

ICOMOS Asia Pacific Regional Network
FOURTH REGIONAL MEETING

Date: **Sunday 24th April 2022**
Time: **14:00 Beijing Time**
Hosted by: **ICOMOS Thailand**
Chaired by: **Jiang Bo and Hatthaya Siriphatthanakun**

NOTES

(Please inform the Steering Committee if there are any corrections to be made)

Participants:

Teresa Patricio (President/Belgium) [TP]	Ju Yun JUNG (Korea) [JJ]
Hatthaya Siriphatthanakun (EM/Thailand) [HS]	Kian Boon Tiong (ST/Malaysia) [KT]
Takeyuki Obuko (EM/Japan) [TO]	Su Su (Myanmar) [SS]
Nupur Prothi Khanna (EM/India) [NK]	Ohnmar Myo (Myanmar) [OM]
Stacy Vallis (EM/ New Zealand) [SV]	Brian Win Thant (Myanmar)* [BT]
Gabriel Caballero (SDGWG) [GC]	Kai Weise (ST/Nepal) [KW]
Tracy Ireland (Australia) [TI]	Anie Joshi (Nepal) [AJ]
Sharif Shams Imon (Bangladesh) [SI]	Shristina Shrestha (Nepal) [SS]
YAN Haiming (ST/China) [YH]	Ian Bowman (New Zealand) [IB]
Soehardi Hartono (Indonesia) [SH]	Fauzia Qureshi (Pakistan) [FQ]
Sugiri Kustedja (Indonesia) [SK]	Saima Gulzar (Pakistan) [SG]
Mahnaz Ashrafi (Iran) [MA]	Shahana Zubair (Pakistan) [SZ]
Mehrdad Hejazi (Iran) [MH]	Maria Cristina Tina Paterno (ST/Philippines) [MP]
Yasuyoshi Okada (Japan) [YO]	Phann Nady (Cambodia) [PN]
Yumi Akieda (Japan) [YA]	Alex Yen (Taiwan) [AY]
Aya Miyazaki (Japan) [YM]	Muhammad Daniel Bina Abd Manap (?)*
GIL Jihye (Korea)* [GJ]	

Regrets:

Jiang Bo (VP/China) [JB]	Navin Piplani (India) [NP]
Peter Phillips (EM/Australia) [PP]	Shalini Dasgupta (India) [SD]
Ona Vileikis (Belgium) [OV]	Patrick Lee (Taiwan) [PL]

Summary

1. The ICOMOS Asia Pacific Regional meetings were found to be a wonderful means of sharing experiences, disseminating information and discussing issues. The format of having short presentations has been rewarding. These topics could lead to further activities and events. The next meeting is to be organized in the coming months. [To consider end of June.]
2. To work together with the secretariat and the Asia Pacific Network to get individual members from countries without a national committee, and to facilitate the establishment of national committees in interested countries. [Cambodia, Vietnam, Uzbekistan, Bhutan, etc.]
3. To fully establish the Steering Committee with six members (still requiring two EP members), to function till after the next elections of International Vice Presidents, taking place in August 2023, when three members will retire, allowing for three new members to be elected. To further clarify and finalize the roles and responsibilities of the Steering Committee. [The possibility of nominating the Vice President through the Regional Network to be further discussed.] Note: presently there are four Steering Committee members: Kai Weise (Nepal), Tina Paterno (Philippines), Tiong Kian Boon (Malaysia) and Haiming YAN (China).
4. To carry out further discussions on the 'Asia Pacific approach to Heritage Conservation', building on the presentations made during the meeting, taking into account, for example the Burra Charter, the Nara Document on Authenticity, the concept of '*seibi*', the concept of living heritage, and discussing the factors affecting the heritage properties and the examples of appropriate responses. To use the 'Heritage Alert' by ICOMOS International to raise awareness of threats to specific sites.
5. To contribute to the global discussions on issues, such as by submitting comments for the Mondiacult World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development [To contact Gabe: gabriel.caballero@icomos.org]
6. To collaborate with other regional networks such as the Asian Network for Industrial Heritage (ANIH) [To contact Alex: alexyen@cute.edu.tw]
7. To discuss the possibility of contributing to the ICOMOS AGA 2022 taking place in Thailand from 25 to 30 October 2022 [To contact Hatthaya: hatthaya.siriphat@icomos.org] and the ICOMOS GA 2023 that will take place in Australia from 31 August to 9 September 2023 [To contact Stacy: tracy.ireland@canberra.edu.au].

