Understanding rights practices in the World Heritage system: lessons from the Asia-Pacific and the global arena

Global Science Policy Dialogue held in Caux, Switzerland
January 18-19, 2016

Workshop Report & Call for Action

Peter Bille Larsen, Project Coordinator

Caux call for action on rights-based approaches in World Heritage

Caux, Switzerland, January 19, 2016

We the participants of the international dialogue on «Understanding rights practices in the World Heritage system: lessons from the Asia-Pacific and the global arena» met in Caux, Switzerland from January 18 to 19, 2016. The meeting was organized by the University of Lucerne in cooperation with ICOMOS and IUCN with support from the Swiss Network for International Studies, ICOMOS Norway and the Swiss National Science Foundation.

We recall the outcome and statements of the two Oslo workshops, in 2011 and 2014, on rights-based approaches in the World Heritage system organized by the Common Dignity initiative.

We welcome the recent changes agreed to the Operational Guidelines for the World Heritage Convention (Bonn, 2015) regarding the rights of indigenous peoples, free prior and informed consent and the recognition of United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), and also the adoption of the Sustainable Development policy[1] by the 20th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention (November 2015), requesting *inter alia* States Parties "to uphold, respect and contribute to the implementation of the full range of international human rights standards as a prerequisite for effectively achieving sustainable development". We note that further specific changes to the Operational Guidelines are contemplated in light of the adoption of the policy to translate the principles of the policy into actual operational procedures.

We note that the Sustainable Development policy requests States Parties "to ensure that the full cycle of World Heritage processes from nomination to management is compatible with and supportive of human rights" and consider this new policy framework a turning point toward building more equitable and effective sustainable conservation and good governance approaches.

We further commend the Sustainable Development policy recommendation to "adopt a rights-based approach, which promotes World Heritage properties as exemplary places for the application of the highest standards for the respect and realization of human rights".

We acknowledge and welcome the growing interest from Special Procedures of the UN Human Rights Council, in particular the Special Rapporteurs on cultural rights, environment and human rights, and the rights of indigenous peoples, in addressing World Heritage issues.

We welcome the work of the Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN) to the World Heritage Committee (hereafter 'the Committee') in the past years in jointly addressing the opportunities and challenges of developing more inclusive World Heritage approaches.

Being mindful of the new momentum represented by the above, we presented and discussed case-study research, legislative reviews and the results of national dialogues on human rights and World Heritage conservation from selected countries in the Asia-Pacific region. This research is demonstrating the significance of taking into account local context, rights claims and local values as a starting point for bridging human rights and heritage protection, conservation and management.

[1] The full title is «Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention » hereafter listed as the "Sustainable Development policy".

We recognize, from the lessons learned at the workshop, that challenges in respecting and supporting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and other groups in the World Heritage context, at the national level, include inadequate legal frameworks, under-resourced institutions, lack of awareness among government officials, communities and organizations, lack of participation and monitoring mechanisms and processes:

Our meeting confirmed the need for, and feasibility of, strengthening the World Heritage system by ensuring its full compatibility and compliance with human rights obligations. In the interest of operationalizing the human rights aspects of the UNESCO Sustainable Development policy:

1. We encourage the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and States Parties to build a common language and conceptual framework aimed at fully implementing human rights, taking into consideration claims made in local contexts, and in accordance with recognized international standards.
2. We recommend States Parties adopt systematic and comprehensive legislative frameworks, approaches and policies recognizing the needs and rights of people and groups on topics such as benefit-sharing, participation, livelihoods and culture, taking into account their vulnerabilities and capacity for resilience.
3. We recommend the Committee and the World Heritage Advisory Bodies devise mechanisms to address these issues across the World Heritage cycle, including upstream processes providing early advice on nominations, periodic reporting by States Parties on implementation of the Convention and the monitoring and policy mechanisms of the Convention, learning from the best practices of the United Nations and regional human rights implementation mechanisms.
4. We recommend the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, UNESCO and the States Parties comply with international human rights standards when reviewing the processes of nomination and states of conservation. We further recommend they advance a heritage nomination and conservation approach that is fully supportive of the rights of people and relevant communities, that empowers them as legitimate stewards of heritage, and that supports their lives and cultures as part of excellence in heritage management.
5. We encourage the World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Advisory Bodies to build capacity in the field of rights-based approaches to the nomination and conservation of World Heritage sites, including through the development of guidelines, training activities and educational awareness materials on key topics and mechanisms, such as Free Prior and Informed Consent. It is also necessary to develop guidance on how to deal with local contexts where the legacy of past injustices may have created suspicion and reluctance with regard to World Heritage nomination and management processes.
6. We strongly encourage the use of a human rights-based framework in World Heritage processes involving third parties such as NGOs, the private sector and public-private partnerships.
7. We recommend engaging with rights-holders and local authorities in devising community-driven and holistic management approaches to World Heritage properties bridging nature and culture as well as tangible and intangible heritage even in the absence of enabling legal frameworks.
8. We underline the importance of inclusive approaches, notably with regards to indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, women, youth and disadvantaged groups living within, in the vicinity of, or with links to World Heritage sites.
9. We encourage civil society organizations to engage with the World Heritage system for strengthening the management of the properties and implementation of the Convention.
10. We further encourage States parties, Advisory Bodies, technical and research institutions, and other interested partners to continue the process of giving full effect to human rights and sustainability standards, *inter alia*, by actively fostering research, dialogue, cooperation, pilot projects and studies in order to further advance rights within the World Heritage processes.

Table of Contents

Workshop summary and outcomes

The international dialogue on «Understanding rights practices in the World Heritage system: lessons from the Asia-Pacific and the global arena» took place in Caux, Switzerland from January 18 to 19, 2016. The meeting was organized by the University of Lucerne in cooperation with ICOMOS and IUCN with support from the Swiss Network for International Studies, ICOMOS Norway and the Swiss National Science Foundation. Participants included researchers from Australia, Norway, Philippines, Switzerland, India, Belgium, the United States and Vietnam as well as institutional representatives from the World Heritage Advisory Bodies, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM as well as the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, OHCHR (see annex for full list of participants).

The meeting represented a landmark process to learn from and engage with country-level issues, challenges and opportunities related to rights in World Heritage. For a number of years, there has been a growing interest among States Parties, Advisory Bodies and UNESCO to engage more systematically with rights concerns at the national level. The research project is demonstrating a variety of ways in which such country-level engagement can take place through both site and policy level discussions.

Many participants stressed the importance of the recent World Heritage «Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention» hereafter listed as the "Sustainable Development policy" and its provisions on human rights. As the research project coordinator had formed part of the UNESCO expert group formulating the draft policy, the Caux meeting offered a critical opportunity to not only discuss country level findings, but equally explore locally relevant implementation modalities and appropriate recommendations for taking global policy objectives forward to implementation.

During two days of intensive discussion and debate, preliminary findings and draft policy briefs by the international research team and shared with World Heritage practitioners. The meeting ended with the identification of possible follow-up opportunities as well as a shared call for action. Detailed information about specific case studies and lessons learned from national dialogues can be found in the respective policy briefs.

Introduction and background

Since late 2014, the University of Lucerne has coordinated a research project financed by the Swiss Network for International Studies concerned with understanding rights practices in the World Heritage system with a particular focus on the Asia- Pacific region. Coordinated in close cooperation with the World Heritage Advisory Bodies, the research project seeks to learn and better understand rights dynamics in four countries across the region. These countries are Australia, Nepal, Philippines and Vietnam. The research project uses a two-pronged approach combining legal and anthropological methods at site, country and international levels. A common methodology framework was adopted with a focus on four clusters of human rights such as consultation and participation, land and resource rights, livelihood and development as well as indigenous and ethnic minority rights.

In each country, approaches were also tailored to the specific sites issues and developments. In each country, national dialogues and round tables form part of the project approach allowing for collective dialogues about the distinct rights challenges and opportunities for action identified. At the international level, an international legal review is being spearheaded by the legal researchers at the University of Lucerne. Researchers from Deakin and Lucerne are also involved in capturing more informal dynamics through the event ethnography.

Workshop objectives

The Caux science policy dialogue was conceived as a forum to bring together the international research team with key players in the World Heritage system involved in addressing rights. This included key representatives from the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, who for the last few of years in cooperation ICOMOS Norway have sought to strengthen capacity on rights-based approaches through the Common Dignity initiative. ICOMOS Norway, indeed, brought in additional funding to allow for representatives from the ICOMOS network to attend the meeting. Additional fund-raising with the Swiss Science Foundation also allowed the meeting to bring in legal researchers and expertise (initially funding only covered country leads). Key objectives of the meeting were to i) share preliminary policy findings from the research projects and national level dialogues with the wider World Heritage community and ii) stimulate further dialogue on the identification of needs and opportunities to strengthen the integration of rights-based approaches at the international level.

Dialogue workshop methodology

The workshop was designed to create a conducive space for open and frank dialogue among researchers and representatives from the World Heritage system. The Villa Maria in Caux was chosen as it offered a distinct setting to retract from the everyday bustle of activities and concentrate energy and efforts in a historical setting known for its significance as a space for dialogue.

The meeting to first of all to gain insights and be nourished by the respective country processes and findings. Considering the complexity and possible sensitivity of rights in issues, not least in the Asia-Pacific region, the importance of a bottom-up perspective was considered critical to build on rather than impose an external understanding of the rights issues concerned. A shared policy brief framework had been conceived allowing for researchers to summarize key policy lessons in a format, which could be shared in preliminary form in Caux and then reworked for wider international audiences in the final phase of the project. The first, and initial parts of the second, day of the workshop were dedicated to the presentation and discussion of research findings. On the second day, institutional representatives were offered a space to present their current activities and perspectives on the topic. With both research findings and institutional realities in mind, the workshop then shifted to a group work modality, where participants were requested to identify key bottlenecks and opportunities for action. The process was conceived as a two-way exchange between researchers and practitioners given the important potential for cross-fertilization.

Day 1

Introductory remarks

The meeting started with a round of introductions by key institutional partners present. Bernhard Fuhrer, director of the Swiss Network for International Studies, presented the general objectives of the SNIS mechanism notably aiming to facilitate bridge building between the research community and international organizations. Following presentations from Tim Badman, director of the IUCN World Heritage program, Edmond Moukala from the World Heritage Centre, Kirsti Kovanen, Secretary General of ICOMOS and Akiko Umezu of ICCROM all stressed the growing importance of rights-based issues. Tim Badman underlined the significance of the new Sustainable Development policy and Operational Guidelines changes as game-changers offering a clear and formal framework for the States Parties to take up and address rights-concerns in World Heritage processes. Edmond Moukala stressed the importance of the outputs of the meeting for the World Heritage Centre in its work to implement the decisions by the General Assembly and the World Heritage Committee. Kirsti Kovanen stressed the importance of sharing knowledge as policy frameworks were evolving and changing. Akiko Umezu stressed the growing significance of rights-based approaches in the capacity building efforts of ICCROM. Marie-Louise Anker, ICOMOS Norway and chair of the ICOMOS Working Group on rights-based approaches emphasized how key questions remain in terms of allowing for the participation of people in and around World Heritage sites. After a general round of introduction, Peter Larsen offered a brief introduction to the research and dialogue process.

Australia research and policy briefs

The Australian research team includes researchers from the Universities of Queensland, Sydney and Deakin. Ian Lilley presented the overall context of the Australian research, how it builds on a larger research project looking at indigenous peoples and World Heritage in Australia as well as the methodology approach and preliminary findings from Fraser Island, the case study area. Among emerging findings was the questioned nature of advisory committees and the challenge of addressing indigenous rights in World Heritage processes in ways that connect with aboriginal people. Ben Boer from the University of Sydney presented intermediate findings from the legal review being undertaken in Australia. He underlined the diverse legal contexts found in the country, presented relevant jurisprudence and recommended further review of federal and state heritage legislation to take into account human rights concerns. Kristal Buckley, in turn, presented the process and findings of the Australian roundtable discussion, hosted by Deakin University. The particular format involved both natural and cultural heritage professional engaged in facilitated group discussions with minimal presentations. Key themes in the discussion included the need to consider how social and rights issues are easily conflicted, the question of different types of rights, how human rights frameworks are often poorly understood and the distinct issues related to private sector involvement. The following group discussion led to further question on experience with management effectiveness tools, the nature of indigenous rights and the effectiveness of corporate social responsibility in the Australian context.

International legal review

The draft policy brief summarizing preliminary findings from the international legal review was presented by Alexander Morawa, University of Lucerne. Coming from a human rights background, he underlined the novelty of the research approach as well noting important parallels, intersections, but also omissions despite a long history of human rights mainstreaming. Human rights are not mentioned in the World Heritage Convention. The review raises a number of questions such as common threats, sovereignty, jurisdictional matters and universality. The legal review methodology had developed a separate set of clusters, where analysis had been initiated to explore certain rights areas in more depth. This raised questions in the discussion about the risks of dividing human rights into subcategories leading to interesting exchanges about how the research project as a whole sought to generate comparable finding across the different research countries and components. It was also discussed how the research project built on the assumption that certain rights are more likely to be affected by WH processes. The group recognized how there had been a long history of non-dialogue between the WH and the HR communities now being replaced by exchange. This exchange would require addressing a range of substantive and procedural rights, and also build on growing body of experience and policy language related to cultural rights, environmental rights and specific rights such as the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent.

Nepal research and policy briefs

Sudarshan Tiwari presented an overview of the research process and key insights from the Kathmandu valley case study. He explained how the research team had gone through an adaptive process following the earthquake, but also the more recent blockade from neighbouring India. A number of important themes were raised such as heritage as space to live, connections with intangible heritage and the role of local communities and traditional technologies in reconstruction. In the Nepali study, the case study pointed to a range of social specificities and complexities identified with the clusters-approach adapted to the specific urban heritage context. Such complexities were further discussed in the presentation by Hans Christie Björnness, who presented a range of specific case study findings from the Patan monument zone in particular raising questions of gender through a look at female-headed households and an emphasis on reducing vulnerability and the complexity of working towards social inclusion and civic engagement. The legal review of Nepal was presented by Bipin Adhikari, among other things underlining the changing constitutional context presenting a set of distinct challenges and opportunities. Finally, Sudharshan Tiwari presented a summary of debates from the national roundtable held in Kathmandu. The following discussions among other things picked up on the Tiwari's proposal to speak of Outstanding Local Values to complement the predominance of global expert voices. Considerable discussion also addressed intangible heritage linkages, resilience and living heritage as resource in the context of disaster and reconstruction.

Philippines research and policy briefs

The Philippines team was represented by Bettina Beer, Kay Malilong-Isberto and Sara Dürr (Maria Lourdes Ingel being unable to attend). Bettina Beer presented preliminary findings from the research site, The Historic Town of Vigan. She stressed that "heritage" is seen as a tool for development in Vigan City. Kay Malilong-Isberto presented building blocks for the forthcoming legal review. Sara Dürr presented preliminary findings from her fieldwork in the Vigan area stressing "development challenges" for people living at the social and geographical margins of the heritage site.

Vietnam research and policy briefs

The Vietnam team was represented by Nguyen Duy Luong, Nghiem Thi Hoa, Nguyen Linh Giang and Peter Larsen. Nguyen Duy Luong introduced the case study area, Phong Nha Ke Bang (PNKB), and pilot cultural mapping undertaken in collaboration with Quang Binh University. The mapping effort is revealing longstanding cultural connections to the WH site confirming the relevance of nature-culture linkages and rights-based approaches increasingly emphasized by the ABs. Peter Larsen continued with a description of a number of rights challenges appearing in the PNKB area in need of a comprehensive response. These concerns rights to customary lands, traditional livelihood rights, consultation and indigenous rights. Nguyen Linh Giang, in turn, presented the legal review undertaken of Vietnam's heritage and human rights policy. The study identified several gaps and needs and opportunities for policy reform in the short and long-term. Nghiem Thi Hoa, in turn, summarized results from the national workshop, which had successfully been organized in

collaboration with the Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences, the UNESCO Hanoi office and the full representation of all World Heritage sites. The meeting resulted in a strong national call for action to address the rights-deficit in current World Heritage policy and management. She also presented a number of findings from comparative work pointing to a number of shared challenges across natural and cultural world heritage sites. Research raised considerable debate and questions leading to follow-up exchanges about how to strengthen the incorporation of human rights data and research into World Heritage management.

