Appendix
Summary of Discussion
Profile of Participants

2011 ICH Expert Networking Meeting in the Asia-Pacific Region

30 November – 3 December 2011, Jeju, Korea

Dr. Seong-Yong Park introduced Jeju to the participants, calling the island a treasure of tangible, intangible, and natural heritage. He thanked the participants for making it to the meeting despite their busy schedules and reminded everyone of the intention of the meeting—to discuss safeguarding efforts in the Asia-Pacific region under topics related to the functions of ICHCAP. Dr Park also expressed his hopes that the meeting would be meaningful not only to the development of future projects in the region, but also to the building of collaborative relationships.

Dongkuk University's Distinguished Professor Dawnhee Yim, the recently appointed Vice Chairperson of ICHCAP's Governing Board, offered words of welcome to the guests, highlighting the unique language and culture of Jeju. She also made special note of the inscriptions for which Jeju is famous, including Jeju Chilmeoridang Yeongdeunggut, a shamanistic ritual. In closing, she expressed her optimism for a fruitful outcome of the meeting.

Session I: Implementation of the 2003 Convention and International Cooperation

Moderated by Mr Roger Janelli, Professor Emeritus, Indiana University, the first session covered two broad topics. Professor Noriko Aikawa of the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies initially presented on the first topic 'Implementing the 2003 Convention and Its Safeguarding Measures', and then the second topic of the theme was presented by Dr Seong-Yong Park, Assistant Director of ICHCAP, who examined the methodologies of ICHCAP's collaborative work for safeguarding ICH.

Implementing the 2003 Convention and Its Safeguarding Measures
Mr Janelli thanked Professor Aikawa for her presentation and opened the floor for discussion.

Mr Park opened the discussion by asking why nomination participation is so low, especially in Africa. Professor Aikawa informed him that many countries are not able to prepare the files; they need to be trained. Ms Adi Ratunabuabua echoed this response by sharing her experience examining nomination files for urgent safeguarding. She indicated that the submission files are missing evidence of community participation or are lacking other documentation. An additional problem is that photographs representing the element should be included with the files; the photos should be accurate depictions of the elements, but instead many looked as though they were for tourism brochures and not focusing on the element. Secretariat is busy, so any files missing information criteria are not considered and returned. With Africa, we could see that some elements were clearly in need of urgent safeguarding, but the files were missing information. She also indicated that this is evidence for why capacity building is so important.

Ms Sudha Gopalakrishnan said that concept of outstanding value is included as a criterion to the Masterpieces list, but when it comes to the ICH representative list, it is not. In fact, there is no form of hierarchy, and this means that nominations from States Parties can pick and choose. She asked who selected the nominations for each State Party and by what criteria as the selected element may not be representative. She also inquired about the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. Professor Aikawa indicated that decisions regarding nominations are made at

the national level by the individual governments. She then went on to explain that there are now eight programmes on the Register and that the criteria have changed, noting that projects nominated to the Register must have been ongoing and implemented. If we see a programme that looks beautiful, but hasn't been implemented, then it cannot be considered a Best Practice.

Professor Janelli officially closed the topic and introduced Dr Seong-Yong Park for the second topic.

Examining the Methodologies of Collaborative Works of ICHCAP for ICH Safeguarding

Professor Aikawa asked about the flexibility of ICHCAP's goals that were already determined at the Governing Board Meeting. She further queried about the purpose of having stated goals for the long and middle terms if they can so easily be changed. Dr Park told the participants that the goals of the Centre, as passed by the Governing Board, are based on the functions of ICHCAP and that a copy of the goals would be provided. He further went on to state that ICHCAP is hoping to build collaborative projects based on the overall objectives of the Centre and that ICHCAP will either directly or indirectly help member states build ICH systems and policies by using our primary functions of information and networking. Dr Park then said that many of the Centre's past activities will continue into the future.

Professor Amareswar Galla thanked Dr Park for holding the meeting and for the work of ICHCAP. He clarified that one of the critical issues is that there seems to be an overall misunderstanding of the importance of communities and their important roles in the nomination process. In identifying, documenting—in all roles of safeguarding, communities are number one. Without communities, there is no safeguarding; there is no intangible heritage. He then asks what is being done within the framework of the Convention in terms of disseminating information and harmonising relationships in the region.

Dr Park reiterated the fact that the three centres have specific functions and that research and training cannot exist without information and networking. There may even be some unavoidable crossover, and these are very complicated issues when talking about the distinct functions of the three centres. ICHCAP, he emphasised, will be working towards diffusing information and networking, but in terms of our main objectives, to strengthen ICH safeguarding capacity in

the region, disseminating information isn't just about delivering documents or giving messages online. Dr Park further noted that we have to build networks among institutes, specialists, groups, and communities to provide opportunities for discussion and that Member States should discuss safeguarding among ourselves. In terms of providing information for our collaborative work, there is some kind of neutral area that cannot escape our primary functions. However, ICHCAP will try to maintain focus on our primary functions and work with Member States to fulfil our mandate and mission as a Category 2 Centre.