1 Introduction

Hatthaya Siriphatthanakun (Thailand/EM International) welcomed all the participants in the name of Jiang Bo (China/VP International) who was not able to attend. The ICOMOS International President Teresa Patricio was welcomed. The agenda was adopted. It was agreed that Kai Weise would be the rapporteur for this meeting. It was agreed that the chair will keep time. In future the EP members who will join the Steering Team will be preparing the meeting minutes and timekeeping.

2 APA Network status – presented by Kai Weise (Nepal)

The ICOMOS AP Network is under the umbrella of the International Committee of ICOMOS. Asia Pacific is well represented with six International Board Members, from Thailand, Korea, Japan, Australia, India and New Zealand. It is a good time to establish the ICOMOS Asia Pacific regional network when there is such good representation from the region in the International Board. Ona Vileikis is assisting in coordinating with the Central Asian members. Gabriel Caballero, the focal point for the SDGs Working Group has also been active. There were also ongoing discussions with the Secretariat in Paris on setting up this network.

There are 20 National Committees in the ICOMOS Asia Pacific regional network. One of them, Pacifika, being a Cluster Committee, which still needs clarification on how it functions. We can further discuss how we can support each other. Some National Committees are much larger and functioning much better than others. Some might need further support, and this network is in a position to support those who might be struggling slightly.

There are additionally individual members from Taiwan, Uzbekistan, Maldives and Vietnam, which do not have a National Committee. This list still needs to be updated. There is a further list of possible future National Committees, such as Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos, Maldives, Bhutan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. Some of these are in touch such as Cambodia and recently Vietnam. There might be interest in Bhutan and Ona is looking into the possibility of Uzbekistan. These can be discussed further, but at least the individual members should get involved with the regional network.

We would like to increase members from those countries that do not have National Committees. Recommendations are welcome from everyone. We would also assist in establishing National Committees where it might be beneficial. This would be more of a long-term plan. We hope this will help to strengthen regional networking and collaboration, as we get better organized.

3 Establishment of Steering Team- presented by Tina Paterno (Philippines)

The Asia Pacific Regional Bureau, or Steering Committee [Steering Team] was being established to assist those who had already been involved in the running network. This was based on a starter document prepared by Peter Phillips on 9 June 2021. Some additions and changes are being proposed to the original document. Instead of four members (two from National Committees, one EP and one co-opted from areas that do not have a National Committee), it has been proposed to have six (four from National Committees, two EP, with the possibility of co-opting members at a later date).

The term was initially one year on trial basis. It has been proposed to extend it to three years. It would be co-terminus with the international board. It would also be staggered to keep the institutional memory. So for example, by 2023, three of the six members would remain, while three would retire. There would then be three new elected officials. It is proposed that this be part of the regional meetings, which would review the effectiveness of the Bureau [Steering Team], and carry out the elections of the three new officials. It has also been proposed to have a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms.

The roles and responsibilities of the Steering Team.

- (1) To facilitate / enable meetings between countries for thematic collaborations. This links back to the survey carried out last year with various theme, and almost everyone wanted to work in smaller groups, on topics they were interested in. There were four countries willing to lead discussions, while eight other themes did not have leads. These meetings could be ushered in before or after the regional meetings, which is something the Steering Team can enable.
- (2) To propose long and short term strategy and objectives for approval.
- (3) To set-up a system that facilitates regional networking (Facebook, meetings, sharing calendars).
- (4) To report on the discussions related to the 'Asia Pacific identity'.
- (5) To support countries looking to set-up National Committees by inviting them to meetings and facilitating informal exchanges with their representatives The Steering Committee [Steering Team] can recommend these representatives to ICOMOS International for the formalities and legalities of the procedure.

This document can be accessed under google docs for review and comments:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/18ZxYVN_YZf6fZH6Bk3LQ1cXRWgDt3Yyo/edit#

[KW] This team would continue till the AGM in 2023, and three members would remain and continue for a further three years, with three new members joining in. That is if we have three members who are willing to continue and we have three new members willing to join. If not we will have to arrange things accordingly.

