

Round Table Report: Rights-Based Approaches to Heritage Management Melbourne, Australia



The Round Table was held on Wednesday, 7 October 2015 at the Melbourne City Centre campus of Deakin University Australia. The purpose of the Round Table was to contribute Australian practitioner perspectives to the emerging consideration of rights-based approaches to heritage conservation.

The Round Table outcomes contribute to the 'Our Common Dignity' initiative - a joint international program between ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM led by ICOMOS Norway;¹ and a research program funded by the Swiss Network for International Studies (SNIS) led by Dr Peter Bille Larsen of the University of Lucerne titled 'Understanding Rights Practices in the World Heritage System: Lessons from the Asia-Pacific'.² The Round Table was also supported by the Australia ICOMOS Working Group on Rights-Based Approaches to Conservation.

Participants were invited through the following methods using an Expression of Interest advertisement distributed through several networks (see Attachment 1):

- SNIS Australian project group
- Australia ICOMOS e-news and the Australia ICOMOS working group on Rights-Based Approaches to Heritage Management
- IUCN and ICOMOS World Heritage program representatives
- Australian Committee for IUCN

Sixteen people attended the Round Table, coming to Melbourne from Western Australia, Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory and New South Wales (Attachment 2). Several researchers joined practitioners working in consulting, the private sector, national and local

¹ ICOMOS Norway's website provides a range of materials from the project: <<http://www.icomos.no/whrba/>>

² See: <http://www.snis.ch/project_understanding-rights-practices-world-heritage-system-lessons-asia-pacific> The Australian case study focuses on the World Heritage property of Fraser Island (known to Traditional Owners as K'gari), and includes interviews with Traditional Owners and site managers. For this reason, the Round Table focused on practitioner perspectives.

governments, the military, mining companies and NGOs. Participants referred to professional experiences in many locations – throughout Australia, including World Heritage properties (such as the Blue Mountains and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park); Pacific Island nations (including New Zealand and Papua New Guinea); and locations within the wider Asia-Pacific region and further afield (such as Myanmar, Cambodia and Iraq).

Many interested colleagues were unable to attend and sent their apologies and offers of continuing involvement. Some participants offered to share relevant academic literature and professional reports. To assist with the sharing of these materials, they were collected in a shared Dropbox folder (see Attachment 3), and the web links for programs that were mentioned are provided throughout this report.

The Round Table model is intended to be compact, allowing robust and relatively open-ended discussion. It cannot represent every experience, but should capture key issues and ideas in ways that can contribute to a continuing dialogue, both locally and globally. To an extent, this was an experiment, with objectives of reflecting on the method itself as well as identifying the key issues.

In order to match the scope of the international dialogue, it was necessary to include both cultural and natural heritage practitioners, researchers and policy-makers at the table. Participants had varying amounts of direct experience with World Heritage. While World Heritage created an important focus for the discussions, it was not an exclusive one. As a result, the discussions moved in and out of the World Heritage realm.

Other than a short framing introduction, there were no presentations, and the Round Table operated as a facilitated discussion.

Introductory session

The international context of the dialogue was briefly outlined in a framing presentation introduced by Anne Laura Kraak (Deakin University), which identified a number of key points about human rights and heritage.

- There is ambiguity in the discussions, concepts and issues in the international dialogue about 'rights-based' approaches to heritage conservation.
- The discussion can be couched within the standards established in international and national legal frameworks and/or as a discursive tool to address issues of social justice.
- Issues of social justice and community involvement/consent are common in the heritage literature, but explicit discussion of rights is more recent. Because rights 'language' is relatively new within heritage, it is unstable and contested.
- Procedural and Substantive rights are relevant to the discussion. In some contexts, there are references to 'citizen rights' and 'biocultural rights', and there is considerable recent attention to 'cultural rights' (which can be collective and/or individual).
- There is a suite of UN and UNESCO Declarations and Conventions relevant to the discussion as well as policy processes implemented through the UN. Heritage practitioners, policy makers and researchers need to become well-versed with this context in order to advance their application in heritage work.

The meeting identified three sets of challenges that need to be incorporated into the discussions about rights-based approaches to heritage management.