Ms Ratunabuabua added an additional comment regarding the primary functions of the three centres. She said that it creates a little bit of confusion across the whole region as most Members do not fully understand what Korea does, what Japan does, or what China does. She suggested that ICHCAP dissemination information regarding what each centre does or is doing. Dr Park thanked her for her comments and reiterated the functions of ICHCAP.

Ms Nguyen Kim Dung, Chief, ICH Management Division of Department of Cultural Heritage, Viet Nam, offered thanks to ICHCAP for past collaborative efforts with Viet Nam and briefly described a few of these efforts before asking whether close partnerships would continue into the future now that the Centre has officially been designated as a UNESCO centre. Dr Park reassured her that the Centre would continue partnership projects with Viet Nam and that ICHCAP would help strengthen capacity by providing cases of good practices.

Ms Ratunabuabua asked Ms Nguyen about how Viet Nam was able to achieve success so rapidly and whether Viet Nam would be willing to share their experiences with others in the region. Ms Nguyen informed the participants that she and her organisation want to share with other nations, but that time has been an issue. She stated that she will send out information to those who are interested.

Professor Janelli thanked the presenters and the participants

Session II: Building Information Systems: Identification, Documentation, and Archives

Professor Amareswar Galla, Executive Director of the International Institute for the Inclusive Museum, moderated the second session, which covered five topics related to information systems in different ways. Dr Jesus T. Peralta, Consultant for the National Commission for Culture and the Arts, the Philippines, opened the first topic on collecting ICH data. Joanne Orr, CEO of the Museums Galleries Scotland, considered the challenges involved with ICH inventory making through a European perspective. The third topic, introduced by Professor Hanhee Hahm of Chonbuk National University, also delved into subject of online databases and archives for ICH inventory making and safeguarding. Pilho Park, Esq., Attorney-at-Law and founding member of the Park Law Firm PLLC, New York, looked into the legal aspects of ICH. 'ICH Safeguarding and Utilisation through ICH Information', the final topic for the second session, was presented by Gaura Mancacaritadipura, Vice-Chairman of the Indonesian National Kris Secretariat.

Parameters of Collecting Data for ICH Information Systems
Professor Galla thanked Mr Peralta for taking everyone though a journey beginning with the initial reactions to the call for nominating an element for the Masterpieces and through all the obstacles and transformation processes that went into creating an institutional framework and ending with the status of today. Professor Galla emphasised that Mr Peralta's presentation is like a metaphor for everyone, as we are all on multiple journeys and that one aspect of ICHCAP is to help us share these journeys through information sharing. Just before opening the floor for discussion, he stressed the importance sharing inventories, as collected data is useless unless it is shared.

Mr Sonny William, Secretary for Culture of the Ministry of Cultural Development, Cook Islands, began the discussion by asking Mr Peralta about the epics initially selected for review for the nomination process, including the hudhud. He specifically wanted to know what form the epics existed. When informed that they are chanted epic poems, Mr Williams expressed concerns that he has in the Cook Islands, where the sacred chants are recited out of context and used for tourism.

Mr Peralta quipped that 'tourism destroys its own resources', and he further elaborated when responding to Professor Aikawa, who asked about the success of transmitting the hudhud. He said that the chant was traditionally performed on four occasions and it was through these performances that it was learned by rote memorisation. Now, children are taught directly and the traditional means of transmission is dying. He added that just women used to do the chant, but now all genders do. He mentioned that traditional religions are being supplanted by others, so the religious connection the chants once had is missing—the performers are doing the 'right' thing, but the beliefs are no longer there. He said that there is something false about a Catholic going through the motions of the rites.

Mr Peralta continued by talking more about transmission through education, noting the irony of trying to teach children traditional ways when they are even forgetting their own language. However, he did emphasise that after eight years, a successful programme was finally established, but only after a series of failures. Today, safeguarding and transmission is incorporated into a competition for chanting the hudhud in a proper social context. The prize for last year went to a bearer, a nine-year-old girl.

Professor Galla said that there are so many different stories coming from different backgrounds, but he emphasised transmitters being an essential component for safeguarding and that transmitters can even come be a nine-year-old girl.

Professor Janelli revisited the idea of traditional beliefs no longer being associated with chants and asked whether there are any projects to incorporate the beliefs into the chants. Mr Perlata said that most of the anthropological studies in Ifugao focused on the culture change, so some aspects of the belief systems are quite dead. He then gave an example of trying to reintroduce a ritual that involved Ifugao warriors with shields and spears tied to their arms, legs, and heads in response to a violent death. The warriors ran through the fields in their regalia creating a spectacle of awe and fear. So, when he and the NCCA tried to reintroduce that, they got a lot of complaints. However, they found a similar ritual with exactly the same form but used for driving away rats from the fields. They were allowed to reintroduce the ritual in that context as a way of not going against mainstream Catholic beliefs.