4 Short presentations on 18 April celebrations and lessons

4a CHINA - Presented by YAN Haiming

There were 12 cities with 32 activities on this very special topic on Heritage and Climate. The secretariat of ICOMOS China held a scientific seminar with scholars from not only the heritage fields, such as meteorology and environment, to share their experience on climate change and its impact on heritage. This was live-streamed for the first time, and there were over 30,000 people who watched, which was a very big number. It was a very good event, which was also interactive. The proceedings of this event will be coming out later this year, which will hopefully be in Chinese and English.

Additionally there were various scientific committees, individual members and institutional members that organized different kind of events. Tsinghua University and the ICOMOS China Committee for Historic Towns and Villages hosted a seminar on historic cities and the impact of climate. In Wuhan, for the annual event on shared heritage, a public lecture was given by a famous scientist on climate and heritage. The YinXu Museum in Henan Province, that experience heavy flooding last year due to climate change, had a lively discussion on the topic. The Han Yangling Museum in Xi'an celebrated the day with the public, including the elementary schools, to discuss their thoughts on climate change and heritage.

Every year ICOMOS China is dedicated to celebrate the International Day for Monuments and Sites. During the past three years we tried to combine virtual with physical meetings. Virtual meetings are being continued since more people can participate online. However, it is hoped that more physical meetings can be held next year.

4b PHILIPPINES AND NEPAL – Presented by Anie Joshi

This is an overview of a joint event organized between ICOMOS Nepal and ICOMOS Philippines. The topic was on 'People, Place and Culture shaping the Architecture'. The built heritage in different parts of the world is influence by climate and the culture. The vernacular architecture was analyzed on

how it developed in response to the climate, with the available material, how they evolved over time and how the local communities have adapted to Climate Change.

In preparation ICOMOS Nepal organized a national event where 14 examples from various regions of Nepal were presented. This then led to the joint event between ICOMOS Nepal and Philippines. Two of examples were then presented from each country. Vernacular architecture has been adapting to the changing circumstances. Climate change has demanded more frequent maintenance and certain adaptations. Comparisons can be made between both countries for example with the vulnerability of thatched roofs to typhoons and heavy rain. This was then replaced with tiled roofing, and then with corrugated metal roofing. The question that was raised was whether the corrugated metal roofing used in vernacular buildings reduces their vulnerability. Then there was the discussion on the impact on the authenticity of these buildings. There was also the concern that the traditional craftsmanship is diminishing in many parts of the world, for the continuity of the built heritage and their maintenance. Through these discussions, it was possible to compare the situation in the two countries. Hopefully these discussions can be continued through the regional network. For example the assessment that was done by ICOMOS Philippines after the Super Typhoon Odette can be disseminated. A modality can be set up to share such information throughout the region.

[MP] It was very fruitful, the comparison in different location and climate. It was also more efficient to work together and there seems to have been interest in learning from each other's conditions. The collaboration also underlined the international nature of ICOMOS and even volunteers were more interested because it was international. Something like this can only be done by ICOMOS and it is something that can definitely be scaled up. This international collaboration is underutilised, and where we can go with this is limitless. As a region if we provide broader talks, fundraising events, and there is a greater potential, more comprehensive information can be put out, with less work.

4c KOREA – presented by GIL Jihye

An ICOMOS forum 'Heritage and Climate Change' was organized in Korea by the National Scientific Committee on Climate Change and Cultural Heritage. The forum is a regular event held every two months. On 31st March 2022 a hybrid meeting was organized in the office located in the UNESCO house in Seoul. There were three presentations and a discussion session. The first presentation was on the Climate Change Policy in Korea. The Third Climate Change Adaptation Plan has been established, which also states the need for further research on the impact of climate change on heritage. The second presentation was on the Current Status of Heritage and Climate Change Response, focusing on minimizing the impact of wind, flood and fire and the need for active involvement of cultural heritage in reducing climate change in the future. The third presentation was on Cultural Heritage and Carbon Emission Reduction Planning, which needs to be included in the cultural heritage policy and carbon emission needs to be monitored.

The International Day for Monuments and Sites was a good opportunity to share Climate Change discussions in the field of Cultural Heritage, and many people including researchers, students and site managers participated, giving insight into the integrated approach to climate change adaptation and mitigation. ICOMOS Korea has seven National Scientific Committees, with the NSC on Climate Change and Cultural Heritage being launch in 2020 with 13 members currently, carrying out seminars, field trips, translation of 'The Future of Our Pasts' and establishing a Comprehensive Plan for Climate Change in the Cultural Heritage sector.