1. **Human Rights is a contested concept.** Despite the widespread adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, not all rights are accepted everywhere, they are interpreted differently in diverse contexts, and some of the identified rights would seem more or less important than others.
 - *How can conflicting and competing rights be addressed?*

- *Are there priorities that can be determined (e.g. development rights vs cultural rights)?*
 - *What role do collective rights play? How can community participation be meaningful when community members have different and sometimes conflicting rights and interests?*
 - *What is the meaning of cultural rights? How can controversial cultural practices that might be inconsistent with some other types of rights be addressed?*
2. **Rights come with duties.** If there are rights-holders, there will also be duty-bearers, raising questions of accountability.
- *Who can be held accountable for rights violations?*
 - *If we are seeking a reflexive heritage practice, what is our responsibility?*
3. **Rights can be politically sensitive.**
- *Power issues can be made more explicit, but how can the sometimes contentious and confrontational nature of rights language be negotiated?*
 - *How can we overcome challenges of 'top-down' engagement?*
 - *Is human rights a 'Western' idea? Can we bridge ideas of universalism and cultural diversity?*

Round Table Questions

Based on this brief overview of questions arising from the current state of the international dialogue, the Round Table participants were asked to contribute to two questions:

1. What difference does it make to apply a rights-based approach to heritage management? Is this a valuable approach for your work?
2. What are the barriers and enabling factors in implementing a rights-based approach to heritage conservation?

The Round Table agenda is provided as Attachment 4.

Key Strands in the Discussion

Each of the participants had experiences that had enabled reflection about human rights and how they could be affected by heritage practices. Despite the recognition of the breadth of 'rights', most of the discussion specifically concerned the rights of Indigenous peoples. This was the direct experience of the participants, particularly in relation to examples drawn from their work in Australia and the Asia-Pacific region. There was a high degree of awareness of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP),³ and the legal, policy and professional framing in Australia to recognise these rights (including the recognition of Native Title).⁴

As noted above, while there was a tendency for the discussion to move between World Heritage issues and Australian heritage practices in general, there are some dimensions to the development of rights-based approaches that are specific to the World Heritage system. These need more discussion within Australia. In relation to Australian World Heritage properties they include the implications of rights-based approaches for the different processes articulated in the Operational Guidelines, such as preparation of nominations, evaluation of nominated properties for inclusion in the World Heritage List, and consideration of the management of properties in relation to pressures. For example, there are particular issues that arise when World Heritage properties have been inscribed for their natural values, but are considered by

³ See: <<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IPeoples/Pages/Declaration.aspx>>

⁴ National Native Title Tribunal: <<http://www.nntt.gov.au/Pages/Home-Page.aspx>>

Traditional Owners to be of cultural significance; and World Heritage listing can generate tourism pressures that have impacts on cultural practices and the rights of Traditional Owners.

There were a number of identifiable strands in the discussion.

1. Starting from a 'do no harm' orientation

World Heritage practice might not have the ability to 'solve' human rights issues, but it seems feasible to improve awareness and attention by the World Heritage Committee and to provide more support for States Parties. It is important to acknowledge that World Heritage can have unintended consequences, and to be sensitive to these.

2. Conflation of human rights with recognition of social value and community consultation

Participants recognised that while relevant issues are not always discussed in terms of 'rights' they are nevertheless frequently part of the work, especially for those working in consulting and government. Practitioners might be more familiar with the dialogue around community values and interests, consultation, and engagement. The value of using interest-based approaches to resolving conflict where there are not great disparities in power or other factors making alternative dispute resolution inappropriate, was noted.

For these reasons, there may be a preference for 'safer' vocabulary centring on community involvement and the interests of 'stakeholders' instead of talking about rights (particularly by and with governments). However, this is problematic and can contribute to poor awareness of the specific perspectives needed for rights-based approaches (which might or might not be addressed via good management of the social significance of heritage places and practices).

Consideration of 'community interests' rather than rights can result in treating all 'stakeholders' in the same way. There was a consensus in the discussion that rights holders cannot be considered as 'stakeholders' because the approaches and obligations are not the same. Rights claims need to be more explicitly recognised. In the particular case of Australia, Traditional Owners should not be treated as 'stakeholders' since this negates the specific issues arising from their rights (and cultural obligations) to speak for Country. In practice the difference hinges around participation (an entitlement of stakeholders) and decision-making (which is arguably an entitlement of those who hold cultural rights).

There are some well-known cases in Australia where conflicting heritage values have been difficult to resolve (e.g. Swan Brewery site; Alpine grazing). The Australia ICOMOS work on the ethics of co-existing cultural perspectives⁵ was developed in light of these, and provides for mediation, respect and the possibility of keeping some knowledge secret.

How can we react to political sensitivity/professional apprehension about rights? Are there ways to address the discomfort that seems to accompany this discussion?