Professor Galla gave a few closing comments before introducing the floor to Joanne Orr.

Supporting Identification and Documentation for Information Building

Dr Park initiated the discussions by first acknowledging the presentation by Jesus Peralta, saying that it was very useful in showing national policies in relationship to inventories. He then emphasised the linkage of inventories with documentation and identification, and he explained how ICHCAP has been working over the past several years to assist Member States with building inventories. Dr Park also pointed out the importance of web integration before asking Ms Orr about the challenges with an online system, specifically with the difficulties for older people in accessing the Internet.

Ms Orr indicated that the Remembering Scotland at War is based on user-generated content and that participation has been intergenerational. She also said that technology is becoming increasingly imported and adopted in community centres, and while she admitted that the system isn't perfect and that there is a possibility of missing some tradition bearers, she was also quick to point out that participation through community centres allows for more intergenerational cooperation. She also said that there are ways in but it will always be a challenge. Ms Orr emphasised the importance of education and in bringing communities together.

Ms Gopalakrishnan asked whether the online inventory is a conscious exercise in which the categories and subsets are marked and then content is created from them. She also inquired about how it is possible to curate and control the wiki-based content. Ms Orr said that there is a template, a set way of doing the inventories based on the criteria outlined in the 2003 Convention. She admitted that there isn't a large amount of moderation due to capacity restrictions; however, she also noted that collecting information at a grassroots level allows the content to be more authentic. She added that the project is one of raising awareness.

Professor Hanhee Hahm said that she is fascinated by the project as her organisation is doing something similar, collecting ICH information from ordinary people. She asked about the terminology of ICH being foreign to westerners, who tend to use terms such as tradition and folklore. She also asked about how ordinary people learn about ICH. Ms Orr said that living culture is being used and added that explaining about ICH is a two-step process where the idea of ICH is introduced and then it is explained by showing what the people are already doing; they understood the concept straightaway. Ms Orr believes that the ease of understanding comes from culture being so imbedded within the communities of Scotland.

Professor Hahm continued by stating she will present a similar concept, as she and her organisation are also using a wiki model for a database. Professor Hahm wanted to know about costs, the number of technicians involved, and other matters about the technical side of the project. Ms Orr said the project started as a research study at the university with three paid individuals. She was also quick to note that the software is free and open source. At the university, they did some moderation, but their focus was primarily on the outreach work. Now that MGS has control over the project, there is a single individual working in terms of moderation and another staff member looking into how the project can be mainstreamed. MGS is also continuing to work closely with the wiki family to see how the project can be developed. She also reiterated that she is looking into models such as the Remembering Scotland at War site over the long term, but that project is also operating on a shoestring budget at the moment.

Professor Galla emphasised the importance ICH being translated into a community's language, but he also noted that the idea of living heritage is a foreign concept in most communities. He thanked Ms Orr and closed the topic.

Establishing and Managing an Online Database and Archives for ICH Safeguarding

Ms Orr asked whether there is a two way link between the ICHPEDIA and archives database. And Professor Hahm indicated that there is, but that information is largely inputted into the ICHPEDIA site then migrated to the archives. Professor Hahm also said that there are plans to have the system work the opposite way as well.

Ms Ratunabuabua thanked Professor Hahm for the presentation and noted that many of the Fijian islands don't have electricity so using online technology could be a barrier. She then said the inventories are good for creating archives, but a greater concern is that the information seems to be frozen. She ask about how the inventories help keep practices alive. Professor Hahm pointed out that Korea has a long tradition of collecting information and has even built a special research centre. However, ever since UNESCO introduced a new type of ICH, the Korean government has been puzzled about what the Convention wants for safeguarding ICH. The Cultural Heritage Administration of Korea asked Professor Hahm's team to research the methodologies in collecting ICH information and this led to the collaboration of the two models to make this new system.

Professor Galla asked Ms Ratunabuabua whether she was satisfied with the answer. Ms Ratunabuabua confirmed that she understand that everything is being documented, but asked again about how the practices are being revitalised. Professor Hahm responded by indicating that this kind of documentation encourages communities to revitalise their fragile ICH.

Dr Park said that ICHPEDIA seems to be focusing on collecting information for safeguarding, so it is a very comprehensive work for collecting information and safeguarding ICH. In that process, there might be some extinct ICH information; however, he indicated that the research team is focused primarily on collecting information related to living heritage in existing ICH communities. He said that it is the project is a beginning stage and that he believes at a later stage, in the spirit of the Convention, the status of ICH will be classified according to how viable it is.

Mr Kalid Javaid, Executive Director of the National Institute of Folk and Traditional Heritage, Pakistan, asked about the background of the student team and about how she manages them. Professor Hahm said that last year there were ten graduate students from the Department of Anthropology, ICH specialists, and community members. And that this year professors and graduate students from six universities from around Korea are involved.

