what meets the criteria of Outstanding Universal Value. He stressed that this evaluation is essential because otherwise, the numbers of World Heritage would be increasing eternally. However, it is also important to notice that all the natural and cultural elements to be conserved at the national level are interrelated. He suggested that before starting a nomination for the World Heritage, States Parties should analyze the candidate as a national level property, considering the many special values for the country or the community in the recommendation, instead of the Outstanding Universal Value. He said that even if the State Party does not recognize these as Outstanding Universal Value, they have value for them. He remarked that this kind of upstream process is critical because it calls to not forgetting the special values to the local communities or people. As for the second point, he pointed out that he agrees with Ms. Buckley regarding the different ways of using cultural landscapes. The first way is the 'cultural landscape' defined in the World Heritage Convention, which has Outstanding Universal Value. The other way is the landscape used by Mr. Okano, where the management of the surrounding area was set up, even out of the buffer zone. He observed that if this idea of landscape is used for a wider area, life and culture can be integrated into the World Heritage properties. For him, thinking about a broader landscape approach is essential to link nature and culture.

**Professor Inaba** thanked the comments and stressed that Outstanding Universal Value is not a hierarchy. She mentioned they have been discussing what is Outstanding Universal Value since the 1998 Amsterdam meeting and in the 2005 Kazan meeting. She stressed this is an essential point because the meaning of 'outstanding' or 'exceptional' should not exclude other things from the World Heritage system. She pointed out that, as said by Professor Yoshida, it is necessary to think about facilitating the national system to enter the World Heritage system. However, she was asking herself why to limit the number of World Heritage sites.

**Ms. Rabliauskas** raised her opinion about 'exceptional,' as it was necessary to change the wording to develop a local interpretation. She said that Pimachiowin Aki represents the exceptional case of how people still use the land. She asserted that sometimes it is the wording that needs to change a bit and not to stay stuck in questions that do not make sense to local communities. She added that this was the work done with the upstream process, and they received excellent advice from the Advisory Bodies.

**Dr. Wijesuriya** mentioned that cultural landscapes were a lost opportunity to look at the nature-culture linkages, but at the same time it has done a great service; some sites as the Hani rice terraces would never have come to be recognized as cultural heritage. He said that, as highlighted by Dr. Ndoro, many people look at all the values, not only the tangible attributes but the people, the traditional knowledge systems, and the livelihood. He suggested thinking about conservation by considering it as continuity. He also suggested revisiting the concept of conservation and how it is considered in, for instance, the Venice Charter.

**Professor Inaba** called for the closing remarks. She asked for comments or questions from the audience or participants.

**Dr. Shimotsuma** commented on the definition of cultural landscapes as heritage. She asserted that the fact that UNESCO considers cultural landscapes not necessarily as heritage but as an approach is very wise. She pointed out that Japan considers cultural landscapes as cultural heritage, and this can bring some complexities. The reason is that cultural landscapes relate to a land-use system established in a space, and

how it has continued or changed constitutes a landscape with particular features. She observed that the first thing to be done should be to think about how the system can be restored. In that sense, 'heritage conservation' is an approach that is more suitable and easier, but more than often, it is necessary to discuss if a landscape can subsist as heritage or if another arrangement is necessary. She stressed that, based on the restoration of that system, both the landscape and the community could find ways to continue in modern society. For instance, the global cases of agricultural landscapes can be systems of verification. She suggested that instead of strict heritage assessments, the increase of landscape subsistence systems that bring fulfillment to people could provide more wellbeing. She said that if the global society looked again at cultural landscapes, she would be grateful if they consider these aspects.

**Professor Inaba** added that they introduced cultural landscapes into the Japanese system and did not change the name, but it refers to people's lives and livelihoods. She also mentioned that the World Heritage system is about Outstanding and Cultural Landscapes categories.

**Mr. Badman** agreed with the need to revisit the concept of landscape in the World Heritage Convention. He remarked, as exposed by Professor Yoshida, that there are several different intersecting questions. One is what sort of places are recognized as having Outstanding Universal Value in terms of the interaction between nature and people. The second is the question of taking either a landscape approach or maybe a place-based approach in order to integrate different concerns around management systems, governance, and the need to situate a World Heritage area within the valuation and use of communities. The third, for him, would be that there are other different types of landscapes spaces that are important, to mention some: the place Indigenous Peoples have in the World Heritage Convention due to innovations such as the International Indigenous Peoples Forum, the place of culture-nature in urban landscapes, the coastal marine situation and the forest landscape.

**Mr. Badman** also called attention to what the International Satoyama Initiative refers to as socio-ecological productive landscapes or rural production landscapes. These places produce food, and this production is based on a long association between people and nature. He expressed concern about the threats many rural landscapes are receiving from multiple sources, including environmental plans, the degree to which subsidies distort production systems, the pressures on the ways of working from powerful actors in the market, and the sustainability of growing with chemicals use. He reflected that the answer to the question might be the needs of a broader concern for the future of rural landscapes. Depending on the country, sometimes recognition of places as heritage might be part of the solution but not in all to a considerable degree. He suggested that much more recognition is needed towards the crisis that is affecting biodiversity, the loss of traditional knowledge and cultural diversity. He stressed that rural landscapes are the places where these aspects are seen in many situations, and the support by national policies needs to be adapted. He commented there are very significant nature conservation and biodiversity values, but traditionally managed productive landscapes are threatened by change, as it happens with the region he comes from. The policy of the European Union towards the subsidies for farmers is seen as extremely damaging to nature conservation because of the way it is being employed and the significant threat it represents to not intensively managed farming systems. He noted that the European Union is continually trying to reform that, but the market issues are significant. **Mr. Badman** pointed out that this is a place where nature and culture need to get together: Mainstream food security and how food production is supported, which is very challenging and a big issue. He observed that World Heritage cultural landscapes that are food-producing could be assessed and inform about the challenges and the alliances with other conventions that are trying to act on the impacts of the better management of food systems. He added World Heritage is very engaged in food systems through UNESCO, CBD, and FAO, trying to make a more focused collaboration. He mentioned the International Satoyama Initiative in Japan as one very interesting and important partner they should work more closely with.

**Professor Inaba** reflected how the cultural landscape approach or the cultural landscape issues in the World Heritage Convention largely influenced the field. If the landscape approach should be implemented at the local level, then it needs to focus on management. She made the question of how to strengthen the management process and how to give local communities the capacity to be able to manage. Then, she wondered how to develop the national system to support these systems, considering that this differs from country to country. She added their work is to ask each participant to think about how it is in each country,

in Kailash, Tibet, and many other places, and she expressed her hope that this was a good chance for all to think about these relevant aspects. She closed the discussion session and thanked the panelists, participants, and the public.

Professor Yoshida thanked everyone and closed the symposium and the four-year programme of Capacity Building Workshops in Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation. He said the year 2020 would be a year for reflection, where the team will use the precious opportunity given by the discussion of this symposium and the four years of experience to think about the future directions and the possibilities of the University and themselves. He remarked this is an excellent step for the future and thanked all the speakers, the participants of the workshop, the audience of the room, and the organizing staff of the symposium.



*Group photo of the Fourth International Symposium on Nature-Culture Linkages in Heritage Conservation during the Tsukuba Conference 2019.*