3. Different Types of Rights/Conflicting Rights

Cultural rights can be individual or collective, but are not straightforward or uncontentious in the human rights sphere. While cultural rights are sometimes interpreted in this dialogue as applying to heritage, this is not explicit. There have been some recent international legal decisions which have upheld cultural rights within environmental law cases, and intellectual property laws are often associated with cultural rights.⁶

⁵ These ideas have been included in the current version of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (2013), but the earlier document 'Australia ICOMOS Code on the Ethics of Coexistence in Conserving Significant Places' can be viewed at: <<http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Code-on-the-Ethics-of-Co-existence.pdf>>

⁶ See for example, the work of the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO): <http://www.wipo.int/portal/en/index.html>

Understandably, much of the discussion about rights-based approaches to heritage management focused on 'FPIC' (free prior and informed consent) and the arrangements for governance and management systems in relation to Indigenous peoples and cultural minorities. Participants found the IWGIA (International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs) 'Call for Action' useful in pushing for new policies and processes within the World Heritage system.⁷ Including 'FPIC' in heritage processes is clearly an important priority for the short-term.

However, it is inevitable that other rights claims will make this work more complex. For example, is the 'right to develop' going to be given the same emphasis? What about economic rights arising from commercial use of traditional intellectual property? What about the right to live in a safe and healthy environment? What about the rights of non-human living things? Is it justified to give nature conservation greater emphasis/weight in World Heritage sites (because they are few and judged to meet the highest thresholds)? Is there a temporal dimension to human rights implied in the conservation of World Heritage for 'future generations' (and, does this somehow disadvantage the current generation)? Is there a 'right to destroy' cultural heritage? (e.g. In the case of ISIS? In the case of merit making in Buddhist societies). What are the differences between rights-based approaches and ethical considerations?

These are some of the Round Table questions which point to the breadth of the issues that could be relevant to the development of 'rights-based' heritage practices. Rights issues are complex and involve diverse knowledge systems.

4. Legal Frameworks for Human Rights

Australia's national human rights and anti-discrimination legal framework was discussed, including the lack of a national Human Rights Act. Victoria has a Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities, the Australian Capital Territory has a Human Rights Act, and the Queensland Parliament is currently inquiring into a proposed Human Rights Act. The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights were also noted as broadly relevant to this work.

In general, the legal framework for human rights, Native Title recognition and heritage protection is not within the training and professional development competencies of most heritage disciplines. For the private sector (clients and consultants), the legal requirements are the important starting point, especially the requirement for free, prior and informed consent from Indigenous peoples ('FPIC'). However, this compliance focus on legal requirements is just the start - good outcomes depend on building relationships. Participants noted the diverse laws across Australian jurisdictions and considered that some legislation for Indigenous cultural heritage has resulted in unhelpful directions for practice. Nevertheless, statutory framing can and should be an enabling factor.

There were references to the legal issues arising from various scenarios, including:

- Transparency and 'freedom of information' are not legally in place everywhere and have impacts on enabling rights-based approaches;
- Legal support and validation of mediation processes (although it was recognised that mediation is not always consistent with the assertion of rights);
- World Heritage legislation (which does not specifically exist in most countries);
- Implications of focusing on cultural sovereignty alongside the strong 20th century focus on political/institutional sovereignty;

⁷ Available from the UNESCO World Heritage website, or from IWGIA: <http://www.iwgia.org/news/search-news?news_id=678>

- Conflict and post-conflict situations – can the same laws/rights be extracted and be applied?;
- Mechanisms for co-management/joint management, recognition of traditional knowledge and equitable sharing of benefits from economic uses of culture such as tourism (noting that ‘equitable’ is not the same as ‘equal’);
- The potential in World Heritage for buffer zones to work as mechanisms to ensure rights are respected and benefits equitably shared;
- Repatriation of ‘cultural property’ and human remains (for example, the recent case of ‘Mungo Man’, Willandra Lakes World Heritage Area);
- The potential for the importance of the landscape scale to be missed – ‘transboundary governance’ and legal frameworks are needed in some cases.

5. Heritage Consulting – specific issues

In Australia, the work of heritage consultants presents specific issues and opportunities. There are constraints arising from the limited time available to complete consultation and assessment projects, and the need to consider the interests of clients alongside the rights of cultural groups and individuals. As a result, engagement with communities and individuals is often done in a limited and/or formulaic way (or not at all).

It can be difficult to overhaul practice within this environment unless there are regulatory requirements or other incentives for proponents/clients. More specific and visible processes would facilitate better practice (and is easier to ‘sell’ to clients).