Ms Sabira Soltongeldieva, Culture Programme Specialist of the Kyrgyz National Commission for UNESCO, asked how many elements are included in the ICHPEDIA and about the distribution of the elements in Korea. Professor Hahm said that the goal is to have ten thousand and that there were five thousand elements last year and close to nine thousand this year. She added that the elements come from six of the eight Korean provinces and that the other two provinces will be covered next year.

Ms Assel Utegenova, Secretary-General of the National Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan for UNESCO, wanted to know who is allowed to edit and add information and how it is checked for credibility. Professor Hahm said that the system, which is just in the first stage, is currently open to just a few people. She added that the team is working towards expanding to the larger community and that a committee will check the credibility of the information.

Mr Gauthier acknowledged that Professor Hahm can see the number of elements on the site and the individuals who input the information, but he wanted to know if she could track how many people visit the site and how they use the information. Professor Hahm said there is a way of tracking the number of people

visiting, but there is no way of knowing how they use the information.

Professor Aikawa inquired about copyrights, indicating that Wiki has very loose policies. Professor Hahm said that her group holds the copyrights and that everything is open for use, expect for commercial purposes.

Ms Nguyen said it seems as though the system would be very useful for her in Viet Nam and asked about the monetary costs and human resources involved in establishing such a system. Professor Hahm said there is just one computer specialist and the remaining staff is made up of students. She said that the Cultural Heritage Administration did fund a portion of the project.

Dr Park reiterated the point that this is a pilot project and not really an inventory and that it is more about database making. In many ways, it should be meeting the requirements, but this is just a stage before the inventory-making process. We can say that this is a database made by a research team.

Professor Galla pointed out two key ideas that kept coming up during the discussion. The first is about credibility and the other about copyrights. Wikipedia isn't seen as valid a valid source; it is even substandard at the undergraduate level. However, he did indicate that it could be a useful tool in raising awareness because it creates a sense of a cultural dialogue. He also indicated that there are serious issues concerning displaying restrictive knowledge.

Protection of Intellectual Property Rights for the ICH Practitioners

Professor Galla thanked Mr Park and opened the floor for discussion.

Mr Peralta said that traditional heritage is older than fifty, sixty, or seventy years. He queried as to whether heritage, given its age, would be in the public domain, and if it is, then what use is informed and prior consent. Mr Park said that this matter is more of a policy issue and that he has no exact answer. However, he did say that if everything is in the public domain, then it is highly probable that it would disappear. Policy could make criteria to preserve heritage. Professor Galla added that one of the issues hotly debated internationally in the drafting and the final adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples deals with customary rights of indigenous peoples. He further noted particular examples from Bolivia, Vanuatu, and South Africa.

Professor Galla asked Ms Nguyen how intellectual property rights were handled in Viet Nam when cultural heritage legislation was being amended. Ms Nguyen

said that matters of copyrights are still complicated and that Viet Nam hasn't dealt with them concretely in 2001.

Ms Gopalakrishnan said that with a documented performance, the copyright is owned by the documenter, the person who has the video or audio recording. She then asked about shared copyrights and whether there is a mechanism that can be employed for the rights of the ICH owner and the owner of the documentation. Mr Park said that this issue is in existing legal systems. The rights go to the person who documented, not the performer. So to protect the rights of performers, there should be a prior agreement, which can include certain benefit sharing. Another way would be to create new laws that directly deal with the issue, granting certain rights to the performer.

Dr Park said the problems in this field of intellectual property rights come from the fact that intellectual property issues in the ICH field cannot be resolved within the framework of current legal systems. He said ICHCAP is keen on the development of solutions. One of our functions is to promote intellectual property rights for ICH practitioners and creators, so this is a very important matter for us to address. Very recently ICHCAP developed joint projects related to ICH information management and intellectual property in specialised institutions. ICHCAP is moving forward and hoping to resolve the issue.

Professor Aikawa recommended giving the issue to WIPO and leaving it alone because the issue started in 1973 from the perspective of ICH rights. It has never succeeded. She also made a point that in the nomination files as well as in the periodical reports that States Party to the Convention have to submit every six years, the measures being taken to protect intellectual property rights in documentation have to be mentioned. And they have to clear the intellectual property rights to protect the bearers. So it could be done under the existing role.

Professor Hahm mentioned that there is another issue in Korea between funding agencies and documenters, where funding agencies want to take over all the rights and benefits. Mr Park indicated that these issues are not matters of fair use or of copyrights because it should be clear through the agreement between the funder and the recipient of the funds.

Mr Williams added that from a Pacific point of view, six countries are in the process of enacting sui generis laws on traditional knowledge with significant help from WIPO and other regional organisations, and UNESCO has been a good supporter as well. In the Cook Islands, at the next parliamentary session, there

will be a first reading related to traditional law, so this aspect has been gaining momentum in the Pacific over the past two or three years.