5 Discussion on the Asia Pacific Approach to Heritage

Facilitated by Nupur Prothi Khanna

5a Heritage Practice in Australia: The Burra Charter – presented by Tracy Ireland

The presentation is on the history of heritage conservation, focusing on the Burra Charter, which is the dominant instrument developed by Australia ICOMOS. Australia ICOMOS is independent of government and has been set up to be an independent voice to government. The modern heritage movement in Australia was influenced by a range of grassroots, community based movements in the 1960s and 1970s. That flavour has continued through into the present. The indigenous rights movements have been significant, but also the green bands movement based on trade unions, activism for banning demolition and other activities on heritage grounds. While the Burra Charter was an initiative of the professions, there was community support and government took notice of this because it was at the time when Australia was getting involved in signing the World Heritage Convention and mirroring legislation.

The **Burra Charter** turned 40 years old in 2019, and the Australia ICOMOS members took the opportunity to reflect upon its legacy and its future. The Charter is periodically reviewed by ICOMOS members as a membership activity (1979, 1981, 1988, 1999, 2013), not on any schedule but respond to consultation with the membership around current issues and how they might need to be responded to. Current version from 2013 has been adopted by most states and territories in Australia. In the 1970s when the Burra Charter was developed, it was designed to be an alternative to the approach to heritage (to that found in the Venice Charter) that suited local conditions in Australia, and the colonial and post-colonial context. Also, its original authors were concerned to make a statement, challenging Euro-centric and colonial establishments of heritage. So it took to task the definition of ‘sites’ and ‘monuments’ and replaced those terms in the Australian context with ‘**places of cultural significance**’, and suggested that significance needed to be established by a public and transparent process prior to making management decisions.

The focus around the Burra Charter was very much about having a document that worked in the Australian conditions, but this did not stop Australian members wanting to promulgate those ideas more broadly. There was a review undertaken of the Venice Charter, but the findings of the review committee presented at the 1978 General Assembly in Moscow, were that no amendments were necessary. It was again revisited at the ICOMOS meeting in 2004, the celebration of 40 years of the Venice Charter, but again no changes were found necessary. ‘Recurrent initiatives both within and outside ICOMOS to amend or substitute the (Venice) Charter are based upon an incomplete understanding or misrepresentation of it’ (Burke 2004: 56).

To conclude, the following are the key aspects of the Burra Charter, based on practice. The Burra Charter introduced a concept of ‘**social value**’ and the notion that communities should be involved in determining that value. It places social values on an equal footing with the other sorts of values that we usually see arbitrated by the professions. These values are summarized as the historical, aesthetic and scientific values. It does promote a useful holistic approach. While many of the states and territories around Australia have adopted the Burra Charter, more legalistic versions of heritage significance now predominate in the Australian system which see more legalised definitions. A final point is that because the Burra Charter is very careful to separate economic decisions from cultural value, this has perhaps isolated heritage practice from developments around better arguments, around **economic values** and **community wellbeing values** of heritage in Australia. That is one of the areas that we see as a challenge for the future.

5b JAPAN (Nara Document) – presented by Yasuyoshi Okada / Yumi Akieda

This presentation was on a few issues in current Japanese approaches to conservation. For the presentation, these were summarized under three main topics: (1) core concepts such as authenticity, restoration/reconstruction and ‘**seibi**’ which is a specifically Japanese concept; (2) Engagements for heritage sites in Japan, especially the recent heritage alert; (3) Commitment to World Heritage in Japan and dialogue with national authorities.

Ever since the Nara Conference, **authenticity** has been in the core of our concerns. In recent months, the concept has again been actively discussed through the example of the Kintaikyo Bridge in Yamaguchi Prefecture. Through this example alternative viewpoints could be compared in respect to material authenticity. The bridge is built of wood over stone foundations, first constructed in the 1670s. The bridges wooden members have been totally replaced over the course of history after being lost due to floods and typhoons. The original construction techniques have been handed down to the present through detailed and precise documentation of the wooden members that had to withstand the weather. This bridge is one of the iconic cases when we consider Japanese approaches to authenticity, alongside the cases of Ise Shrine and its ritual rebuilding, or the case of Horyu-ji Temple, which through repairs still retains a large number of original members from 1300 years ago.