6. Risk Management

Managing and minimising risk is a particularly strong focus for many actors, especially for government officials and the private sector. This is generally more explicit than consideration of rights, and could be a key driver for change.

For governments, this means that there are political sensitivities for World Heritage – this can either support or hinder the adoption of rights-based approaches. Focus on potential political or reputational risk can serve as a catalyst to facilitate more-inclusive rights-based approaches to heritage management decisions at all levels.

7. Identifying mechanisms of accountability and measuring outcomes

A number of participants raised issues of accountability, evidence and measurement.

For example, do we know if rights-based approaches improve conservation outcomes (especially for nature conservation)? There are assumptions that rights-based approaches will improve conservation (for example, by reducing conflict and aligning with traditional knowledge), but there is little evidence about the outcomes (which can be social, environmental or political).

There are some emerging mechanisms that are relevant, typically packaged with measurement of the benefits of community involvement and effective governance. IUCN has been active in this area and some of the work could be extended to more fully address cultural heritage (especially in relation to measuring management effectiveness for protected areas). Another example is provided by the Aichi targets established within the Convention on Biological Diversity.⁸ While the data are variable throughout the world, effective management is highly correlated with good governance and participation, but these factors are not necessarily good predictors of biodiversity outcomes. Corporate social responsibility, the Global Compact⁹ and United Nations Principles on Business and

⁸ See <<https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>>

⁹ See <<https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/our-work/social/human-rights>>

Human Rights¹⁰ – and issues of reputational risk – could be enabling factors for improving rights practices.

8. Social research is needed to advance community consultation approaches

Heritage practices need to include research phases to identify whose rights are involved. Often social research is poorly done in heritage conservation work. Many issues need to be considered, and the heritage sector needs to ‘upskill’ to be able to respond appropriately.

There is a tendency in these discussions to more readily recognise groups that are relatively well-organised to make rights claims. There is a need to take account of the rights of Indigenous peoples – but also a large range of others whose rights might be impacted by heritage decisions. These could include rights arising from gender, disability, religious or political affiliations; and groups such as LGBTI people, homeless people and so on. Understanding how to incorporate disparate views to reach sound outcomes, recognising rights broadly, and recognising the attachments people form through engagement with their heritage all challenge notions and methods of heritage.

In many parts of Australia, there are conflicts over questions of who speaks for Country (i.e. disputes within and between Indigenous groups, families and individuals). The policy and process inconsistencies between jurisdictions in Australia contribute to this problem.

9. Identify barriers to applying rights-based approaches

There are issues of practice and perception that act as barriers to adopting rights-based approaches. For example, legitimacy can be an issue (Who speaks for rights-holders? Whose rights are acknowledged?). Once acknowledged, what does the ‘reasonableness test’¹¹ actually mean? What are the boundaries? Are there points beyond which rights do not prevail? How can the costs of effective ‘grass-roots’ work be properly funded (especially in remote areas in Australia where this is particularly expensive)?

The discussions frequently noted that consideration of rights-based approaches to heritage conservation were often framed negatively or defensively – positioning heritage conservation and protection as infringing rights. While this awareness is important, can we also begin to ‘flip’ the conversation to find the positive benefits of recognising rights in heritage practices? There are some World Heritage cases where processes have been community-driven that offer some possibilities.

In the 21st century context – with immense and complex movement and displacement of peoples – are there new issues and ways to think about heritage and cultural rights?

10. The value of developing international consensus

There were various examples given of where nominations to the World Heritage List have occurred without appropriate consultation and consent, and this is a continuing problem. International consensus about raising the standards will enable better outcomes in many countries, particularly if there are clear policies or guidelines that States Parties are expected to use.

In general, there was a sense that site managers, communities and governments need more guidance about how to address rights issues, and how to develop consent processes. However, there was also some wariness about seeing guidelines as the solution. It will be important to ensure that any guidelines that are developed do not inadvertently

¹⁰ See <<http://business-humanrights.org/en/un-guiding-principles>>

¹¹ This point was not discussed in detail, but in brief, legal systems in democratic societies apply a test of ‘reasonableness’ to the implementation of decisions.

encourage a static or formulaic approach. For consultants, it is sometimes the case that guidelines can result in a narrowing of focus, with less room to innovate.

While Australia is seen internationally as a leader in many respects, its existing World Heritage properties have different legacy issues owing to insufficient attention to rights at the outset, and these are challenging for site managers and governments to address. It is therefore considered that Australia can benefit from the development of international standards and approaches (as well as contributing to such matters through their application to specific cases).