Ms Ratunabuabua said that Fiji started up an inventory based on a model law for all countries. They were told to take the model law and to start an inventory. That was the basis for Fiji and some of the other islands. It wasn't because of the Convention; that came later. We started with the inventory and documenting community ownership because the model looks at the communities and what they own. Because most people in Fiji are indigenous, living in smaller communities, we could go back and assign ownership. We paid particular attention to motifs and symbols, and in the process of identifying these motifs and symbols, we also had to identify the owners. The draft legislation is almost there because we have done the background work.

Ms Utegenova indicated that the Kazak parliament has been discussing an issue of a German businessman who got patent to produce a traditional Kazak beverage. She asked Mr Park whether it is legal to get a patent for a traditional dish. And she asked his opinion about the inclusion of French cuisine on ICH lists. Mr Park said that that is a question to be brought to a court for a decision. He added his opinion that to be issued a patent, the product should be new or a novelty. He also said that the criteria are vague and that the system is different in different countries, so even if a patent is granted in one country, it may not be in another. Professor Aikawa addressed the issue related to French cuisine. She said that it is on the list as a social practice, not a recipe. She also said that the 2005 nomination was rejected because it was too centred on recipes, so they changed it to social practice in 2010 for it to be inscribed.

Professor Galla closed the topic by saying there are so many complex issues to deal with—the more we share and the more we work together, the better.

ICH Safeguarding and Utilisation through ICH Information
Professor Galla thanked Mr Mancacaritadipura for providing such good examples. He then said that Indonesia has come up with a number of innovative ways of raising awareness. They have taken a systems approach, and the production of comics related to ICH was quite interesting. He noted that just one other country, Mexico, ever tried to use comics in safeguarding activities. Mexico worked in collaboration with Interpol and high schools. They used the comics to transform

students into community police to reduce incidents against cultural property.

Professor Galla summarised his thoughts by saying the most important points that comes across in Mr Mancacaritadipura's presentation are that we should not forget why we are doing what we are doing—safeguarding ICH. We cannot be all over the place; we need to have a systematic approach. He said that the Convention is not an ordinary thing; it has taken a long time to get here it is today. There is international cooperation and knowledge embedded in it, so it is important to read the Basic Texts. He also mentioned how shocked he was he learned that some States Parties haven't even read the texts. He then stressed the importance of reading the basic texts of the Convention because if you don't get the basics right, then you will do more harm than good.

Ms Orr thanked Mr Mancacaritadipura for his presentation. She said that it was very clearly presented, and from her perspective, it is very helpful to see a back-to-the-basics approach. Dr Park also offered Mr Mancacaritadipura complimentary comments and thanked him for his work. He said that the presentation gave participants the whole picture and that it is important to know the very specific programme and duties, even though they are for an Indonesian context. Dr Park also said that it also shows how important collaboration is across all levels of safeguarding, from individuals and communities to the national and regional level.

Ms Ratunabuabua said that we typically operate in terms of best practices but that she liked the approach of understanding the worst practices, and she asked for a few examples. Mr Mancacaritadipura said he actually gave a lecture on this in 2009. He said that one of the worst practices is to do things that are very exclusive. Another is to not have community involvement and taking a top-down approach with government officials deciding what is or isn't a community's heritage. He further noted that many nominations are being sent back because there isn't sufficient evidence of community involvement. Another bad practice is relying exclusively on digital data. Mr Mancacaritadipura offered an Indonesian example of a very big integrated culture information system project. All the data was put into a computer database. Then one day, the system crashed and they lost all their data— many years of research, gone. He cautioned on the importance of backing up data.

Professor Galla mentioned that he was asked to do a presentation for the Tonga workshop on multinational nominations. He refused. The big problem for why files are being sent back, as Mr Mancacaritadipura said, is that people are going for nominations without dealing with the implementation of the Convention, without

knowing what is involved. It is a case of putting the cart before the horse. He said that this is the most widespread bad practice. He said that countries should not go for nominations until they have the capacity to implement the Convention. He cited an example from Ethiopia and indicated that the situation isn't unique.

Mr Siosiua Lotaki, Assistant Senior Education Officer, Ministry of Education, Tonga, commented on his own experience with incomplete nomination files. Although they were rejected, he said that he is now happy because he knows the reason for the rejection and he can now resubmit.

Professor Galla reiterated the importance of knowing and using the basic texts and closed the topic.

Session III: Strengthening Collaborative Networks through ICH Information Sharing

The final session, moderated by Professor Sangmee Bak of Hanguk University of Foreign Studies, focused on networking, one of the main functions of ICHCAP. Sudha Gopalakrishnan, Executive Director of Sahapedia, presented the first topic for the session, providing information about the roles and functions of non-governmental organisations in fostering ICH. The second topic was presented by Akatsuki Takahashi, Ph.D., Programme Specialist for Culture, UNESCO Office for the Pacific States.

