

*Follow-*

## **A shared community and rights agenda**

Interviews clearly revealed how all organizations involved in the current dialogue on rights and World Heritage within the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre (termed the ABC Group), not just IUCN in its own policy processes, were moving towards a stronger community and rights-based agenda. The 2011 ICOMOS General Assembly resolution “Our Common Dignity: Rights-based Approaches to heritage management” is an important milestone in terms of promoting rights-based approaches not least through the “Our common dignity” initiative of the 2012-2014 Triennial Action Plan<sup>2</sup>. This parallels broader work on human rights in UNESCO context, not least on-going work to put in place a policy on indigenous peoples. The recent volume of the UNESCO World Heritage journal on the theme 02 Twt1(Ur )JT.

Key finding: Further strengthening work on community and rights can benefit from building on existing work, which is evolving in both formal and informal ways

### **Moving from shared ideas to collective action**

Interviewees expressed a strong commitment to engage in collective practical follow-up action from their respective organizational realms and positions. The kinds of comments raised included the differing institutional realms and opportunities, yet also the similar kinds of challenges and concerns. Thus ICOMOS representatives spoke of similar kinds of community and rights concerns in cultural sites, while equally pointing to other aspects and concerns to be raised in the reworking of the report. Indeed, it was clear that the community and rights concerns are far too complex and diverse to be able to be addressed through quick fixes and deserve more analytical work in this respect. It was also clear that organizational cultures, capacities and evaluation processes are not identical, necessitating the tailoring of specific processes without losing touch for actual opportunities for shared language, definitions and reporting categories.

Key finding: The importance of acting collectively as a group even if roles, concerns, types of action and procedures may differ was emphasized

### **Comparing evaluation processes and guidance**

The evaluation processes of IUCN and ICOMOS, while following similar calendars, differ somewhat in terms of emphasis according to available material. ICOMOS field visits, for example, are mainly concentrated on management aspects, whereas in IUCN, the field evaluators may provide more comments on values, although this is also substantially complemented by reviews as the main source of information. Both combine different



example, both present distinct challenges in terms of evaluation and inscription. Such expressions of interest to work together would need urgent planning to materialize effectively and get integrated in the actual evaluation process from the start. This would build on existing joint evaluations of mixed sites and the standing relationship on cultural landscapes. While the two types of areas are dealt with differently, they both harbour significant potential to further integrate community and rights concerns. This work was furthermore considered critical as it specifically would help in shaping the building blocks for more systematic attention to cultural dimensions in all natural sites and vice-versa natural dimensions of all cultural sites. Although resources do currently not allow for comprehensive reviews of all sites by both advisory bodies, such ideals are certainly being considered by professionals in both agencies.

Key finding: there is an immediate opportunity to further engagement on community and rights concerns by ICOMOS and IUCN agreeing on strengthening joint steps and processes in the context of mixed sites and cultural landscapes

### **Question of capacity and feasibility**

Lack of or dispersed capacity to address the wide range of community and rights concerns was identified as a relevant concern for all advisory bodies. While supportive of the ideas and intentions, some interviewees also raised time pressure and workloads making rapid progress challenging. While such constraints form part of the reality of any technical work, it also raises the underlying question of minimum standards and programmatic decisions to take on-board community and rights concerns no longer merely as a welcome “add-on”, but as fundamental normative principles and operational standards. In terms of feasibility, consultations revealed on-going evaluation experiences showcasing technical feasibility, as well as other cases pointing to logistical and political challenges hampering immediate take-up. Not all community and rights concerns are perceived as “do-able” in all places. Yet, there was a shared perception that a collaborative effort to put more structural

up.dJ 0.iui3 0(how)(u )1(ex)9(t)ture 0 Tc 09.337 0 T9ow 8.ET 64.92 3



*Follow-*

reflect an emerging consensus, but are at least also in part being “spearheaded” by hands-on advances on the ground. The issue is now to scale-up such experiences and address them in a more systematic way across the diverse institutional realities of the advisory bodies. This is most likely to take place through a structured and collective learning process, which is most likely to take through hands-on learning by doing. Such processes in turn require immediate action in order to benefit from the new round of evaluations getting started now. IUCN has started planning in this respect, interviews revealing parallel activities by ICOMOS as well as *joint learning* opportunities in the context of this year’s nominations for mixed sites and cultural landscapes. There are immediate opportunities to make this happen if rapid planning is undertaken in the next few weeks in the run-up to the St. Petersburg meeting.

**Learning bea1(.)TJ 0-6(a)na1.( )i3(n e9</M2 T( )11(r)-6(api)3(d1ni)i)-7(n >>E**



- x There is an urgent need to complement efforts by advisory bodies with additional activities with the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO
- x Given the heavy work load and tight schedule advisory bodies operate under, there is

### People interviewed/ contacted

Kristal Buckley	ICOMOS
Gustavo Araoz	ICOMOS (referred to Kristal Buckley, not interviewed)
Regina Durighello	ICOMOS
Amund Sinding-Larsen	ICOMOS Norway
Joseph King	ICCROM
Douglas Nakashima	UNESCO
Serena Coker	NSIC