A further implication of this legacy is that FPIC is itself a contested matter between rights holders. This can contribute to government reluctance to proceed with new World Heritage nominations in contexts where there may be highly-public protests from detractors.

Suggestions for Further Work

Aside from a general consensus that the Round Table had been interesting and useful, participants made the following suggestions about further work that could be initiated by Australia ICOMOS and/or AC IUCN (together with Australian Governments and communities).

1. Work at the national level is essential in order to look in more depth at how rights-based approaches could be more widely applied in practice. This could directly help to improve outcomes, and to shape the international dialogue. Global standards are useful, but it is necessary to also tailor them to specific situations. There was support for Australia ICOMOS and ACIUCN to continue to work in this area, although national leadership is properly a matter for the Australian Government (this is reflected generally in the Australian Heritage Strategy which was launched a short while after the Round Table in December 2015).
2. Build awareness and capacity with practitioners. A 'snowball' approach could be used to improve the engagement with practitioners on these issues; and depending on what 'kind' of heritage is being considered, other professional colleagues need to be included (e.g. urban planners). Australia ICOMOS could initiate cross-sector discussions and both ICOMOS and IUCN have specialist groups that could lead some of this further work. There is a need to shift the thinking on rights-based approaches to find beneficial outcomes for both heritage and rights holders. Some opportunities were identified, including:
 - World Conservation Congress to be held in Hawaii in 2016;¹²
 - Association for Critical Heritage Studies conference, Montreal in June 2016;¹³
 - World Heritage Resource Manuals and in IUCN's Governance and Law materials could include guidance and information about rights issues;
 - The Australia ICOMOS working group could have a page on its website (linking with the page already maintained by ICOMOS Norway);
 - Australia ICOMOS could develop one of its 'Burra Charter Practice Notes' on this topic;
 - IUCN's World Heritage Conservation Outlook (online) and Green List tools could include commentaries on rights issues;
 - Australian Heritage Strategy implementation;¹⁴
 - Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SOPA) process.

¹² For sessions and events relevant to rights-based approaches: <<http://www.iucnworldconservationcongress.org/>>

¹³ See <<http://www.criticalheritagestudies.org/>>

¹⁴ The Australian Heritage Strategy was in development for an extended period, so while it was anticipated at the Round Table, it was not released until afterwards (December 2015). Participants updated these comments when the report draft was circulated. For further information: <<http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/australian-heritage-strategy>>

3. Developing clear guidance about applying 'FPIC' in Australian contexts could be an important next step. For World Heritage, recent amendments to the Operational Guidelines have strengthened the requirements to seek FPIC. Guidance is therefore needed for each of the processes – what does it mean for Tentative Listing, nominations, extensions, management systems? Guidance is desperately needed for governments and for consultants in their work. In order for guidelines to work, there is a need to build capacity. This could become part of the dialogue within the current Commonwealth and State consultative processes for updating Australia's World Heritage Tentative List.
4. Overcoming the conceptual divide between nature/culture in heritage practices will be an important component of developing rights-based approaches in Australia. This intersects with rights issues in Indigenous cultural heritage practices and Protected Area management. There was interest and support for the international work started by IUCN and ICOMOS through the 'Connecting Practice' program.¹⁵ Issues of non-human rights also need attention within this dialogue.
5. Management Effectiveness Tools developed by IUCN could be revisited and expanded to apply to cultural heritage and also to strengthen the specific focus on rights in the social indicators.
6. Identify and take advantage of relevant processes in Australia. What opportunities do existing national processes offer for advancing the discussions with governments and communities?
 - The work of the leadership groups in the UN Global Compact Network Australia and support for the call for the development of a National Human Rights Act could be beneficial;
 - In addition to the implementation of the Australian National Heritage Strategy implementation, the 2016 State of the Environment Report is currently being prepared. While rights issues are not typically highlighted, this could be proposed as part of the 'Outlook' component of the report;
 - AWHAC [Australian World Heritage Advisory Committee] is currently finalising its 'best practice' guidelines and has proposed a national seminar on research needs and community engagement;
 - Australia's engagement with the Human Rights Council could provide an opening for discussions with governments. The outcomes of the Round Table should be sent to the Human Rights Commission.
 - The Australian Panel of Experts on Environmental Law and the Places you Love Alliance's work on the next generation of environmental law;
 - Links to the sustainable development agenda will help to develop a higher level of sensitivity to rights-based approaches.
7. Benefits of IUCN and ICOMOS working jointly on these processes. There should be more regular and formal contact between the two Advisory Bodies (internationally, but especially in Australia); indeed Australia is well placed to set new standards and protocols for international best practice. If there are guidelines and policy documents that both IUCN and ICOMOS use, they would be very powerful and would be more readily recognised by governments.