Involvement and Collaboration of NGOs in Building Information:
A View from India
Professor Hahm posed the first comment by stating that NGOs play a rather limited role in Korea and that the government has the main role in ICH safeguarding. Based on personal experience, files have to go through the government. She asked Ms Gopalakrishnan about how Margi, an Indian NGO, was selected and able to prepare and submit the files for the first proclaimed Masterpiece element of India. Ms Gopalakrishnan explained that it happened by accident. She explained how her troupe was in Paris performing when she met Professor Aikawa who informed Ms

Gopalakrishnan of the Masterpieces programme and recommended preparing the files. With just two months to prepare, she and other experts hastily put together files and presented them to the Ministry of Culture who didn't really know the procedures, and that is how the NGO was able to be involved the files. She added that because the ICH program is now better understood, the government is handling all the submissions, but consults heavily with NGOs.

Mr Lotaki thanked Ms Gopalakrishnan for the presentation and video. He asked whether the Indian school system limits students to the information provided on Sahapedia. Ms Gopalakrishnan said that she recently approached the Ministry of Education, and through an order, 6,500 secondary education schools have been linked to Sahapedia for enhancing and creating content, so we have teacher participation and student participation.

Mr Gautier said decentralisation sounds like a great idea, with a lot of NGOs involved with ICH safeguarding. He said that since India is such a large country, the centralised Ministry of Culture cannot do much fieldwork, so he wanted to know whether there is a linkage between the national and provincial governments. Ms Gopalakrishnan indicated that while there is a centralised ministry for the entire country, each state has its own government, and they are linked with each other and other centres and departments funded directly by the government. She added that there are also a number of NGOs connected with all these places; she described the intricate network as a web.

Dr Park said that the Sahapedia is quite beautiful and that it will serve as a model project for future ICHCAP activities. He added that he agreed with NGOs getting bigger and more important roles in ICH safeguarding. He said the 2003 Convention is a very democratic one, so it strongly advises Member States to get NGOs and communities involved to participate in the safeguarding process. He asked what she believes are the biggest challenges in maintaining Sahapedia in terms of consuming human and financial resources. Ms Gopalakrishnan said that while they are still in the process of developing the platform, it is a very difficult system to operate; it is very rich in content and features. Sahapedia is lucky, however, to have partnerships with other organisations and there are funds being provided. Since the project is still in the beginning stage, she could not answer Dr Park's question directly, but she did say that there are many funding challenges.

Mr Mancacaritadipura addressed two issues. First, regarding Ms Gopalakrishnan's definition of an NGO, he pointed out that UNESCO's criteria of

an NGO indicates that it must have some level of international capability, a legal personality, and so on. In Indonesia, there are thousands of community-based organisations; however, if he were to apply UNESCO criteria, then there would be very few. He asked Ms Gopalakrishnan to elaborate more on the situation in India. Second, as far as making films for nomination files, he said it is very tricky because he is not a scriptwriter or a director. He wanted to know her opinion about making film versions of nomination files. Ms Gopalakrishnan said the first question is very tough because there are many types and varieties of NGOs in India. She said that one criterion is that it must be a non-profit organisation. The organisations must also be registered societies. They are in many different sectors, so there is no real common parameter that can apply to all of them. As far as filmmaking, she agreed with his assessment that it is a challenge. She elaborated more on her fortune to have had an expert filmmaker at her disposal as it made things much easier.

Professor Bak asked whether any of the participants would be able to elaborate on NGOs, especially in the context of UNESCO. Mr Peralta first entered into the discussion by saying an NGO is a community. However, cannot come up with a universal definition for community. We have to look at it within a certain context within ever-changing parameters.

Professor Aikawa provided information about how UNESCO perceives NGOs. There are several recognised international NGOs that have varying degrees of relationships with UNESCO, and some, such as ICOM, were even created by UNESCO. For proclamation forms, the evaluations are made by such international NGOs, which have special relationships with UNESCO. In Article 9 of the 2003 Convention, it is written that the NGOs make the evaluations because they are operating in the same spirit of UNESCO. Then, when the Operational Directives were being drafted, India asked why only NGOs were involved and that it wasn't fair to other places that have relatively few or no NGOs. So they wanted to include specialised institutions and experts to be eligible to make evaluations. This is the way it has been being developed; there are all kinds of NGOs, institutes, and organisations.

Professor Bak thanked Ms Gopalakrishnan and the discussants for their participation in the topic. After a short recess, Professor Bak opened the floor for the second topic of the day.

Enhancing Regional and Sub-regional Collaboration among ICH Stakeholders

Mr Gauthier, noting that Dr Takahashi mentioned the Living Human Treasures System (LHTS) in one of her examples, inquired about the countries involved with this system. Since it doesn't exist in Canada, he is very unfamiliar with it. Professor Bak opened the question to the participants. Dr Park said that LHTS promotes institutional ICH safeguarding. He mentioned some of the countries that amended their legal systems and established polices to safeguard ICH very early on, in the 1950s and 1960s. Then in the 1990, it was proposed to disseminate the LHTS within the framework of UNESCO activities. At that time, this was a very controversial proposal because the focus was more on tangible and immovable heritage. However, a decision was finally made, and the LHTS was accepted and disseminated among Member States. It could be said that the LHTS was a symbolic project to promote institutional safeguarding. Furthermore, within the ideas of the 2003 Convention, policies and legal support of States Parties are strongly increased, so it is in line with the promotion of the LHTS.