The Japanese practice of repair and conservation, especially for built structure, puts us constantly face to face with different aspects of restoration, reconstruction, rebuilding. In Japan, these concepts lie at the very core of practice and constantly challenge each other, and there is constant effort made to understand them better in the light of international documents such as the Venice Charter, the 1990 Lausanne Charter, or of course the Nara Document. A probably less known concept is ‘**seibi**’, which cannot be translated with a single English term. A recent proposal was to translate it as ‘integrated management’. However, it involves different developments according to the nature of the site and/or the kind of intervention in question. Recently ‘**seibi**’ has come to the forefront in discussions especially in relationship with archaeological sites inscribed in World Heritage.

In ICOMOS Japan we engage in advocacy in heritage as an independent expert organization, that can draw from international lessons for the benefit of sites at national and local levels. Recently there have been several cases of concern in urban and landscape contexts. The railway site of the Takanawa Chikutei Embankment is one of them, for which we called upon ICOMOS International to issue a worldwide **Heritage Alert**. Takanawa Chikutei Embankment is Japan’s oldest railway site located in the centre of Tokyo alongside one of the busiest lines of road and rail transport, and in a densely developed urban context. There was a press release and a statement in the ICOMOS International website. The structure was discovered miraculously in 2019 practically in its original state. It is a coastal embankment which extended for 2.7 kilometres. It was built using an extremely unique construction method that combined traditional Japanese stone wall technique. This site is not only a precious piece of railway heritage, but also testifies, that Edo, the city of the Shogun, was reborn as Tokyo, the modern capital of Japan. Responding to the call, ICOMOS issued a Heritage Alert to immediately suspend the ongoing excavation, recording and destruction cycle to allow much wider public access to the site and a review of developments that would allow to fully preserve the remaining sections of the site in their entirety and in situ. But the alert has not yet been successful in changing the course of destruction at this exceptional site.

ICOMOS Japan is committed to stay focusing as a committee of experts, but always be open to dialogue. For example, for World Heritage, engagement is not only with the local government interested in nominations, but also at national level for the revision of Japan’s Tentative List for World Heritage. Engagement is also in the means of managing sites after inscription, by developing a system for Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and monitoring the sites. These projects are still in preparation. These initiatives can hopefully be reported on to the ICOMOS regional network in future.

5c NEPAL – presented by Kai Weise (with comments from India - Navin Piplani)

The following points were sent by Navin Piplani, President of ICOMOS India, as a contribution to the discussion on the Asia-Pacific approach to heritage. “One of the most important aspects - **'Living Heritage'**, which is not entirely the same as Intangible Cultural Heritage, but is a part of it. The second important concern - **linkage of heritage with livelihood and craft**. This is again a distinguishing factor from the western approach where traditional crafts and craftsmanship are highly vulnerable and threatened for survival. In this part of the world, the situation is much more favorable and promising. Thirdly - **Conservation and Development** need to be inextricably dovetailed. In contexts such as India, and many other countries in the global south, development is key for employment, education, health, local economy etc. and it will be counterproductive to pose 'conservation' as an impediment in the way of development. We, as heritage professionals, are to be seen as facilitators and not obstructionists!”

These points can be examined using the example of Kathmandu after the 2015 Gorkha Earthquake. There was a lot of destruction and once we started analysing this more in detail, we found that a lot of the destruction was caused due to the lack of maintenance and inappropriate interventions, where strengthening of the monuments were carried out with materials that were not compatible with the traditional materials. The initial understanding was that the traditional structures were not stable, but the reasons for collapse were that they were not sufficiently or appropriately maintained.

After the earthquake many of the elements were salvaged, and whatever possible was reused. As a comparison, there are a lot of chariot festivals in the Kathmandu Valley, such as the Seto Machhendranath Chariot of Kathmandu City. Every year this chariot is rebuilt and pulled through the streets of Kathmandu, and then disassembled. Because it is done every year, those responsible have regular practice of putting the chariot together and then take it apart. The chariot is put together in maybe two week and a lot of material is reused, but some adaptations can be seen, with strengthening using metal elements. They do not take material authenticity seriously, but have regular practice in erecting the chariot. This is an example of how the skills and the traditions are passed on every year. is done every year, which allows it to be tested.

In Kathmandu there is the good fortune that there are still artisans to rebuild the monuments. For example there is the Kasthamandap which was rebuilt using traditional materials and technology. So the heritage value would in this case lie in the traditional materials, methodology of reconstructing and the skills of the artisans. We need to look at where the values lie. It is not only on the authenticity of the structure itself. Here things keep having to be changed. It lies in the means of being able to maintain and restore the structures in an appropriate manner.

In respect to this change in approach, I have been working on the management of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage and its monument zones. The main focus is of course on the immovable heritage, the landscape and the built heritage. what we have been discussing more frequently is how we deal with movable heritage, the cultural artefacts. After the earthquake we had a lot of destruction, a lot of cultural artefacts were displaced. These might have been images or elements of buildings. The question was how to deal with trying to put these back. Can they still function the way they were functioning. A structural element would still need to retain its ability to hold up the structure. If we replace it, how do we replace it, and what do we do with the original material? And then there are the intangible heritage aspects, such as rituals linked directly to a place or monument, and also the skills and the knowledge of the artisans to be able to maintain and rebuild after the earthquake. We have been working on setting up some procedures for the protection of immovable heritage, movable heritage and intangible heritage. This has been a very interesting discussion which has not been finalized. The significance of heritage seems to clearly lie beyond the focus on the material. This would be something really interesting to discuss on a regional basis.

During the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Asia and the Pacific Region (2010-2012) a lot of information was collected on the factors affecting World Heritage properties. There is a publication. Comparisons were made between the sub-regions, and the individual sites. What happened to all this information? It was never used. These are the types of discussions we need to conduct at the regional level. The Third Cycle has recently been completed. Can this also be something that we can continue discussing?

5d Discussions - Facilitated by Nupur Prothi Khanna (India/EM International)

[NK] The presentations brought out some important points, the Australian Burra Charter, the Japanese concept of 'Seibi' and the Heritage Alert. The example from Nepal showed the importance of bringing together the site, built, artefacts and belief. This is the region where cultural landscapes began being nominated for World Heritage, we have brought all the aspects together for nominating landscapes. Can we have consider having an event or be involved in some manner in next year's ICOMOS GA in Sydney?

[TP] We are facing a lot of tremendous disasters and catastrophes, natural and human conflicts, such as the huge problem we are facing in Europe. More and more we need to have a holistic approach to conservation, and more and more we need to think of '**living heritage**'. If we preserve monuments, sites and heritage places without the people, we are losing everything. That is possibly the next theme that ICOMOS must address. Another important consideration is for World Heritage in the Asia Pacific and the **impact of development**. We need to clarify what our approach will be, how we deal with it, since ICOMOS is not against development, of course, but we need to preserve some ecosystems: natural and human ecosystems. How can we preserve some heritage sites, with the living heritage, where there is big pressure for development? These are our big concerns for the future that should be addressed by all.

[TI] The three presentation were similar, though using different terms for similar concepts. The term 'living heritage' seems to have great resonance with this particular group. I presented on challenges around 'heritage and wellbeing', and the 'economic vitality of communities', which are very much the concerns of living heritage. There is very strong grounds to move forward with this discussion, as a shared concern in our region.

The theme of the **GA2023 is 'Heritage Changes'**, and it has already set up a platform to take these issues forward. The theme considers the challenges that heritage is facing, such as those mentioned by Theresa, and how our actions as professions need to change. I would be happy to take the discussion to the convener and the co-chairs of the scientific symposium, Ona and Steve, to come back with some more practical and concrete suggestions on exactly where this network could plug in to the GA programme. The concerns of the GA are very aligned to the concerns articulated here.

[NK] The PechaKucha style of presentations, not only during this meeting, but also the previous one, have been very interesting, and have already set the standard for these meetings. China engaged not only heritage experts but other departments. Philippines and Nepal have shown the way forward by collaborating. Korea presented on the legal system and change. These are already topic for an event.

[SH] Greetings from ICOMOS Indonesia. We are honoured to be part of this network and a good opportunity and look forward to wider collaboration. We share similar concerns. The conservation experts are becoming aware of the UNESCO recommendation of the **Historic Urban Landscape**. This brings the Asia Pacific community, since we share the same challenges and concerns, which are different from those in Europe and Africa.