¹⁵ Connecting Practice news and reports can be found at:
https://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/about_world_heritage/linking_culture_nature/

8. Track/map activity in this space. There is a lot of reading to catch up with – the materials everyone has mentioned and brought to the Round Table should be widely shared. What else could work efficiently?

This report has been finalised following circulation of a draft to all participants, and will be made available to: IUCN, The Australian Committee for IUCN, ICOMOS, Australia ICOMOS, and the SNIS research team (as a contribution to the work to develop 'Policy Briefs' that can have some practical application).

Attachments:

1. Notice to participants
2. List of participants
3. List of materials collected
4. Round Table Agenda

Attachment 1

Round Table – Rights-Based Approaches to Heritage Management Melbourne, Wednesday, 7 October 2015

Call for Expressions of Interest (deadline 10th September)

Australia ICOMOS will be participating in a small round table discussion on rights-based approaches to heritage management, with a focus on practitioner and professional perspectives.

This work will contribute to the 'Our Common Dignity' initiative - a joint international program between ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM; and also a research program in which ICOMOS is a partner, led by the University of Lucerne titled 'Understanding Rights Practices in the World Heritage System: Lessons from the Asia-Pacific'. The Round Table also represents an initiative of Australia ICOMOS Working Group on Rights based Approaches to Conservation. If successful this could serve as a model for discussions in other countries.

You can find out more about the international program at <http://www.icomos.no/cms/content/view/232/131/lang,english/>, and in Resolution 18GA 2014/43 adopted by the 18th ICOMOS General Assembly held in Florence late last year. The international program focuses primarily on World Heritage, but this is not an exclusive focus for the Round Table, which seeks to better understand how rights issues are perceived in heritage practice, and to identifying 'enabling factors' that might contribute to the better recognition and implementation of rights-based approaches.

To ensure a productive and engaging day we are limiting the event to 15 participants, with those involved in cultural heritage and natural heritage policies, protection and management encouraged to attend. We also particularly welcome those from the Australia ICOMOS Working group, as well others interested in the issue. The day will begin with a framing presentation by Laura Kraak, who is currently conducting a PhD on international trends in Rights Based Approaches to Conservation.

Please note, there is no funding available to support travel expenses, although lunch will be provided on the day.

The Round Table is supported by the Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific at Deakin University. It is scheduled for 9.30am-5pm, on Wednesday, 7 October, at the City Centre campus of Deakin University (located in the Melbourne CBD).

If you would like to contribute to this event, please send a short statement about your interests to the Australia ICOMOS Secretariat, by 10th September.

Tim Winter
Laura Kraak
Kristal Buckley

On behalf of the Australia ICOMOS working group on Rights-Based Approaches to Heritage Management

Attachment 2 – List of Participants

Dr Olwen Beazely – Senior Team Leader, Historic and World Heritage, NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, Sydney. Olwen.Beazley@environment.nsw.gov.au

Elizabeth Bradshaw – Global Principal Advisor, Rio Tinto's Communities and Social Performance (CSP) global practice, Perth. Elizabeth.Bradshaw@riotinto.com

Kristal Buckley AM - Lecturer in Cultural Heritage, Deakin University's Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific, Melbourne. kristal.buckley@deakin.edu.au

Joan Domicelj AM – planner, cross-cultural mediator and heritage advisor, Blue Mountains, New South Wales. domicelj@gmail.com

Professor Marc Hockings - Professor and Program Director in the School of Geography, Planning and Environmental Management at the University of Queensland, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas global program on Science and Management of Protected Areas. ARC Discovery Project on What World Heritage can deliver for Indigenous people. m.hockings@uq.edu.au

Dr Tracy Ireland – Associate Professor of Cultural Heritage, University of Canberra. tracy.ireland@canberra.edu.au

Dr Hanna Jaireth – Law Council of Australia, and member of the ACT Heritage Council, Canberra. mhsjaireth@netspeed.com.au

Anne Laura Kraak - PhD candidate at the Cultural Heritage Centre of Asia and the Pacific at Deakin University, Melbourne. akraak@deakin.edu.au

Jane Lavers - PhD student, University of Queensland - World Heritage and States Parties: Perspectives, priorities and intentions. jane.lavers@uqconnect.edu.au