Mr Mancacaritadipura briefly mentioned the Indonesian Maestro Programme, which is similar to the LHTS, but on a much smaller scale. Within this system, the government recognises master practitioners and gives certificates and financial support.

Professor Aikawa asked about how evaluations are done for the LHTS. She said in Korea it seems that designations for intangible cultural properties are done first and then a designated person is evaluated. Professor Hahm said that ICH has many meanings and that the LHTS is similar to the urgent safeguarding list we have today. She provided background into the Korean designation process of the 1960s. At that time, because of the rapid development and industrialisation, Korean traditional life was quickly disappearing as was traditional ICH, especially folklore. This is why the Korean government selected particular cultural items, for example, drama performances, but not many performers were left to maintain the dramas and songs. So among the people who knew of these performances, the person who knew the most was designated as a living human treasure. This person's obligation was to transmit his or her knowledge to future generations, so it is a form of safeguarding ICH in urgent need. She said that this is the basic concept.

Ms Ratunabuabua thanked Dr Takahashi and said that it was interesting to see the linkages among the international, the regional, and sub-regional levels. She pointed out that having the expert networking meeting is a manifestation of

multilevel collaboration because it is giving us a chance to see how we can move forward together. Returning to the topic of LHTS, she asked whether it would be possible for ICHCAP to post on the Centre's website the status of various living human treasures in the region because many countries have done something related to the LHTS and these could be used as models. Dr Park said that her suggestion is one of ICHCAP's planned projects and that ICHCAP has implemented a survey project to identify current policies and legal systems.

Ms Ratunabuabua had a follow up question for ICHCAP. She mentioned a few upcoming festivals on the sub-regional level, including the Pacific Arts Festival, which happens just every four years. She asked whether it would be possible for ICHCAP to network or do research into linking these gatherings, as they are good opportunities to disseminate information about the ICH Convention to artists, creators, and producers that attend the festivals. Dr Park thanked Ms Ratunabuabua for the information about the festivals. He added that ICHCAP is hoping to collaborate in networking both before and during the festivals. We would want to know some information about how we can contact and who to contact. He also said that he wanted to discuss any possible collaboration with dealing with the festival.

Professor Bak thanked Dr Takahashi for her presentation and introduced the final topic of the day.

Intangible Heritage in Canada:
Political Context, Safeguarding Initiatives, and International Cooperation
Mr Mancacaritadipura thanked Mr Gauthier for his frank presentation. He then addressed the reason for why we need inventories. He said it is a question for anyone who wants to make an inventory—why do we need one? Essentially, we need to take stock in what we have; otherwise we will not know how we can safeguard it. Mr Mancacaritadipura likened the situation to having money and leaving some here and there. In a couple of years, you will end up with nothing, wondering where it all went. He said this is the same thing with ICH; if we don't know where and what it is, it will eventually disappear.

Professor Aikawa said Mr Gauthier's presentation gave us new insight on the relationship between economic development and ICH, which is a rather significant aspect. She pointed out to all the participants that UNESCO's medium programme

is focused on the development of MDGs, as Dr Takahashi pointed out earlier. The United Nations has documentary resolutions saying that even though, there is no cultural mention in MDGs but the UN recognises the importance of culture. UNESCO's specific goal is development. Through all the cultural activities, including the World Heritage or ICH, the development is the ultimate objective. She said that she just wanted to remind everyone of these goals. Professor Bak said there was a recent international forum on the in Busan, and during discussions culture came up as an important element in sustainable development.

Dr Park said that the reason Mr Gauthier and Ms Orr were invited to the Asia-Pacific meeting to share different perspectives, expertise, and experiences in the field of ICH safeguarding. He reminded the participants that one of the main reasons for the signing of the MoU on the first day is to build strong international ties in exchanging this kind of information, so Member States can learn how other regions are managing these issues. Once again, thank you for your presentation.

Mr Williams addressed the issue of inventorying. He said that in the Cook Islands, it was a big area of debate for a long time. He told of a story where an old man said that if you want to know the history of the Jews you can buy a Bible, but if you want to know our history, you cannot get it anywhere. He also said that the spread out nature of the Cook Islands makes it particularly susceptible to losing ICH, especially with a change from a monoculture to a multicultural society. He also mentioned that the recent economic crunch around the world has increased the need to sustain traditional methods of boat making and sailing. This shows a form of sustainable development through ICH, and it is related to why we are keeping inventories.

Ms Ratunabuabua first congratulated Mr Gauthier and Ms Orr for their organisations' accreditation as NGOs. She mentioned the importance of statistics and inventory making from a government point of view to prove the worth of this industry. She asked about his and other participants' thoughts on safeguarding in multi-ethnic communities, especially for minorities in those communities. She also said that inventories are important ways of giving recognition to communities because it creates a lasting record. Mr Gauthier said that he isn't against inventorying, but that he believes who is going to be using the inventory and for what purposes should be considered. He then addressed the matter of minorities by giving a background to the two types of citizens in Canada—there are the natives who have special privileges, and there are the rest—so there are different approaches

in dealing with minority groups, but they are mostly handled through NGOs.

Mr Peralta returned to the matter of inventories. He said that it isn't so much about naming or listing the elements. The most important matter is that the inventory also includes the processes involved with element. He used an example of making baskets: If you destroy a basket, then you have destroyed just one. But if you destroy or forget about the process of making a basket, then no baskets will ever exist again. Mr Peralta said that in making an inventory we focus on documenting the process as well. Mr Gauthier replied that using the inventory for transmission of processes is good, but that the target audience should still be considered because there is a difference between creating a site for promotion and creating one for information.

Professor Bak closed the topic and the third session. She thanked everyone for being attentive and informative. She said that everyone worked hard and produced a valuable outcome.

Plenary Discussion: Adopting a Collaborative Agenda for Safeguarding ICH in the Asia-Pacific Region

Moderator
Seong-Yong Park, Acting Director, ICHCAP

Rapporteur
Adi Meretui Tuvou Ratunabuabua, Principal Cultural Development Officer, Ministry of Education, National Heritage, Culture and Arts

Dr Park began the plenary discussion by reviewing the main point—namely, to discuss feasible suggestions for the Centre's future tasks. Ms Ratunabuabua said she had a draft of a basic report of the three days of meetings and restated that participants were invited to submit recommendations or suggestions for collaborative work in the Asia-Pacific Region. She gave a brief summary of the networking meeting before going over the submissions.

The submitted recommendations and suggestions are as follows.

1. ICHCAP's roles at the institutional level

Provide information about the strategic short-term, mid-term, and long-term priorities as decided at the first Governing Board Meeting of ICHCAP board and communicate this information to ICHCAP partners.

2. Build networks among communities, groups, and individuals concerned to reinforce transmission and dissemination of ICH, by organising public events and meetings at the regional and international levels.

In relation to the other Asia-Pacific Category 2 Centres in China, Japan, and Iran, articulate the roles of ICHCAP and provide a brief statement on the differences in their functions and priority actions, and communicate through information networks.

Organise sub-regional meetings among people of a common region, so there

is networking and sharing among people of the same/similar common cultural heritage on themes of common interest.

3. Strengthen international and regional networks for the exchange of knowledge and information.

Strengthen networking and information sharing with strategic partners at the international level through NGOs from the Asia-Pacific region and other regions and State Parties implementing the Convention and those States intending to become signatories.

The meeting recommended ICHCAP develop to act as a clearing house and produce a comprehensive database with information on each country and region. This data should include country information, cultural specifications and practices, and safeguarding efforts as well as audio-visual movies, interviews, and other materials related to documentation.

4. Establish an information system to ensure effective ICH data management through the construction of a database to support ICH identification and documentation, to conserve and digitise archival materials, and to support the development of metadata standards.

The meeting recommended that ICHCAP, in partnership with State Parties, conduct a mapping of experts and community-based organisations in the Asia-Pacific region involved in cultural mapping, groups, individuals, and networks.

5. Use accumulated ICH data for dissemination purposes to produce and publish informational and promotional materials and to promote the protection of intellectual property rights of the ICH bearers and practitioners included in documentation and recordings carried out for inventories, nominations, and informational materials;

There were discussions about linking ICHCAP's website to WIPO's website and

other IP-related that have examples of legislation for protecting intangible heritage and/or traditional knowledge and cultural expressions.

Ms Ratunabuabua wrapped up her presentation by stating that the summaries for days two and three would be forthcoming and sent via e-mail. Dr Park thanked Ms Ratunabuabua for her hard work and opened the floor for additional comments from participants. Ms Soltongeldieva suggested that ICHCAP invite other Category 2 Centres to be involved with meetings, conferences, and other activities. Dr Park said he invited many participants, but due to time restrictions and schedule conflicts, some were unable to participate.

Professor Galla, referencing a technique used at the 6.COM meeting in Bali, suggested having live streaming video of ICHCAP's meetings as a way of disseminating information covered. Dr Park said that it is possible, but that costs are a concern. Professor Galla said that it is expensive in some countries, but that Korea already has a lot of the hardware, so costs shouldn't be prohibitive. Dr Park said ICHCAP should work towards developing something and look into the costs.

Dr Park again thanked Ms Ratunabuabua for her work and he expressed his appreciation for the participants' active involvement in the meeting.