[FQ] It is an honour to be here with these very interesting and important discussions taking place. Very relevant points have been raised, for the Asia Pacific, and even more so for South Asia. Living heritage and development, these are crucial points, which we face every day. For example our shrines, there are craftsman, there are pilgrims, their actions lead to changes within these religious sites, and how important it is to look at it from the Venice Charter, the Burra Charter and the Nara Document. For example Lahore, it is a living city. Do we need to conserve the fabric or the living heritage, which is also going through a process of change? This requires a lot of discussions to address them.

[NK] We cannot change the world in one sitting, but we will change the world. I thank Navin for his contribution and Kai for pulling in these comments in his presentation. To wrap up, a thought: **SDG Goal 17**, on partnerships and collaborations, that is an important way forward for each of our NCs, and ICOMOS overall, and the suggestion is that every time we have an event or meetings that are not confidential, we must invite guests from other professions. That has had such a huge impact, since the non-believers get converted after the session, and they contribute in their own way.

6 The Asian Network for Industrial Heritage ANIH - Alex Yen (Individual Member)

Celebration activities in Taiwan focused on the “Exchange Forum for International Organization of Cultural Preservations”, with international NGOs, on how to attract young people to participate. Emerging Young Professionals from various organizations were involved – ICOMOS, ICOM, IUCN, TICCIH, Docomomo, etc. The **Climate Justice and Equity Toolkit** was launched. The initiative of Advancing Taiwan in Joining International Non-governmental Organization of Cultural Preservation, was established to improve international linkage, collaboration, co-learning and youth participation.

During TICCIH Congress 2012 in Taiwan, the ‘**Taipei Declaration on the Conservation of Industrial Heritage**’ was adopted and ‘Asia Route of Industrial Heritage’ was proposed. This led to the establishment of ANIH, the **Asian Network of Industrial Heritage** in 2018, with the mission of multilateral communication, information sharing and transnational collaboration. Information was provided on ANIH: <https://anlh.culture.tw>

7 Mondiacult World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development - Gabriel Caballero (SDGWG Focal Point)

The conference is taking place in September 2022, invited by UNESCO and the government of Mexico. This started in 1982 in Mexico when culture was defined as ‘the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group’. Culture encompasses ways of life, the fundamental rights of human beings, value systems, traditions and beliefs. This was the foundation for the 2003 Intangible Cultural Heritage and the 2005 Cultural Diversity, as well as for Culture being part of the SDGs. In this next conference, the issues of Covid 19, conflicts, inequalities, climate change, etc. are being discussed and the need for new policies. The conference will also focus on regional perspectives and priorities of UNESCO leading up to 2030. The discussions of the ICOMOS Asia Pacific Network could contribute to this. The main discussions are on: What is the role of culture in the changing paradigm and new public policy? Further information can be found on <https://www.unesco.org/en/mondiaacult2022/timeline>

The summary of issues that have been compiled from the different regions are the following:

- Heritage and the Climate Emergency. Climate change will affect the successful implementation of the SDGs
- Role of civil society in the process of cultural policy
- Restitution of trafficked cultural goods
- Cultural pluralism, cultural rights
- Transversal value of cultural heritage to social life

- Culturally focused economic development
- Cultural heritage as an important component of the UN SDGs, VNRs and VLRs

During the many events, one of the suggests was to work towards ensuring a separate Cultural Goal in the next UN Agenda. ICOMOS setting up activities for Mondiacult 2022. Everyone is encouraged to participate in the discussion: What do heritage practitioners believe are important issues to highlight to UNESCO for cultural policies in the future?

The main points that were noted down from this meeting to be passed on were:

- Importance of living heritage and how to deal with the process of change;
- Recognition that development pressures are intense in the region because of the rapidly changing cities. Historic Urban Landscape is a potential approach that is already being applied in some countries in the region;
- There is a need to develop policies that addresses the realities of the region. There are experiences developed in Australia, Japan, India & Nepal that have emerged or beginning to emerge;
- Partnerships and collaborations (SDG17) are important to push for new ideas. Working with people outside the heritage sector enriches the heritage practice;
- Civil society has a role in crafting cultural policies and it should not just be the sole responsibility of UNESCO or governments to define policies that will affect future practice.

Further contributions to this discussion to be sent by end of May to gabriel.caballero@icomos.org

8 Information on ICOMOS AGM Thailand (October 2022) - Hatthaya Siriphatthanakun (Thailand/EM International)

Further discussions on the Steering Team

[MP] The present members will remain till 2023. There are supposed to be six members, which means a further two EPs are meant to join. In 2023, out of the six, three will relinquish their seats and open to three others, who would start a new three year term.