Richard Mackay AM – ICOMOS World Heritage Adviser, and Heritage Consultant/Director of Possibilities at Mackay Strategic, based in Sydney. Richard@mackaystrategic.com.au

Lisa Rogers - PhD student with Deakin University's Faculty of Business and Law, a member of the team of researchers on the ARC Project, *Intangible Cultural Heritage Across Borders*. lroger@deakin.edu.au

Dr Susan McIntyre-Tamwoy – AHMS Consultants, based in Sydney, and President of the ICOMOS ISC for Intangible Cultural Heritage. SMcintyre-Tamwoy@ahms.com.au

Peter Shadie – IUCN World Heritage Advisor and Panel Member and Chief Executive Officer of the Blue Mountains World Heritage Institute, New South Wales. Peter.SHADIE@IUCN.org

Diane Siebrandt - PhD candidate at Deakin University, Melbourne, Assessing Relationships between US Military Forces and Iraqi Archaeologists. dsiebran@deakin.edu.au

Dr Sarah Titchen - National Indigenous Heritage Section in the Australian Government Department of the Environment, Canberra (with extensive previous experience with UNESCO and United Nations). sarah.titchen@gmail.com

Professor Tim Winter - Research Professor of Cultural Heritage at the Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific, Alfred Deakin Institute, Deakin University, Melbourne. tim.winter@deakin.edu.au

Attachment 3 – Materials provided by Participants

- Baird, Melissa F. 2014, 'Heritage, Human Rights, and Social Justice', *Heritage & Society* 7 (2): 139-155.
- Blake, Janet 2011, 'Taking a Human Rights Approach to Cultural Heritage Protection', *Heritage & Society* 4 (2): 199-238.
- Boer, B. and Wiffen, G. *International Heritage Law*. [chapter 3: The World Heritage Convention in Australia]
- Borelli, S. and Lenzerini, F. (eds) 2012, *Cultural Heritage, Cultural Rights, Cultural Diversity: new developments*. Brill, Leiden.
- Brown, Jessica and Hay-Edie, Terence 2014, *Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage. A methodology based on the COMPACT experience*. World Heritage Papers 40. UNESCO.
- Campese, Jessica, Sunderland, Terry, Greiber, Thomas and Oviedo, Gonzalo (eds) 2009, *Rights-based Approaches. Exploring Issues and Opportunities for Conservation*. Centre for International Forestry Research, Bogor Barat, Indonesia.
- Coombe, Rosemary J. 1998, 'Intellectual Property, Human Rights & Sovereignty: new dilemmas in international law posed by the recognition of Indigenous knowledge and conservation of biodiversity'. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 6 (1): Article 3.
- ELAN (Ecosystem & Livelihoods Adaptation Networks), nd, 'Integrating Community and Ecosystem-based Approaches in Climate Change Adaptation Responses'. <http://www.elanadapt.net>.
- Ekern, Stener, Logan, William, Sauge, Birgitte & Sinding-Larsen, Amund 2012, 'Human Rights and World Heritage: preserving our common dignity through rights-based approaches to site management', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3): 213-225.
- Greiber, Thomas, Janki, Melinda, Orellana, Marcos, Savaresi, Annalisa and Shelton, Dinah 2009, *Conservation with Justice: a rights-based approach*. IUCN, Gland.
- Hodder, Ian 2010, 'Cultural Heritage Rights: from ownership and descent to justice and well-being'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 83 (4): 861-882.
- ICOMOS Norway 2014, *World Heritage and Rights-based Approaches*. Report from workshop in Oslo 1-3 April 2014.
- Ireland, Tracy and Schofield, John (eds) 2015, *Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. Springer, New York.
- IUCN 2015, 'IUCN Standard on Indigenous Peoples'. January 2015.
- IWGIA 2012, 'World Heritage and Indigenous Peoples: a call to action'.
- Jokilehto, Jukka 2012, 'Human Rights and Cultural Heritage: observations on the recognition of human rights in the international doctrine', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3): 226-230.
- Kapchan, Deborah (ed) 2014, *Cultural Heritage in Transit: Intangible Rights as Human Rights*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kraak, Anne Laura 2015, 'Impediments to a Human Rights-based approach to Heritage Conservation: the case of Bagan, Myanmar', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*.
- Larsen, Peter Bille 2012a, 'IUCN, World Heritage and Evaluation Processes related to communities and rights: an independent review'. Report to IUCN World Heritage Programme, June 2012.
- Larsen, Peter Bille 2012b, 'Discussion Paper: Advisory Body Evaluations of World Heritage nominations in relation to community and rights concerns'. Report to IUCN, ICOMOS Norway and Ministry of the Environment Norway, June, 2012.
- Law Council of Australia 2015, Submission: Review of the Protection of Movable Cultural Heritage Act 1986 (Cth). Available from: http://www.lawcouncil.asn.au/lawcouncil/images/3045_-_S_-_Review_Moveable_cultural_heritage.pdf
- Logan, William S. 2007, 'Closing Pandora's Box: human rights conundrums in cultural heritage protection', in H. Silverman and D.F. Ruggles (eds) *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. Springer.