DAY 2

Summary discussion and expert perspective

The second day was initiated with a general discussion as well as a commentary and presentation from Ryan Rowberry, invited legal expert contributing with a comparative perspective from the United States. He underlined the relevance of the global initiative and pointed to similar challenges in the US context. As for the general discussion, participants raised a number of issues, questions and challenges emerging from the discussions on the first day.

Emerging questions

How are local and national rights perspectives articulated? Is there a risk of imposing western value sets and post-colonial impositions?

How are local perspectives on cultural rights listened to and implemented? How do people define themselves and their rights?

What are the implications for local knowledge and expertise?

How do we deal with the conceptual challenges with concepts like “local”, “community” and the diversity of “rights-holders”?

How do we address changing professional values and obligations of heritage professionals under the new paradigm meeting new dilemmas and practices when exploring rights?

How do we resolve the tensions between the diverse origins and implications of universalist rights language?

How do we grant more importance and priority to local values and priority setting in the heritage process?

Who’s missing in our heritage professional teams to better take into account local values and practices?

How do we grant more attention to the present conditions of heritage stewards and practices, and not merely think of past and future?

How do we strike a balance between local values, human rights and heritage practice while avoiding cultural relativism?

Event ethnography and World Heritage Committee

This presentation, by Peter Larsen and Kristal Buckley, presented a number of policy lessons learnt from the event ethnography organized in connection with the World Heritage Committee meeting in Bonn 2015. As a complement to the formal legal analysis of international human rights standards and World Heritage policy, the event ethnography sought to provide an overview of rights issues appeared and were addressed in a number of different Committee contexts related to nominations, state of conservation reporting, side events and policy reform discussions. The event ethnography was well-received with both the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre representative stressing the usefulness of such kinds of assessments in terms of getting an alternative perspective on Committee dynamics.

Institutional perspectives

Following the presentations of preliminary research findings, it was then the turn of organizational representatives to present the state of affairs in their respective institutional contexts and equally respond to some of the questions and issues being raised. In addition to presentations. This included brief presentations by UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM, the Common Dignity project, ICOMOS Norway and ICOMOS India. Without going into detail with every statement made, it was noteworthy that an increasing number of activities are being undertaken with a rights-angle. These include changing evaluation practices by the advisory bodies, the inclusion of rights in capacity building. At the national level, ICOMOS Norway is engaging in cooperation with national ICOMOS organizations. Gurmeet Rai of ICOMOS India summarized recent activities taking place in India to explore rights issues both conceptually and across a selected number of the World Heritage sites. ICOMOS India is also hosting the 2017 General Assembly with a specific focus on the theme of democracy with rights-based approaches as a cross-cutting priority for the organizing committee.

Group discussions on possible action opportunities

Most of the afternoon on the second day was dedicated to group discussions around key issues and possible responses at site, national and international levels. A fourth group of workshop participants drafted a collective statement to be discussed in plenary (see adopted Caux Call for Action). Group work was not expected to produce final findings, but rather to promote exchanges around key issues, bottlenecks and opportunities. Once again, in the meeting, it was suggested that the recent policy changes offer an important window of opportunity to strengthen rights-based approaches at different levels grounded in action by a variety of actors.

Group work results

Group 1

	Bottlenecks / opportunities	Action and next steps
1	Revision of regulatory framework of nomination process and M&E process	Identification of regulatory framework Identification of authority/duties Establishment of civil society mechanism/rights/duties for feedback and capacity building… Pilot project on right based approach
2	Systematic documentation of case-studies (bad and good)	Pilot project Documentation of exercises of rights
3	"Good governance" at all levels	Research into "good governance" at all level: how is it identified/measured Development of mechanism to introduce/sustain "good governance"
4	Opportunity to map local histories (humanizing WHS)	Cultural mapping to identify local values ⇔ OUV
5	Local empowerment and capacity building for involved stakeholders	Two way capacity building Standards of practice → multi-disciplinary (culture rights)
6	Involvement of corporate sector and ownership	Engage with corporates/state/local (and international) levels to develop standards/safeguards

Group 2

	State level	International level
1	Enact policies/laws at the national level … - For sharing of benefits from World Heritage - To acknowledge and provide for rights to participation - To support cultural continuities as part of heritage conservation - To recognise and include minorities living in and around World Heritage properties - To ensure the intangible is not secondary to the tangible, but that they are recognised as inseparable Provide resources directly to communities for intangible practices and festivals	'OLV' should be integrated into the conceptual understanding of 'OUV' - Revise the criteria in the OGs to ensure that local values are recognized - Include OLV in descriptions when nominating properties to the World Heritage List - Include OLV in the components of the management system. - Include rights issues associated with OLV. UPR (Universal Periodic Report) – HRC. Consider human rights issues in World Heritage as part of the contents requested for the national reports (every 4 years).
2	Recognise the importance of town planning processes as tools for: - Supporting urban diversity - Supporting creativity and heritage (rather than an entirely 'fixed' idea of heritage components) Engage with National Commissions for Human Rights to highlight World Heritage issues, cases and solutions. Develop policies and	Develop and promote a UNESCO Declaration (or Recommendation) on Human Rights in World Heritage. Incorporate human rights questions in the third cycle of Periodic Reporting. Support independent research that can review performance and outcomes, as well as sharing innovations. Work further on defining 'community' in the OGs, including more than strictly spatial definitions. Consider ways to support communities and States Parties that avoid the negative perceptions of Danger Listing. Understand the ways in which positive outcomes can be achieved at the local level

	capacities that respect traditional materials and methods of building (ensuring that the intangible dimension is equally respected)	
3	Each country should consider the development of legal texts on World Heritage management that integrate nature and culture and explicitly take human rights into account.	
4	**At all levels**	
5	Develop guidelines for raising awareness about diverse rights issues in World Heritage and outline possible methods for inclusive planning and decision-making processes. - For the World Heritage Committee - For State authorities - For community organisations and NGOs	

Group 3

	Action Priorities
1	Need for a more integrated / holistic approach to nomination, listing and management principles of WH sites, and reassess the OG in this regard (nature / culture; tangible / intangible)
2	Enhance the cultural rights implications in the SDG.
3	Acknowledge the need for full disclosure of the motivations for the choices made in the nomination and management of WH sites, from all levels (e.g. local values, local policies and OUV)
4	Create a mechanism within the WH context for urgent action requests, and disseminate information on existing urgent request mechanisms within the HR system.
5	Explore the HR implications of reconstruction, and explore whether there is a right to rehabilitation / reconstruction, which should then be made more explicit
6	Acknowledge the need for on-going inter-agency discussions and the creation of synergies on heritage and HR
7	Establish guidelines on how to implement the FPIC approach
8	Translate the 2010 UNESCO Disaster Preparedness Guide into languages other than French and English
9	Call for regional conferences, with the participation of relevant international and regional organizations (UNESCO, OHCHR, HR mechanisms, etc.) as well as NGOS, to address the issue of HR and CH at WH sites.

Concluding remarks

The Caux discussions confirmed a wide range of needs and opportunities to strengthen rights-based approaches in the World Heritage context. Research findings from site to national levels not only identified a wide range of rights issues, challenges and factor influencing practice, and in general terms underlined the significance of a culturally responsive and context-specific approaches. Such context-related aspects were particularly apparent in discussions. The policy brief model was welcomed by World Heritage organizations and it was further agreed to establish a side event space for the World Heritage Committee, where final briefs could be presented.

Whereas overall policy commitments have been set forward through the Sustainable Development policy, participants recognized the remaining work in terms of translating such commitments into effective and equitable heritage practices. The task is not straight forward as it may seem. Whereas many present saw the new policy framework as a "game changer" compared to the timid efforts to address rights till date, a substantial programme of work is now required. Interestingly, the SNIS-funded approach of combining research with dialogues showcased the relevance and practicality of identifying country-specific issues and possible next steps. In addition, it also revealed the significant interest and potential for cross-fertilization across different country contexts. There is much to learn from on-going practice at site, policy and management system levels.

There is, as appears, a growing momentum in the World Heritage context for strengthening World Heritage policies and management practices, which are far more explicit and attentive to possible rights impacts as well as harnessing positive contributions. The timing of the dialogue, appearing only a couple of months after the adoption of the sustainable development policy, was critical. For this very reason, the Caux Call for Action and set of recommendations was considered an important signal to send to the wider World Heritage community.

Common Dignity project

A Common Dignity project[2] meeting took place with the participation of Tim Badman, Kirsti Kovanen, Kristal Buckley, Marie Anker, Bénédicte Selfslagh, Gurmeet Rai and Peter Larsen. Marie Anker presented the on-going activities in terms of planned training activities in Oslo, follow-up with ICOMOS network as well as "wrap-up" activities. Results will be presented at the next World Heritage Committee meeting and activities of the ICOMOS Working Group on RBA and heritage was discussed not least in relation to the 2017 General Assembly in New Delhi.

[2] The Advisory Body supported and ICOMOS Norway-led « Common Dignity » project has for a number of years, with support from the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, sought to build capacity on rights-based approaches (for further information, see ICOMOS Norway web-site).

Internal project management

On the final morning, an internal project management meeting was held to assess progress and plan for the finalization remaining project outputs. Responding to the positive feedback about the policy brief model, it was agreed to accelerate finalization of country briefs taking into account specific conditions. An edited academic volume is also being planned pulling together the respective contributions expected in final draft form by the end of May. Deadlines for the respective activities will be listed in an internal action plan note. As for the edited volume, it was agreed that PL would explore options and additional funding to allow for an open-access publication.

Next steps

As a first step, a week-long consultation would be held to finalize in detail the Call for Action (the inserted document represents the final statement). It was also agreed that workshop participants would provide input on briefs produced in their respective groups to help authors with the process of finalization. Secondly, it was generally agreed to ensure that work was ready to be presented and shared at the World Heritage Committee meeting. The Advisory Bodies expressed commitment to allocate space and time for this event, which could be co-organized in cooperation with the Common Dignity initiative equally planning to have materials ready for the Committee meeting in Turkey. In addition, there was a call and invitation from participants to take the Caux format to the regional and even sub-regional level. There are immediate opportunities with universities and research institutions in the region potentially willing to host such workshops whether targeting national or international audiences. Finally, there are good follow-up opportunities where research findings could be shared by linking into planned training activities, the World Conservation Congress and the ICOMOS General Assembly in 2017.

Annex 1: Final workshop program

Draft Programme

Understanding Rights Practices in the World Heritage System:
Lessons from the Asia Pacific and the Global Arena

Venue: Villa Maria, Caux Conference Centre, Caux (Montreux, Switzerland)

January 18, 2016

DAY 1

8.15 – 9.00 Coffee and registration

9.00 – 9.30 **Welcome Remarks** (Bernhard Fuhrer, Peter Larsen, Tim Badman, Kirsti Kovanen, Akiko Umezu, Edmond Moukala) and quick round of self-introductions

9.30 – 9.45 **Setting the stage: research objectives and framework** (Peter Larsen)

Session I: Australia findings

9.45 – 11.15 Case study findings (Ian Lilley)

Legal review findings (Ben Boer)

National roundtable findings (Kristal Buckley)

Discussion

Session II: International legal review of WH and Human Rights standards

11.15 – 11.30 Presentation of international legal review (Alexander Morawa)

11.30 – 12.30 Lunch break

12.30 – 13.00 Session II continues

Commentary and comparative perspective (Ryan Rowberry)

Discussion

Session III: Nepal findings

13.00 – 14.30 Case study findings and lessons from Kathmandu (Sudarshan Tiwari and Hans Bjönness)

Legal review findings (Bipin Adhikari)

National roundtable findings (Sudarshan Tiwari)

Discussion

Session IV: Philippines findings

14.30 – 16.00 Case study findings and lessons from Vigan (Bettina Beer and Sara Dürr)

Legal review findings (Kay Malilong Isberto)

Discussion

16.00 – 16.30 Coffee Break

Session V: Vietnam findings

16.30 – 18.00 Case study findings and lessons from Phong Nha Ke Bang (Peter Larsen)

Legal review findings (Nguyen Linh Giang)

National roundtable findings (Peter Larsen and Nghiem Thi Kim Hoa)

Cultural mapping pilot experience (Nguyen Duy Luong)

Discussion

18.00 – 19.00 Dinner

19.30 – 21.00 Preliminary showing of footage from the field / social time

January 19, 2016

DAY 2

8.00 – 8.30 Breakfast

8.30 – 9.00 **Key issues and challenges from preceding day**

Rapporteurs

Session VI: International dynamics in global practice – lessons from WH Committee 2015

9.00 – 10.00 Peter Larsen and Kristal Buckley

Discussion

Session VII: Organizational perspectives: experiences, challenges and opportunities

10.00 – 10.30 Brief round of presentations on organizational experiences till date

UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM, Common Dignity project / ICOMOS Norway, ICOMOS India, OHCHR

10.30 – 10.45 Coffee break

10.45 – 11.30 Round continues

Q & A

11.30 – 12.30 Lunch break

Session VII: Group work brainstorm on lessons and opportunities

12.30 – 12.45 Introduction to group work

12.45 – 15.30 Group work on how to respond to different rights themes and challenges identified. What appear to be significant issues, bottlenecks and opportunities? What would priorities be and next steps?

15.30 – 16.30 Group work presentations & discussion

16.30 – 17.30 **Concluding statements on research findings and possible responses**

17.30 – 18.00 AB Common Dignity follow-up meeting

18.00 Dinner

January 20, 2016

DAY 3

Departure / Research teams meet for morning session

8.30 – 11.00 Research team exchanges on research results discussions and exchanges on findings and next steps in terms of publication and sharing strategy

11.00 Departure

Annex 2: List of participants and contact details

List of participants

Surname	*First name*	*Country team*	*Institution*	*E-Mail*
Adhikari	Bipin	Nepal	Kathmandu University	bipin.adhikari@ku.edu.np
Anker	Marie-Louise		ICOMOS Norway	ma757@kirken.no
Badman	Tim		IUCN	tim.badman@iucn.org
Beer	Bettina		University of Lucerne	bettina.beer@unilu.ch
Bidault	Mylène		OHCHR	mbidault@ohchr.org
Bjønness	Hans Christie	Nepal	NTNU	hans.c.bjonness@ntnu.no
Boer	Ben	Australia	Wuhan University, China	ben.boer@sydney.edu.au
Buckley	Kristal	Australia	Deakin University	kristal.buckley@deakin.edu.au
Dürr	Sara		University of Lucerne	sara.duerr@unilu.ch
Fuhrer	Bernhard		SNIS	fuhrer@snis.ch
Umezu	Akiko		ICCROM	au@iccrom.org
Kovanen	Kirsti		ICOMOS	kirsti.kovanen@icomos.org
Larsen	Peter		University of Lucerne	peter.larsen@unilu.ch
Lilley	Ian	Australia	University of Queensland	i.lilley@uq.edu.au
Malilong Isberto	Kay	Philippines		kay.malilong@gmail.com
Morawa	Alexander		University of Lucerne	alexander.morawa@unilu.ch
Moukala	Edmond		UNESCO	e.moukala@unesco.org
Nghiem Thi Kim	Hoa	Vietnam	Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences	nghiemhoa@gmail.com
Nguyen Duy	Luong	Vietnam		aaandl@hotmail.com
Nguyen Linh	Giang	Vietnam		lgiang77@gmail.com
Oviedo	Gonzalo		IUCN	gonzalo.oviedo@iucn.org
Rai	Gurmeet	India	ICOMOS India	raidelhi@gmail.com
Rowberry	Ryan Max			rrowberry@gsu.edu
Selfslagh	Bénédicte		ICOMOS	benedicte.selfslagh@gmail.com
Tiwari	Sudarshan	Nepal	Tribhuvan University	srtiwari@ioe.edu.np
Zehnder	Uta		University of Lucerne	uta.zehnder@unilu.ch