[HS] So for this team it will be from 2021 to 2023. Then the next team can start till 2026.

[TP] It is a very good idea to this steering committee is being organized. AP is a very big region with very different countries. What is the role of the Vice President of ICOMOS?

[MP] The ICOMOS Vice President has the overall responsibility for this, we are here to assist him.

[KW] We are here to help the Board Members and the Chair of this whole setup would be the Vice President. The steering team would be set up again after the term of the new or renewed term of the Vice President begins. The new Steering Team would be set up under the guidance of the new Vice President, who would chair the process, the Vice President and the Board Members.

[TP] An advice for the regional groups, it would be nice if the regions would identify the candidate for being Vice President, to represent them in the Board. We sometimes have a problem with the elections when members present themselves individually and they divide the votes and you do not have a good candidate. Maybe this should be considered in the roles of procedures for the Steering Committee.

[KW] We thank Teresa for recommending how we get a Vice President to represent our region. This might also be something that can be discussed at the International level, to identify who this would work. If the region is going to be working more closely with the Vice President, which would be beneficial to establish this regional collaboration through the Vice President, and then on to the

International discussions, that coordination and how it works might need to be looked at for all the regions. This might be something to discuss on the international Board. This would be supporting the board, the elected Board that represents ICOMOS.

[HS] There is need to carry out activities at the regional level, dealing with the regional issues, while the board is more concerned with the global agenda. The Steering Team can help strengthen the response to such concerns, for the Board and the Vice President. Since this is the beginning of establishing the system, the involvement of the Steering Team and the Board needs to be improved.

[KT] Possibly the process would need to be that nominations are invited from each of the regions, rather than just of Asia Pacific. Another point is that we are here because we are interesting in advancing the interests of the region within the region itself and sharing among ourselves. We are a very diverse region, as seen in the presentations, the issues that are coming up are very diverse and very interesting, and give us the opportunity to learn from each other. Since there will be a Vice President from Asia Pacific, we would willingly give the chair to the Vice President, or the most senior Board Member can take that role. We do not want to campaign for any one particular candidate from the Asia Pacific Region, since it would not be fare to the other regions.

[TP] It is not only for the Asia Pacific Region. It will be open to all the regions and all the regions will vote for the Vice President of this region. Since this region is so large and diverse, it is a good idea to have a Steering Committee, a group of people, three or six national committees, whatever is decided, to help the Vice President. The Vice President is the voice of the region in the Board. Then there is the Bureau, which is composed only of the Vice Presidents, the President and the Sectary General. So it is very important for the region to have a good representative, to bring the issues to the Bureau level after the regional meetings. Last elections we had a problem with the Arab Region, since it was a real pity that they were not able to have a Vice President elected. This is a problem for the Arab countries. Two colleagues from the Arab Region are invited to follow the work of the Board. Such situations need to be avoided. This would need to be discussed between you, but during the elections everyone will be voting.

Presentation of ICOMOS AGA 2022 by Hatthaya Siriphatthanakun

The ICOMOS AGA this year will be held in Thailand in Udon Thani, in the northeast part of the country. The official announcement will be made soon. It will be from 25 to 30 October 2022. The Scientific Symposium will be on 29 to 30 October, hosted by PRERICO, in collaboration with ICLAFI and ICAHM. ICOMOS Thailand is preparing the website, and registration which will be launched soon. It will be a hybrid event. The Scientific Symposium is planning on having the on-line platform as well, and a time that is best for everyone. As per the draft programme we will have the usual regional meetings, which is normally one or two hours. But if we plan other side events, in parallel, after launching the official programme, maybe we can see whether there is a gap that we would like to propose any activities for. This can be discussed with the local hosts to find a venue for our regional discussion.

9 Vote of thanks - Takeyuki Okubo (Japan/EM International)

The Vice President Jiang Bo and the organizers of the important meeting were thanked. Many lessons were learned, providing ideas to move forward on. The speakers and the participants were thanked.

10 Closing statement - Jiang Bo (China/VP International)

Hatthaya Siriphatthanakun (Thailand/EM International) thanked all the participants in the name of Vice President Jiang Bo and closed the meeting. A screen shot was take of the participants.