- Logan, William S. 2008, 'Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights', in B. Graham and P. Howard (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Ashgate.
- Logan, William 2012, 'Cultural Diversity, Cultural Heritage and Human Rights: towards heritage management as human rights-based cultural practice'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3): 231-244.
- Mackay, Richard and Palmer, Stuart 2015, 'Tourism, World Heritage and Local Communities: an ethical framework in practice at Angkor', in T. Ireland and J. Schofield (eds) *Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. Springer.
- Meskell, Lynn 2010, 'Human Rights and Heritage Ethics'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 83 (4): 839-860.
- Moore, Patricia, Pholsena, Minavanh, Phommachanh, Ketsana and Glemet, Raphael 2013, *Review of Statutory and Customary Law in the Xe Champhone Ramsar Site, Lao PDR: implications for a rights-based approach to conservation*. IUCN.
- Oviedo, Gonzalo 2015, 'IUCN's Rights-based Approach and its application to World Heritage'. Brief. IUCN (unpublished)
- Oviedo, Gonzalo and Puschkarsky, Tatjana 2012, 'World Heritage and Rights-based Approaches to Nature Conservation'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3): 285-296
- Rio Tinto 2009, *Why Gender Matters. A resource guide for integrating gender considerations into communities work at Rio Tinto*.
- Rio Tinto 2011, *Why Cultural Heritage Matters. A resource guide for integrating cultural heritage management into communities work at Rio Tinto*.
- Rio Tinto 2012, Human Rights Policy.
- Rio Tinto 2013, *Why Human Rights Matter. A resource guide for integrating human rights into communities and social performance work of Rio Tinto*.
- Silberman, Neil A. 2012, 'Heritage Interpretation and Human Rights: documenting diversity, expressing identity, or establishing universal principles?' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3): 245-256.
- Silverman, Helaine and Ruggles, D. Fairchild 2007, 'Cultural Heritage and Human Rights', in *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. Springer.
- Sinding-Larsen, Amund 2014, 'Our Common Dignity: rights-based approaches (RBA) in heritage management. An ICOMOS perspective'. ICOMOS.
- Strecker, Amy 2015, 'Indigenous Rights, Cultural Heritage and Restitution in the Caribbean', *Human Rights Defender* 24 (2): 23-25
- UNESCO 2015, World Heritage Committee 39th session, Bonn Germany. Item 5D: World Heritage and Sustainable Development. WHC-15/39.COM/5D.
- Vrdoljak, Ana Filipa 2011, 'Cultural Heritage in Human Rights and Humanitarian Law'. In Ben-Naftali, Orna (ed) *International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Worboys, Graeme L., Lockwood, Michael, Kothari, Ashish, Feary, Sue and Pulsford, Ian (eds) 2015, *Protected Area Governance and management*. IUCN.
- Young, Michael Brett 2015, *From Commitment to Culture: the 2015 review of the Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*. Department of Justice, Victoria.

Round Table: Rights-Based Approaches to Heritage Management

Agenda –

10am - 11am: Welcome and Introductions (Kristal Buckley and Tim Winter)

Opening talk presented by Laura Kraak.

11am - 11:15am: Morning Tea

11:15am - 12.30pm: Question 1: *What difference does it make to apply a rights-base approach to heritage management? Is this a valuable approach for your work?*

12.30 – 1.15pm: Lunch

1:15pm - 3.00pm: Question 2: *What are the barriers and enabling factors in implementing a rights-based approach to heritage conservation?*

3:00pm - 3.15pm: Afternoon Tea

3:15pm - 4.00pm: Discussion

The outcomes of the discussions will assist the 'Our Common Dignity' program (jointly supported by ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM, and led by ICOMOS Norway); and the SNIS-funded project 'Understanding Rights Practices in the World Heritage System: Lessons from the Asia Pacific', led by Dr Peter Larsen, University of Lucerne. The outcomes will also be shared with Australia ICOMOS and the Australian Committee for IUCN.

The Round Table is supported by Deakin University's Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalization and the Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific.