



Event Report

5th Annual Coordination Meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage-related Category 2 Institutes and Centres

on 22 November, 2016;

Consultative Dialogue on Kailash Sacred Landscape

on 23 November, 2016; and

Consultative Dialogue on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites

on 24-25 November, 2016

Organized and Hosted by

**UNESCO Category 2 Centre for
World Natural Heritage Management and Training (NWHMT) for
Asia and the Pacific Region,
Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun**

November 2016

FOREWORD

UNESCO Category 2 Centre (C2C) for World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region (NWHMT), established at the Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, India, is the youngest of the nine C2Cs under the auspices of UNESCO related to World Heritage globally. The Centre's mission is to strengthen implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Asia and the Pacific Region by building the capacity of professionals and institutions involved with World Natural Heritage Site inscription, protection, conservation and management in the Asia-Pacific, through training, research, dissemination of information and network building.

The representatives of World Heritage Category 2 Centres regularly meet to share their experiences and harmonize their activities. Following the four previous Coordination Meetings organized by the other C2Cs, it was an honour for the UNESCO C2C NWHMT India to host the 5th Coordination Meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage-related Category 2 Institutes and Centres at the Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun on 22nd November, 2016. The participation of Dr. Mechtild Rossler, Director, World Heritage Centre and Division for World Heritage, UNESCO Paris along with representatives from UNESCO's Advisory Bodies, Chairs and Category 2 Centres resulted in very fruitful discussions on building institutional capacity and strategic collaborations to implement Global Sustainable Development Goals and World Heritage Convention priorities by the C2Cs.

The presence of such internationally experienced professionals also provided us with an opportunity to leverage their expertise by conducting back-to-back Consultative Dialogues on Kailash Sacred Landscape as a World Heritage Site on 23rd November, 2016 and on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites on 24th - 25th November, 2016. The dialogues led to greater clarity on the road map for inscription of Kailash Sacred Landscape as a World Heritage Site and stimulating discussions on the need for bridging the gap between natural and cultural attributes of World Heritage properties. The outcomes from the meeting and dialogues offer a framework of action to align our work and priorities in the forthcoming period. It will be our endeavour to take these learnings forward.

The number and variety of participants was extremely encouraging with over 70 participants representing the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India, various State Governments, academic institutions, non-government organizations among others, both national and international. I would like to gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), Nepal and Uttarakhand State Council for Science & Technology (UCOST), Dehradun towards the successful conduct of these events.

I am pleased to present the main discussions and consensus emerging from this event to you in this report for your review and to take necessary follow-up actions for securing the unique heritage of our planet earth.

(Dr. V. B. Mathur)
Director, Wildlife Institute of India & UNESCO C2C

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5TH ANNUAL COORDINATION MEETING OF THE UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE RELATED CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTES AND CENTRES	1
I. SETTING THE CONTEXT: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS	2
II. THE AGENDA: REPORT, REVIEW AND ROADMAP	4
III. THE WAY FORWARD	6
Glimpses	8
 CONSULTATIVE DIALOGUE ON KAILASH SACRED LANDSCAPE	 9
I. SETTING THE CONTEXT: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS	10
II. THE AGENDA: DEVELOPING WORLD HERITAGE LANDSCAPE GOVERNANCE CAPACITY FRAMEWORK FOR KSL INDIA	18
III. THE WAY FORWARD	34
Glimpses	35
 CONSULTATIVE DIALOGUE ON CULTURAL LANDSCAPES, MIXED AND TRANSBOUNDARY HERITAGE SITES	 37
I. SETTING THE CONTEXT: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS	38
II. THE AGENDA: CROSS-LEARNING FROM CASE STUDIES	43
III. THE WAY FORWARD	57
Glimpses	58
 Media Coverage	 60
ANNEXURE 1: CONFERENCE SCHEDULE	71
ANNEXURE 2: DELEGATE SNAPSHOTS	75

**5TH ANNUAL COORDINATION MEETING OF THE UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE
RELATED CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTES AND CENTRES
NOVEMBER 22, 2016**

The 5th Annual Coordination Meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage related Category 2 Institutes and Centres took place in Dehradun, India on 22 November, 2016. The UNESCO Category 2 Centre on Natural World Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region (henceforth, UNESCO C2C-NWHMT) at Wildlife Institute of India hosted the meeting in its campus. This meeting built upon the previous four coordination meetings that took place in 2010 at Manama, in 2012 at Milan, in 2013 at Oslo and in 2014 at Shanghai. The meeting also aimed to take forward the efforts of the First Coordination Meeting of C2C Institutes and Centres and UNESCO Chairs/UNITWIN Networks held in December 2015 at UNESCO, Paris, and especially the dialogues about institutional capacity-building and natural heritage conservation through enhanced and effective international cooperation. The meeting drew participation from 19 representatives from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, Regional Institutes and Universities, UNESCO Chairs and Category 2 Centres.

I. SETTING THE CONTEXT: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Dr. V.B Mathur, Director UNESCO C2C-NWHMT and WII, welcomed the delegates and briefed them about the purpose of the 5th Annual Coordination Meeting in terms of cross-learning and building synergies towards international cooperation for natural heritage management and training.

Mr. Ravindra Singh, Former Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Government of India was invited as the Guest of Honour. He welcomed all the participants of the workshop and congratulated UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris and Wildlife Institute of India (WII), Dehradun for collaborating and setting up the UNESCO Category 2 Centre in India. Mr. Singh emphasized on the importance of regional collaboration for protection of World Heritage Sites in the Asia-Pacific region. He believed that the Centre has a crucial role in conservation of transnational properties in the region which is endowed with outstanding cultural and natural heritage values.

Elaborating on the potential and possibilities for World Heritage Category 2 Centres & Institutes (C2C&Is), Chief Guest of the programme, **Dr. Mechtild Rössler**, Director World Heritage Centre, Paris highlighted that they have a rich contribution to make in UNESCO's work. Their potential lies in serving as regional Centres of excellence, assisting in extension of UNESCO's programs on heritage, and providing services in policy making, research, documentation and capacity building of member states.

Besides these contribution, C2C&Is are expected to establish links with UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN network & rotate coordination with different C2Cs and resource hubs. Dr. Rössler insisted that cooperation between Category 2 Centres, Institutes and Advisory Bodies (viz. IUCN and ICCROM) can foster capacity building of different World Heritage stakeholders. UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN network can be considered as potential links for knowledge sharing and capacity building. In this regard, WHITRAP can explore future collaborations with potential future C2C in Morocco which will deal in Urban Areas. Similarly, International Centre for Rock Art and the World Heritage Convention, Spain can look into collaborating with another forthcoming Centre in Indonesia which will focus on Human evolution and pre-historic heritage. She suggested that the cooperation between UNESCO C2C&Is would be useful in terms of knowledge sharing as well as sharing financial burden on organizing capacity building workshops and meetings, especially with young centres.

Dr. Rössler stressed that driving collective efforts of governments, UNESCO C2C&Is, Chairs and other technical institutions to operationalize the 2015-World Heritage Sustainable Development policy should be central to future endeavors of C2C&Is. In this context, World Heritage Leadership program, a partnership project between IUCN and ICCROM, can also provide support to world heritage practitioners to advance sustainable development through World Heritage Sites.

Setting the context for session's agenda in terms of reporting and reviewing C2Cs' ongoing work for exploring possibilities of international cooperation, **Dr. V.B. Mathur** gave an overview of the origin and significance of establishing the C2C-NWHMT at WII. He emphasized on importance of this Centre in managing natural sites of Asia-Pacific region. The Asia-Pacific region has 36 state parties entailing 173 Cultural, 62 Natural, and 12 Mixed World Heritage Sites. Within its first two years, despite initial teething problems, the C2C-NWHMT has conducted 19 workshops and training programs at national and international levels. In the capacity building and outreach initiatives, over 1000 participants from 18 countries have participated in the Centre's programs. Acknowledging the immense cultural significance of ecologically rich sites, the centre demonstrated forward thinking as illustrated through its proactive role in the successful inscription of Khangchendzonga National Park as a Mixed Heritage Site in 2016 – the first in India. The other sites in pipeline for nomination include the Bhitarkanika Conservation Area and the Kailash Sacred Landscape & Pilgrim Routes. The Centre is also actively involved in dissemination of information through quarterly e-news bulletin on UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites and developments. Dr. Mathur stressed upon the cross-sectoral collaborations for achieving mandates and objectives and called upon C2Cs to engage in active dialogue so as to learn from contexts and challenges confronting each centre, and explore ways to support and collaborate.

II. THE AGENDA: REPORT, REVIEW AND ROADMAP

The primary aim of the coordination meeting, as articulated strongly in the inaugural session, was to undertake a collective and transparent exercise of reporting and reviewing the work of each C2C so as to facilitate fertile grounds for future activities and cooperation among them. For this purpose, discussion was conducted in form of four overlapping technical sessions (a combined report is presented below):

Technical Session 1: Review of previous agenda and action taken from C2C Coordination Meetings

Technical Session 2: C2C Report on Progress and Activities

Technical Session 3: Mandate and activities of UNESCO Chairs

Technical Session 4: Road map for enhancing collaboration and cooperation amongst C2Cs

The technical sessions were initiated by **Dr. Sonali Ghosh**, Scientist-F, UNESCO C2C- NWHMT, who gave a brief background of Annual Coordination Meetings and UNESCO Category 2 Centres emphasizing on their role pertaining to both nature and culture. She mentioned that the recently established UNESCO C2C-NWHMT is the youngest among UNESCO C2Cs. Dr. Ghosh discussed the role of UNESCO C2C in complementing the priorities of the World Heritage Convention through focused capacity building, training and research programs, and the potential of regional collaborations. She insisted that integrating World Heritage priorities and Sustainable Development Goals should be one of the key targets of UNESCO Category 2 Centres and Institutes (C2C&Is). She shared the summary outcomes of previous Annual Coordination Meetings and stressed on the need for building emphatic discussions on mainstreaming Result Based Management (RBM) approach in reporting the Sustainable Development goals. She mentioned that the positive experience of the 39th Session at Bonn in 2015 inspired informal meetings of focal points or representatives of C2C to strengthen efforts towards achieving their mandates through networking and coordination.

Considering that Dr. Mathur had already presented the progress made by UNESCO C2C-NWHMT in India, the session on C2C reports began with Spain. **Ms. Elisa de Cabo de la Vega**, Deputy Director General for the Protection of Historical Heritage, represented International Centre for Rock Art and the World Heritage Convention, Spain. She gave an overview of the Centre's mission and progress, and drew attention to its work on conservation of Rock Art Heritage through improvement of tools, methods and planning. In addition, the Centre is specialized in the Rock Arts through lines of action and specialized programs. Centre's objectives of developing specific tools for property conservation, disseminating scientific knowledge and implementing the World Heritage Convention in Rock Art Heritage management are progressing well as demonstrated by the targets met annually. She shared the Centre's progress by presenting a glimpse of its activities like exhibitions, education

programs, International Rock Art in the World Heritage Congress, World Heritage Youth Program, and developing a nomination file for inscription of Magura Cave in Bulgaria. She also shared that the Centre will start its formal operations soon considering that Spain's Ministry of Culture has recently approved its establishment. This development will help in better representation of Rock Art Heritage on UNESCO World Heritage Sites list.

The C2C report from Mexico was given by **Ms. Susana Alvarado De la Torre** who represented the Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas. She shared the progress made towards incorporating twenty more Member States of Central American and Caribbean region into the Centre's reach to implement World Heritage Convention goals. The Centre has sent a report to Director General of UNESCO where eight Letters of Adhesion from the twenty Member States has been accorded while those from Guatemala and Salvador are in pipeline. Having necessary number of accessions, the Centre will work on formulating Action Plan for all the signatory member states. She stressed that this expansion of C2C-Mexico will lead to improved regional coordination, strengthened institutional capacity and enhanced realization of World Heritage Convention. She also briefly mentioned the planned future activities planned such as: Thematic training for site managers, specialized courses on management of World Heritage Sites with integration of Disaster Risk Reduction strategy, Heritage Impact Assessment studies and Training on tentative listing and nominations of sites for state parties. Collaborations of UNESCO Centres, Advisory Bodies (viz. IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM) and government bodies is also planned for the second cycle of the periodic report of Latin America and the Caribbean region.

The report on Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH), Bahrain was presented by **Mr. Kamal Bittar**, Cultural Heritage Specialist. He stressed upon the Centre's focus on up-streaming process for nomination of marshy lands in the region. To strengthen the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab States Region, the Centre is working hard to revamp cultural world heritage sites that are in danger because of conflicts and tensions. The Centre has succeeded in signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Global Heritage Fund, San Francisco to implement conservation and capacity building projects in the region. In addition, the Centre has supported Iraq in making management plan and nomination dossier of marsh lands. This reflects the coordination existing among member states and the Centre. Mr. Bittar said that the C2C-Arab is also focusing on involvement of public participation by identification of relevant communities for long term sustainable management of heritage sites. Among the main accomplishments of the Centre, he pointed out the successful training workshops on natural and cultural heritage sites in the Arab region and gulf countries.

Dr. Zhu Ziyun, Research Assistant at Shanshui Conservation Centre, Beijing represented The World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITRAP). The

Centre was officially founded in April, 2008 to serve the State Parties of the World Heritage Convention and UNESCO by promoting the conservation and development of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific region. In the meeting, an update on the Centre's work on World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building through different trainings and workshops was shared with the participants. The Centre is actively involved in organizing trainings and short courses for World Heritage practitioners, scientists and youth. These capacity building, outreach and sensitization initiatives were largely focused on Sustainable Tourism, Historical Architecture and Heritage Impacts Assessment in World Heritage Sites. WHITRAP, Shanghai has established cooperation with a number of institutes and professionals, and integrated resources and disciplines to promote the research and training programs.

III. THE WAY FORWARD

The meeting emphasized on the opportunities for UNESCO C2C&Is to collaborate strategically with regional resource hubs including UNESCO Chairs, other C2Cs, Advisory Bodies and UNESCO WHC to implement Global Sustainable Development Goals and World Heritage Convention priorities with effective use of technologies.

Participants in the meeting agreed upon following recommendations:

- a. C2Cs should use Result Based Management (RBM) approach for effective annual reporting of the Centres and regions respectively;
- b. A list of UNESCO chairs and UNITWIN networks active in a region should be circulated with C2Cs to build institutional capacity through research, exchange programmes, e-portals, sharing case studies, tentative list, nomination process learning and achievements;
- c. Member State parties, UNESCO C2Cs and Chairs along with regional resource hubs should initiate synergising World Heritage Convention priorities with the UN Sustainable Development Goals by using the 2015 World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy;
- d. Linking of specialized institutions having similar thematic mandates: Regional institutions including UNESCO C2Cs should explore possible collaborations with existing resource hubs. Potential future collaborations include the pairing of C2C in Morocco and Indonesia on Urban Areas and Human Evolution & Pre-historic heritage;
- e. Follow up on the World Heritage Regional Capacity Building Strategy should be steered by existing C2Cs and Chairs in close collaboration with UNESCO and advisory bodies;

- f. ICCROM and IUCN should invite relevant C2C experts for the World Heritage Leadership Project activities;
- g. C2Cs should increase fund raising activities for their operations and regional projects;
- h. Use of modern technologies to evaluate collaboration for effective communication is recommended. Building capacity of multi-level stakeholders through internet based communication means is strongly encouraged;

The UNESCO C2C Monsoon bulletin was launched during this meeting and is available on the following website link http://www.wii.gov.in/UNESCO_C2C_Monsoon_Bulletin_2016.

The C2C meeting was followed by two consultative dialogues on the subsequent days: the Nomination of Kailash Sacred Landscape (KSL) as WHS and the Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites.

During the consultative dialogues, delegates had the opportunity to be introduced with the agro biodiversity of Uttarakhand, the site of the current meeting, through an Organic Food festival curated by Navdanya- a network of seed keepers and organic producers spread across 18 states in India.

The delegates also participated in the Nature Trail at the Wildlife Institute of India led by Dr. Manoj Nair, and joined by Dr. Gautam Talukdar, Dr. Gopi G.V, Dr. Pratap Singh, Mr. R. Suresh Kumar, and Dr. Manju Siliwal who explained the development of this 2km wild trail in the campus, its biodiversity and conservation efforts for the same.

The five day international gathering at UNESCO C2C-NWHMT saw participation from nearly 100 participants from different institutions including ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM, IFLA, ICIMOD, the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Delhi office, UCOST, INTACH, State Government Departments as well as Universities and research organizations.

Glimpses

5th Annual Coordination Meeting of UNESCO Institutes and Centres

November 22, 2016



Picture 1. Group photograph of 5th Annual Coordination Meeting of UNESCO Institutes and Centres related to World Heritage



Picture 2. Dr. V. B. Mathur, Director, WII & UNESCO Category 2 Centre – India, gave inaugural address



Picture 3. Launch of monsoon edition of Natural Heritage Bulletin by UNESCO Category 2 Centre – India



Picture 4. Discussion during Technical Session 1



Picture 5. Kamal Bittar, Cultural Heritage Expert, ARCWH, Bahrain sharing his views



Picture 6. Discussion during Technical Session 2

CONSULTATIVE DIALOGUE ON KAILASH SACRED LANDSCAPE
NOVEMBER 23, 2016

The Consultative Dialogue on Kailash Sacred Landscape was held on the 2nd day of the international conference at UNESCO C2C at WII. It was attended by a diverse group of delegates that included UNESCO and Advisory Body members, ICIMOD, Indian government and civil society representatives, academics, professionals and other technical experts associated with the natural and socio-cultural dimensions of the Kailash Sacred Landscape (KSL). This consultative dialogue primarily aimed at presenting the initial proposal and progress on KSL India's nomination to World Heritage Site Status. This was one of the main tasks identified after the first stakeholder consultation held in mid-October 2016 at Pitthoragarh district, which forms most of KSL India region.¹ The consultative dialogue was envisaged to be an opportunity to mobilize support from wider community towards crafting a careful strategy that responds to pre and post nomination conservation challenges of KSL.

I. SETTING THE CONTEXT: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Dr. V. B. Mathur, Director of UNESCO C2C-NWHMT at WII opened the inaugural session by acknowledging the delegates and their contribution to the nomination process of KSL as WHS. In this regard, he first thanked the Chief Guest, Dr. Amita Prasad, Addl. Secretary and head of Mountain Division, MoEFCC, Government of India, New Delhi for gracing the occasion. He also expressed appreciation for Dr. Rajan Kotru and Mr. B.M.S. Rathore from ICIMOD based in Kathmandu, Nepal for being instrumental in the process of nomination of the KSL including technical and funding support to the project. He thanked Dr. Rajendra Dobhal, Director, UCOST for his long standing association with WII, and for graciously extending funding support to this project. He then extended a warm welcome to all the resource persons whose contribution will make rich and meaningful contribution to the process. He also expressed appreciation towards other eminent delegates and professionals for attending the session including Mr. Ravindra Singh, Mr. B.S. Bonal, Dr. Shikha Jain, Dr. Nupur Prothi, Ms. Gurmeet Rai, Dr. Pankaj Tiwari, Dr. G.C.S Negi, Mr. Manoj Chandran, Mr. M.S Garbyal, Dr. Shekhar Pathak, Dr. R.S. Rawal, Mr. Jairaj and Dr. Lokesh Ohri. He stressed on the relevance of their core competencies that are central to the nomination of KSL as UNESCO World Heritage.

Dr. Mathur noted the interest and enthusiasm that has been generated by the initiative to inscribe KSL as WHS project. He stressed that the project is undoubtedly a complicated nomination compelling us to resolve several key questions such as under what category the nomination should be made: Should this be done as a mixed site or cultural landscape? Should the nomination be transboundary/transnational serial or a joint nomination? He stressed that Mount Kailash has thrived in mindscapes and culture of billions of Indians and for hundreds of years even as actual

¹ A Backgrounder on KSL Nomination, summarizing the previous discussions and stakeholder consultations on KSL, was made available as resource booklet to all delegates attending the session.

physical property lies beyond Indian Territory. The geopolitical location, cultural connections and community association with KSL makes it a unique nomination and unarguably a formidable challenge. However considering, on one hand, the strong commitment and willingness of communities for this inscription which was clearly articulated during the stakeholder consultation held in October 2016 in Pitthoragarh, and on the other hand, the presence of Dr. Amita Prasad, senior official of the Ministry, together with the presence of national and international delegates in the consultative dialogue, the process so far conveys the inspiration and confidence in this nomination. Citing the example of Khangchendzonga National Park, where UNESCO C2C-NWHMT played a crucial role in altering the nomination from a natural site to that of mixed site by responding to the sentiments and knowledge shared by the local people, Dr. Mathur was optimistic that UNESCO C2C will play a similar role in nomination of KSL through a consultative and inclusive process.

Building further on the complex nature of KSL nomination, **Dr. Rajendra Dobhal**, Director General, UCOST – Dehradun, insisted on transboundary relevance of KSL nomination as it has the potential of bringing the three neighbouring countries from South Asia together and enabling transboundary cooperation. He, therefore, insisted that it would be better if India, China and Nepal come together and nominate KSL. He expressed hope that the transboundary nomination would be possible in future, if not immediately, when geopolitical issues turn favourable between India and China. However, he stressed that a bilateral nomination from India and Nepal might still be a possibility. Given that a substantial geographical part of KSL lies in Nepal, Dr. Dobhal stressed that ICIMOD will have to play a pivotal role not only in funding, but in bringing together the stakeholders of India and Nepal to make this happen. Noting that although KSL India forms a smaller part of KSL geographically, but demographically it is the largest part where population with cultural ties to Kailash is concerned. Dr. Dhobal saw nomination of KSL India under cultural site as a better proposition. He argued that while the KSL India region is rich in forest and biodiversity, the outstanding value lies in the cultural realm of Kailash given its religious, sacred, and mystical dimensions that uphold the ultimate mesmerizing value.

Dr. Dobhal also highlighted that the local communities in KSL India region have suffered alienation from the mainstream development initiatives for long. He suggested that the nomination process must find ways to identify specific deliverables for the region. For instance, Munsiyari could be developed for pilgrims/tourists to stay during their trek to Kailash which would boost local economy while also offering visitors opportunities for interacting with local population and experiencing why Kailash Mansarovar is a universal heritage. Therefore, the local communities must be made aware of the benefits and risks of the World Heritage Site status to obtain their consent and cooperation for the nomination.

Elaborating on the need and ways in which people with local knowledge and ties can play a part in the nomination process, **Shri B.S. Bonal**, Addl. DG (Wildlife) & Member-Secretary, NTCA shared insights from his own personal and professional journey. He himself has intimate knowledge of the local ecology and people considering that he is a native of Uttarakhand and as an officer has travelled to Kailash Mansoravar. He remarked that while he was born in the land of tigers (Uttarakhand), he worked in the land of rhinos through his appointment as a Forest officer of Assam Cadre in two World Heritage Sites viz. Kaziranga National Park and Manas National Park. He said that senior officers and professionals could play an important role in identifying information and other resources relevant for nomination process. He pointed out that Dr. S. S. Garbyal, Former DG, MoEFCC has done his PhD on traditional knowledge in Dharchula Valley, and could be an important resource person for providing information relevant to the nomination dossier. Likewise other research done by senior officials can be used to understand the landscape. He also mentioned about Rung Kalyan Sanstha (www.rungmung.net/), a joint initiative by government officials and retired personnel as a potential organization to connect with for help with nomination process.

He stressed that KSL India presents certain unique phenomenon. It has very less and scattered population and it witnesses migration during winter season from higher to lower region. He shared his experience through mesmerizing photographs of the sites on Indo-Nepal border – Bias Valley, Darma Valley, Chota Kailash and Ascot Wildlife Sanctuary. He stressed that the Bias valley falls on the route to Kailash Mansarovar, and this route has several sites of interests that could be notified such as Om Parbat which is considered to be an exact replica of Mt. Kailash. These places have also found to have abundance of medicinal plants, endemic flora and fauna. Lastly he suggested that Darma Valley is more viable option than Auli for winter sports.

Mr. Bonal articulated his strong desire and commitment to work for the development of his native village i.e. Bonn after his retirement. Bonn is one of the isolated villages in Pitthoragarh. He mentioned that as this place is remotely located, human casualties due to harsh climatic conditions remains unreported. Traditionally local populations are engaged in sheep rearing which is now shifting to collection of coreopsis. He saw inscription of KSL India as WHS as an important opportunity to enhance life quality of local people, and to bring attention to the challenges faced by local community.

Responding to the need for understanding the landscape and its relevance as a heritage site, **Dr G.S Rawat**, Dean WII, gave an overview of the outstanding universal values of KSL, providing an insight on different components of the landscape. He talked about the unique geology of KSL as it is a confluence of three different bio-geographic regions. He added that the landscape also supports Asia's four major river systems forming a crucial catchment area. In addition to the geomorphic aspect Dr. Rawat talked about the cultural aspect of KSL citing its historical and artistic linkages. He

specially mentioned the coexistence of different socio cultural group in this region. He also discussed the rich biodiversity of western Himalaya and its endemic species. He pointed out that KSL comprises of 140 Sacred Natural Sites, 15 glaciers, 20 Ancient temples, 4 sacred peaks and 6 sacred confluences which strongly highlight the cultural OUV of the landscape. Dr Rawat also stressed on the 'biocultural heritage' of KSL giving an example of the Indian butter tree (*Diploknema butyracea*) locally known as 'chyura' which is used for multiple purposes by the local community. He said that KSL also comprises of India's largest holy pilgrimage routes giving it an OUV on the same aspect. He suggested highlighting three Routes in KSL India: Heritage Yatra Routes and connections, Inner alpine valley combining trade routes and high passes, and Network of Sacred Natural Sites, sacred groves and temples.

Extending the discussion to the need for presentation of the cultural landscape and its OUV in terms of the World Heritage Convention, **Dr. Mechtild Rössler**, Director – World Heritage Centre, Paris, gave a global overview. She has been instrumental in guiding the work on Cultural Landscapes since 1992. She, along with other experts, defined the definition of 'Cultural Landscape' for the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention in 1992. The term embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and the natural environment. The Convention now has Article 1 on cultural heritage, which also includes criteria for Cultural Landscapes (because the natural environment is changed by people) and Article 2 on natural heritage (which includes the criteria on natural beauty even though some perceive natural beauty to be defined by cultural perceptions). She mentioned that criteria for cultural properties include designed landscapes, Living and/or relic cultural landscapes, and Associative Cultural Landscapes under Criteria I, II to V, and VI respectively. She stressed that to inscribe a site as Cultural Landscape it is essential to prove to the world that the interaction between human and environment is of Outstanding Universal Value. She insisted that Associative Cultural Landscape Criteria will certainly be a consideration for KSL nomination.

She cited several examples from across the world to illustrate the different categories of Cultural Landscapes. For instance, *Designed landscape* such as Sintra in Portugal or Kew Gardens in United Kingdom, *Living Cultural Landscapes* such as Agriculture in Val d'Orcia, Italy or pastoralist systems in Andorra, and *Cultural Landscapes* such as Sukur in Nigeria, Maymand in Iran, agrodiversity in Agave landscape of Mexico, Honghe Hani Rice Terraces in China, Singapore Botanic Gardens, and Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape.

She mentioned that there were no major problems faced in inscription of Designed Cultural Landscapes because they were already in parts included on the World Heritage List. The Sintra in Portugal and the Kew gardens in United Kingdom were among the first to be inscribed as designed landscapes. The Kew gardens have in-situ biodiversity conservation which is very important seed

banks of tomorrow. She also gave an example of the Lower Valley Landscape in France where a Living Cultural Landscape relied heavily on the seed banks of tomorrow. The Yin-Yang beans found historically in the Lower Valley, that had been lost to the region, were revived again by using the seeds available in a centre in Russia. She also mentioned the case of the Tuscany Cultural Landscape where an old painting depicted the entire landscape management plan. Also, Andorra, a tiny land lock country between France and Spain, of which 80% of its landmass has been nominated as a living cultural landscape for its outstanding agro pastoralist systems. She mentioned that the list now has agro pastoralist systems that go beyond national borders, which she stressed was an important aspect for future. She mentioned the case of the Agave Landscape and Ancient Industrial Facilities of Tequila in Mexico that was nominated by the Mexican authorities as a Cultural Landscape demonstrating its OUV in terms of incredible agro biodiversity and human ingenious systems. She mentioned that the first three Cultural Landscapes to be listed as World Heritage were from Asia including the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras in Philippines. Since then the FAO adopted a practice to nominate agricultural sites under the title 'GIAHS-Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Sites'. She also highlighted the case of Sukur in Nigeria, the first cultural landscape inscribed in the African region, which was recently destroyed by Boko Haram, and is presently being rebuilt after UNESCO's intervention.

Dr. Rössler stressed that inscribing cultural landscapes has several difficulties including the fact that many cultures do not have the term cultural landscapes in their language such as in Farsi and many African languages, which makes it difficult for people to comprehend the properties of their sites in terms of the criteria listed in the World Heritage Convention. She talked about the experience of the Living Landscapes of Maymand in Iran, a winner of Melina Mercouri Prize long before its inscriptions as WHS, where the designated authority didn't know what should be listed under the OUV (Outstanding Universal Value) whereas, in contrast, the authorities in the Seine Landscape in France listed everything they had noticed in the landscape. In both cases the World Heritage Committee guided the designated authorities in understanding the actual requirements of the Convention. This, she said, is the case with many other cultural landscapes in the world. For instance, Rock Art Cultural Landscape in China and also the first ever Associative Cultural Landscape inscribed under the Convention in 1993.

Elaborating upon the latter instance, she said that in 1993 the Tongariro National Park in New Zealand was re-nominated from natural site to Cultural Landscape because the Maori people wanted to have their sacred mountain to be included within the site. The World Heritage initially debated this proposal because they didn't find any physical cultural property that could be inscribed, although they confirmed the geological significance of the site. This, Dr. Rössler said, was due to a lack of understanding. The Mountain peaks at Tongariro were the most sacred mountains for Maori people as demonstrated by the fact that in the 18th Century they wore hats so that they do not look

directly into the mountain. The Heritage Committee was looking for some physical property that could be inscribed, ICOMOS suggested tree huts, but the Maori people refuted the suggestion and insisted on the association of the people with the natural environment. This became a landmark re-nomination because it was the first inscription of a World Heritage Site under Associative Cultural Landscape.

She cited other examples of re-nominations, such as the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in Australia which was originally inscribed as a Natural Site, but re-inscribed as a Mixed Cultural Landscape when the Anangu Aboriginal People in Uluru insisted that *Uluru*, an immense monolith, and *Kata Tjuta*, the rock domes located west of Uluru, both of which formed the traditional belief system of this oldest of human societies, to be included as part of the World Heritage Site. Although there were difficulties in identifying the actual sites (Anangu people's male sacred sites could be physically located, but female sacred sites were identified only through associative value), these re-nominations triggered a new understanding that people wanted the connections between their culture and nature to be recognized. This proved a turning point not just in terms of nominations, but also presentations of the sites through interpretation centres, expected behavior from visitors towards these sites, and management of the site (the site is closed for few days to tourists so that Anangu people could perform their sacred rituals). She also shared her experience with nomination of Kii, in Japan- a sacred site known for its associative and spiritual values. She recalled that during the First Meeting on Sacred Mountains of Asia, held in 2001 in Japan there was a discussion on Kailash too. She recommended that the report of the Meeting should be referred to learn from that initial discussion.

She clarified the distinction between Cultural Landscape and Mixed Sites. A Cultural landscape is where an interaction between people and environment of OUV takes place whereas a Mixed Site is where OUV in each set of criteria under natural and cultural has to be identified and proved. She emphasized that during nomination it is important to identify both the natural values and the cultural values, and then assess whether these are of OUV or not. She cited Mr. Juan Mayr, former Minister of Environment in Columbia, who had said that biodiversity should be appreciated in terms of human diversity (as different people face and perceive biodiversity differently due to their distinct heritage and experiences, which are translated into knowledge systems, cultural expressions and language, and which enrich and transform the environment, landscapes and especially biodiversity). This, she argued, is a point to be considered while moving forward on cultural landscape nominations.

She also emphasized that the Cultural Landscape systems are the resilient systems in a globalized world, and it is important to protect the traditional knowledge and practices for sustainable management of landscape. For this, recognizing the value of nature in cultural heritage and the

value of culture in natural heritage is crucial. She shared her engagement with perspectives emerging on cultural landscapes from different countries such as Bhutan where the current King declared the entire country to be a cultural landscape. Although Bhutan has not made even a single nomination for World Heritage inscription, but the efforts to understand Cultural Landscape and sustaining its significance in rapidly changing society in Bhutan, a project supported by Japan, is very much ongoing. Similarly, she mentioned work on nomination of Silk Roads: the Routes Network of Chang'an - Tian-Shan Corridor, China, Kazakhstan & Kyrgyzstan which are not inscribed as Cultural Landscape sites, but with key landscape components. She made a special mention to ICIMOD's working paper on Assessment of Cultural Ecosystem Services of Sacred Natural Sites in Hindu Kush Region based on fieldwork in KSL region in Nepal and India. She also explained the evolution of World Heritage Concepts from exceptional monuments to cultural landscapes and from nominations of single sites to cluster, from serial nominations to trans-border nominations. This had parallel resulted into more complex requirements about the protection and management of sites. She insisted that intimate knowledge of Operational Guidelines is essential for preparing the nomination. She pointed out that the idea of sustainability was first introduced in form of 'Sustainable Land Use' in Operational Guidelines through the work on Cultural Landscapes in 1992. She stressed on the role of local communities and stakeholders in sustainability of conservation and protection of the World Heritage Sites including the Sacred Sites such as KSL where many stakeholders may not even live in the Landscape. She stressed on the relevance of understanding the guiding principles of Cultural Landscape Management for the inscription process because successful management contributes to sustainable societies.

Concluding these expert perspectives and setting the agenda for the consultative dialogue, **Dr. Amita Prasad**, Addl. Secretary, MoEFCC, Govt. of India articulated the concerns and potential of the project. She called upon the attending delegates to examine KSL India with parallels at the global scale in order to identify its unique value for nomination process as well as to identify the approaches for its post-nomination management. She emphasized on making a long term strategy which will not only help KSL India in becoming a WHS but also retain its value through the decades by sustainably responding to changes in ecology and culture. She maintained that this poses a tricky and difficult scenario considering any such planning must address issues of strategy of mountain, livelihood, Green Mission, and also issues of ecology, environment and culture.

She shared her personal experience from her visit to Kailash through Nepal which gave her a first-hand understanding of the challenges that she foresees in the nomination process. First, the region has poor infrastructure and developmental amenities. While China has already started building roads and water management for the site, India is yet to initiate any such plans. Secondly, she highlighted the multicultural and intergenerational significance of Kailash to not just Hindus but also to Buddhists, Bonns and other religions. While interacting with local women, she learnt about

different religions and traditional practices prevalent in those remote areas. She insisted that our nomination process must include perspectives of all these communities. She also emphasized that as the first site under Sacred Landscape category from India, KSL India nomination should represent an exemplary work model instead of following any predefined strategy developed by any other country. For this, she said, it would be important to look critically into the needs and possibilities emerging from the landscape.

Similarly, the cultural aspects are yet to be recognized by our policies for protected areas. Even the protected area has a cultural landscape. She argued that while heritage means shared belief and a shared way of life, we need to deliberate upon our strategy for making it a landscape and its management plan. Presently, India has no policy related to mountains. Without a policy, it is difficult to plan a successful strategy at the ministry level. She pointed out that despite a growing consensus that understanding the landscape constitutes the first step, unfortunately biodiversity and landscape planning has yet not found its way to our environment policymaking. She stressed on the importance of policymaking that includes heritage and culture along with biodiversity and livelihood issues. She called upon UNESCO C2C and all attending delegates to develop an effective landscape governance plan for KSL India for it to make actual difference to the landscape as well as lives of local communities dependent on it through its inscription as a WHS.

Thirdly, she stressed upon the need for community engagement and motivation of local people. She insisted that we must be clear about what is in it for them. She said that in the nomination process Gram panchayats, urban and local bodies must be involved. It must not be the case that this entire process takes place in isolation therefore more local and national consultations are required to include them in the process of identification of landscape's heritage value, the ways to preserve it and the ways that people will find motivating to be involved in the preservation of the landscape.

II. THE AGENDA: DEVELOPING WORLD HERITAGE LANDSCAPE GOVERNANCE CAPACITY FRAMEWORK FOR KSL INDIA

The main goal of the KSL consultation was to develop a World Heritage Landscape Governance Capacity Framework for KSL India so that a time-bound, effective and inclusive plan can be generated for inscription of KSL India as a WHS through collective deliberation.

Facilitating this process, **Dr. Shalini Sharma**, Asst. Prof. at TISS Guwahati and UNESCO C2C Visiting Fellow, supported by **Mr. Niraj Kakati**, Technical Officer at UNESCO C2C, presented the rationale of the technical sessions. The three technical sessions were designed based on Dr. Cara van Oosten's (Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University, Netherlands) concept of 'Landscape Governance Framework' and her format for determining it.² Referring to Oosten's work, Dr. Sharma explained that Landscape Governance Framework addresses landscapes as socio-ecological systems working across actors, and for ensuring adaptive co-management. It aims at forging sustainable human-natural relations, bringing spatial decision-making closer to those affected directly by it, ensuring restored connectivity, multi-functionality & biocultural diversity, ultimately leading to stronger resilience. She said that it is particularly useful to tackle the complexity of managing, conserving or restoring landscapes such as KSL which is diverse, multifunctional and incorporates both natural aspects and social dimensions. These aspects and dimensions can be local as well as regional or even global. Furthermore, each landscape is distinct because they are the product of different social and ecological processes at multiple scales that are unique to that landscape at a specific moment in time. Finally, landscapes are also social constructs beyond being just physical or material. This suggests that landscapes do not have fixed borders, and that the different relevant actors may be difficult to identify. This poses specific challenges for governance processes. Accordingly, Landscape governance refers to the complex process of decision making and negotiation between stakeholders operating at various levels and scales allowing their interests to be at the centre of its restoration, alongside interests of landscape's biophysical characteristics. Thus, transforming governance into a process where place-bound negotiation and decision making occurs collectively.

This session, Dr. Sharma said, seeks to identify landscape governance arrangements that are put together by landscape actors, more or less embedded in locally existing livelihood strategies and socially embedded institutional frames, who are able to formulate shared objectives which relates to 'landscape happiness', identify fundamental process and generate resources to perform. The session

² Oosten, V. Cara. 2013. 'Forest Landscape Restoration: Who Decides? A Governance Approach to Forest Landscape Restoration', in *Natureza & Conservação, Brazilian Journal of Nature Conservation* 11(2):119-126, Also, Oosten et al. 2014. 'Governing Forest Landscape Restoration: Cases from Indonesia', *Forests* 2014, 5, 1143-1162

therefore adopts: a) *An integrated approach* that involves relevant actors from different stakeholder groups, including state and non-state actors, b) *A cross scale approach* that considers both the characteristics of the landscapes in question as well as the wider environmental, social and economic drivers that affect it, and c) *An interdisciplinary approach* that involves the collaboration of experts from different disciplines, including cultural studies, social sciences, and ecological sciences. The session facilitates thinking about landscape governance through assessment of five *Core Collective Capabilities*: to understand landscape dynamics, to achieve coherence in landscape diversity, to make institutions and policies work for the landscape, to create landscape market value and, to manage landscape resources.

Dr. Sharma explained the process to determine the nature of nomination and potential core collective capabilities through participatory exercise, and shared the following layout for participatory assessment of core collective capabilities.

Participatory Assessment of Core Collective Capabilities

Group	Core Capability	Facilitators	Key Determinants	Outcome(s) presented in Technical Session III
Technical Session I Mr. B.M.S. Rathore & Dr.RajanKotru, ICIMOD				
1.	Capability to understand landscape dynamics and think/position strategically	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape awareness - Landscape assessment - Adaptive learning/contextual flexibility - Recognizing opportunities/threats - Readiness for the future/responsiveness 	Task Report 1 (Plan towards readiness to appropriately engage with the landscape)
Technical Session II Dr.Shalini Sharma, TISS Guwahati & Niraj Kakati, UNESCO C2C-WII				
2.	Capability to achieve coherence in landscape diversity	Gurmeet Rai, Shekhar Pathak, Shikha Jain, Manoj Matwal, Inaba Nobuku, Zhu Ziyun, & Ajaz Hussain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape leadership - Facilitating multi-stakeholder networking - Establishing common concern/pathways - Leveraging power relationships - Conflict management 	Task Report 2 (Plan towards inclusiveness and togetherness in the landscape)
3.	Capability to make institutions and policies work for the landscape	B.M.S. Rathore, Mechtild Rössler, Rajan Kotru, Leticia Leitaó, Ravindra Singh, Gajendra Singh, Sussana Alvarado, Kamal Bittar, Sonali Ghosh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognizing and capitalizing on landscape institutions - Securing access rights to resources and benefits - Engaging with external institutions for the benefit of the landscape - Policy coordination/integration within in the landscape - Mobilizing external support (information, finance, political..) 	Task Report 3 (Plan towards connectedness and alliances beyond the landscape)

Group	Core Capability	Facilitators	Key Determinants	Outcome(s) presented in Technical Session III
4.	Capability to create landscape market value	Pankaj Tewari, Nupur Prothi, R. S. Rawal, Ghanshyam Pande, Ram Boojh, Kai Weise, & B. S. Adhikari	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livelihood benefits from the landscape - Landscape-conscious entrepreneurship - Landscape-oriented business models and finance - Enabling economic/market environment - Landscape-based certification/quality control 	Task Report 4 (Plan towards responsible landscape enterprise)
5.	Capability to manage landscape resources	G.C.S. Negi, Vinay Bhargava, B. S. Bonal, Hareesh Chandra, Manoj Chandran, G.S Rawat, Aarti, Mona and Sumit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated WHS landscape resource management processes and structures - Management decision-support base/tools - Integrated spatial planning - Spatial decision-making - Participatory monitoring and evaluation of WHS landscape resource management 	Task Report 5 (Plan towards a resilient landscape)

Discussion: Road Map for Inscription of Kailash Sacred Landscape as World Heritage Site based on Landscape Governance Framework.

After an icebreaking and perspective building group exercise by **Dr. B.M.S Rathore**, the delegates were re-grouped into four separate groups to discuss the nature of nomination and potential core capabilities. A consolidated summary of the group reports presented in Technical Session III and expert inputs from Technical Session I and IV is shared below:

To give an overview of the dynamics of the transboundary landscape, **Dr. Kotru**, Coordinator of Kailash Sacred Landscape Conservation and Development Initiative, ICIMOD explained the organizational mandate of ICIMOD, the concept of transboundary landscapes and the World Heritage Initiative on KSL. ICIMOD is regional mountain knowledge, learning and enabling centre devoted to sustainable mountain development for mountains and people in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Myanmar, Nepal, and Pakistan.

He explained that within this region ICIMOD is involved in strengthening transboundary cooperation for conservation, development and applied research to inform policy and practice. He said that ICIMOD has a 20 year target period for enhancing cooperation within Transboundary landscapes so that they are better conserved and managed for sustaining ecosystem goods and services to improve livelihoods and enhance ecological integrity, economic development, and socio-cultural resilience to environmental changes. Dr. Kotru recalled that the idea of Transboundary Landscapes

dates back to mid-2000s when Millennium Ecosystem Assessment-2005 had come out and where ICIMOD discussed the various Transects including Kailash. These landscapes were unique because these were eco-regions, these enabled corridor connectivity, had North-South climate gradient which was highly perceptible, these had a climate range from Arid to Tropical, and also unique cultures and traditions. Kailash stood out as a sacred landscape with unique biodiversity and culture. Increased cooperation between three Regional Member Countries –India, China and Nepal – was crucial for transboundary cooperation and conservation efforts at KSL.

Dr Kotru gave a brief account of the ICIMOD initiative on Kailash Sacred landscape nomination as WHS. He emphasized on the transboundary nature of KSL as it shares the boundary with Nepal and China, and connected with India through pilgrim routes. Explaining the significance of Kailash in consciousness of people from the three countries, Dr. Kotru quoted Puranas, ancient works of Indian mythology, “There are no other mountains like the Himalayas for there are found Mount Kailash and Lake Manasarovar.... As the dew is dried up by the morning sun, so are the sins of human kind by the sight of the Himalayas”.

He mentioned that ICIMOD’s Transboundary Landscape Program is working together with key subjects, livelihoods, ecosystem services and geospatial solutions to make the program very inclusive as well as consultative in other scientific fields which are there to make the Kailash project happen on the ground. This, he said, is supported by ICIMOD’s robust knowledge management and communication system which helps to create, preserve and disseminate the knowledge.

He explained that for this, partners, processes and tools (in China-India-Nepal & Others) are being developed. These include: Participatory Impact Pathway Analysis; Monitoring & Evaluation System, Knowledge Management and Communication Strategies; Landscape Journey Tool which originated in KSL, Platforms for dialogue and consultations, and Gender Mainstreaming. He also elaborated upon the regional cooperation/ partnerships strategy which involves harmonized frameworks, and a strategy of integrating conservation and development in form of strategies for establishing livelihoods value chains, taking stock of biodiversity and Traditional Knowledge, Integrated Action Plans for the management of natural resources with Landscape Approach, Datasets on environment and socioeconomic changes, and National & Transboundary cooperation where WHS UNESCO provides a bridge to Transboundary-ness.

He identified interfacing at local, national, and regional/global levels with integration as way forward. This would lead to heritage work mainstreaming, harmonized approach to data collection and use, cross-border human and institutional strength for improved livelihoods, cooperation on “win-wins” such as disaster management, markets, natural resource governance and cultural invigoration, peace and stability in the region, and success in meeting Sustainable Development Goals-2030.

He described the efforts undertaken to assess KSL as a potential “World Heritage”. This involves scoping exercise for Serial Cultural and Natural Sacred Sites as common ground for the long term Transboundary Cooperation, identifying Trans-boundary UNESCO World Heritage property in the KSL, and developing the concept of Kailash as Transboundary Landscape, He explained that this requires an agreement on having a trans-boundary nomination for the KSL, preparation of a common tentative list submission document, and concisely listing the reasons for a trans-boundary nomination. This common tentative list submission document would have to be put on the country tentative lists for UNESCO World Heritage Sites by each of the three countries. Only one of the three countries would have to put the proposed KSL transboundary property on its annual nomination quota for the year when the actual nomination would be made. Alongside/beforehand, the three countries would need to begin the preparation of the nomination dossier.

Explaining the many advantages of Transboundary World Heritage Nomination for KSL, Dr. Kotru mentioned that a transboundary nomination could help speed up the process of getting the KSL nominated by putting it on the quota of the country that has the shortest queue of sites to nominate. It could help promote peaceful cooperation and improve relations among the three countries. Also, UNESCO looks favorably on transboundary nominations for its potential to enable transboundary cooperation. He emphasized that KSL also has huge significance for millions of people therefore it is a high profile transboundary landscape across three countries. Citing Dr. Edwin Bernbaum’s research, Dr. Kotru said that when compared with other Mountain heritage sites, Kailash fulfills all the parameters as a Sacred Landscape for World Heritage Site Status.

He mentioned that ICIMOD is actively involved in consultation and dialogues on KSL nomination in all three countries 2012 onwards. He shared the outcomes of previous consultations, where ICIMOD, an intergovernmental agency, was proposed to provide the ‘pull factor’ in the transboundary nomination. Dr. Kotru said Nepal has a keen interest in pursuing a trans-boundary nomination including KSL India. China, with current focus on reviving old culture, is definitely moving forward on the nomination of Mt. Kailash. At this point of time, the Chinese counterparts expressed a great interest in a nomination for a World Heritage Site designation for the Kailash landscape (i.e. the Holy Peak and Lake Manasarovar), and may join the transboundary nomination if the other two countries were also on board.

For KSL India, he stressed on the need to adopt mechanisms for knowledge management and consultation as well as strategies for conservation and livelihood development. He insisted that multi-stakeholder consultation, with a focus on local communities, should be an intimate goal for transboundary heritage which should begin with raising awareness about the WHS designation process and its implications for the rights and livelihoods of local communities.

Dr. Shikha Jain, Former Member Secretary, Advisory Committee for World Heritage Matters, Govt of India and Director of DRONAH, explained the current nomination requirements and steps for KSL India inscription as WHS viz-a-viz the Operational Guidelines .

She said that deciding the type of nomination is crucial. We have already looked at KSL as one contiguous landscape and in this session we will further discuss whether we should opt for Serial Nomination or Transboundary/Transnational nomination. She said, that Dr. Kotru has already mentioned that India and Nepal must take first steps and that there is a possibility that China may join later, so for us it becomes important to consider the nomination from both angles. We really need to decide, at this point of time, whether we are going for a national nomination or transnational. Either we could go for a transnational nomination with a contiguous property in one go. If not, then India and Nepal can either go for separate or bilateral nomination with clearly defined national properties.

As far as category of nomination is considered, she said, the potential is clear in terms of both Cultural Landscape and Mixed Site nomination. She highlighted the potential of the Mixed Heritage Site Nomination for KSL-India as the cultural landscape contains properties that qualify for natural criteria. This, she pointed out, is similar to the recently inscribed the Khangchendzonga Mixed Cultural Landscape Heritage Site with value as Associative Cultural Landscape and Natural Heritage.

She said that there are two Special Cultural Properties for KSL India. Firstly, Cultural Landscapes, that manifest as tangible expressions of significant interactions between man and nature. Secondly, Cultural routes, including religious and trade. She said that we need to ensure that the extent of the cultural landscape that we identify for inscription on the World Heritage List is relative to its functionality and intelligibility, and that it adequately represents the totality of the cultural landscape that it illustrates. So, the property area, whatever the country nomination selects, has authenticity and integrity, and that it has the maximum area that represents the OUVs.

She stressed that Mount Kailash is undoubtedly a strong Associative Cultural Landscape with so many religions associating with it. It is the ultimate pilgrimage destination for Hindus, Buddhist, Jain and Bon. For all religions, Mount Kailash is the spiritual epicenter. Tibetan Buddhists believe that Kailash is the home of the Buddha Demchok, who represents supreme bliss. Hindus believe Mt. Kailash to be the abode of Lord Shiva. For a Hindu, to make the arduous pilgrimage to Kailash and have the *darshan* (divine view) of Shiva's abode is to attain release from the clutches of ignorance and delusion. The pilgrimage around the sacred mountain is called the Kailash Kora. It is said that one trip around the sacred mountain will wipe away all the sins (bad karma) of one's current lifetime; 108 revolutions will remove the sins of all one's lifetimes and bring salvation from reincarnation (moksha).

However, the challenge is that Mount Kailash itself, which has the strongest OUV, is in China, not India. Therefore China going for transboundary nomination at a later stage is a matter of concern. She said they already faced a similar situation in case of the Architectural Work of Le Corbusier which was a transnational dossier presented twice to the World Heritage Committee where Chandigarh was not originally included and therefore it was only after several referrals it was inscribed this year with Chandigarh as a part of it . So we really need to think over the feasibility of moving forward on Associative Cultural Landscape Nomination without China there. However, as far as KSL India is concerned if India is moving ahead separately and later on joining hands with China and Nepal, then we need to identify the OUVs and define them for Indian proposal. She mentioned that ICIMOD had done an excellent cultural mapping even in terms of visitors. She said it is important to Identify potential OUV for KSL India because until potential OUV has been set out and justified, it is not possible to develop many other aspects of the nomination such as defining the boundaries, which should be drawn to reflect the extent of attributes that convey potential OUV; and being clear about protection, conservation, management and presentation / promotion of the attributes that convey the potential OUV.

Referring to the WHS Manual on Nomination, she suggested staging the nomination process. First, understand the value of the property and the WHS criteria that applies to it. Second, carry out a global comparative analysis to test the values of the property against comparable World Heritage and other properties selected on a worldwide basis. Third, confirm the criteria that should form the basis of the nomination and develop a Statement of OUV.

She suggested that we need to first list down all the OUVs of Kailash Sacred Landscape and then move ahead with its nomination. These criteria will decide over the integrity of the site. She proposed Criteria III, V, VI, VII and VIII for KSL India nomination. In terms of Potential OUV for KSL India she mentioned a) Pilgrim Routes - Every year, thousands make a pilgrimage to Kailash, following a tradition going back thousands of years and, b) Pilgrims of several religions believe that circumambulating (walking around) Mount Kailash will remove sins and bring good fortune. She said that the challenge is to identify the Pilgrim Routes/ Settlements in India, and the attributes that qualify them for OUV. She suggested developing a Justification of KSL India where OUV is defined through ten criteria listed in the Operational Guidelines. She said that a comparative analysis explains the importance of the nominated property both in its national and international context. In order to do this, the property should be compared with similar properties, whether on the World Heritage List or not. The comparison should outline the similarities the nominated property has with other properties and the reasons that make the nominated property stand out. She said that here it would be useful to have a comparison of seven transboundary landscapes identified by ICIMOD and its partners: Hindu Kush Karakoram Pamir Landscape (HKPL), Karakoram-Pamir, Kailash, Everest, Kangchenjunga, Landscape Initiative for Far Eastern Himalayas (HI-LIFE), and Cherrapunjee-

Chittagong. Also, it would be useful to compare KSL India with other Cultural Landscapes/Cultural Routes on similar criteria across India, Asia and across the World.

She emphasized that, in addition to the requirement that the property must meet one or more criteria for WHS, the property must also meet the conditions for Authenticity and Integrity as well as have an effective site management plan. It is important for all the stakeholders to decide over its nomination procedure and related aspects as China has already begun with its preparatory work for nominating it. She said that the next step is to place KSL India on Tentative List as per Operational Guidelines.

Building on the outstanding values of KSL India **Dr R.S. Rawal**, from GBPNIHESD, discussed in detail the Diversity, Uniqueness and Sacred Values of KSL India. He mentioned that KSL India constitutes of 96% Pithoragarh and 4% Bageshwar making a total area of 7120.2 sq.km, and covering a total population of approx. 5 lakh. He also gave a pictorial overview of the diverse natural and cultural aspects of the landscape.

He mentioned that KSL India has several diverse physiographic features. He said that KSL India has 6 hydro-geographic units where 4.6% of total area is covered by Saryu, 7.9% by Kuti-Yangti, 20.4% by Dhauli, 20.6% by Ramganga, and 31.2% by Gori.

KSL India also demonstrates presence of diverse ethnic groups such as: The Aryans (Armanoids, Alpanoids, Dinarics, Nordics), the Mongoloids (Palaeo and Tibeto-Mongoloids), and The Negroids (Negrito-Australoids, Palaeo-Mediterranean). He mentioned that the region also has diversity in cultural areas. It has six distinctive cultural areas: Bhot which is inhabited by Tribal - Shauka, and Rang-Shauka communities, Askot by Tribal- Rajees and Non Tribal communities, Seera, Sor and Gangoli are predominantly Non tribal areas. Accordingly one sees a diversity of human faces in terms of people from Seera, Askot-van rajee, Darma, Bhot-Johar, Gangoli, Bhot- Chaudans, Bhot-Byans, Bhot-Darma and Sōr communities. Further, he explained, KSL India demonstrates diversity of Land use & land cover as well as diversity of settlements in the landscape.

Dr. Rawal explained that KSL India overlaps with Nandadevi Biosphere Reserve. It has Askot Wildlife Sanctuary. There is also diversity in forest areas of KSL India as there are 9 types and 30 tree sub-types of Forest and conservation areas. It is unique due to its Floristic richness with sensitive taxa. It also shows Fauna diversity and had sensitive and unique taxa. He pointed out that KSL India is also important region as it is home to some threatened plants species, endangered fauna species including birds; He said that there is sufficient documentation to make the case for KSL India's uniqueness in terms of its biodiversity.

Further, he mentioned that the Sacred Sites in KSL India includes Sacred Om Parvat (Nabhidang), Nabhi Parvat (Nabhidang), Narayan Ashram, Parvati-tal (Jeolinkong), Chotta Kailash, Hat Kalika-

Gangolihat, Kali Mandir-Kalapani, Taleshwar - near Jhoolaghat, and Pancheswar which is the start point of the landscape. He said that we need to build a case around each of these sites as these demonstrate both natural and cultural values.

In terms of landscape governance framework in KSL, Dr. Rawal mentioned the relevance of identification of the governance and jurisdictions of the state party of the countries. He stressed on the need for establishing landscape connections especially emphasizing on relevance of 'landscape yatra' as special tool which gives a lot of information about the landscape (understanding on ground realities, bringing experiences and values to stakeholders). The Community and agency institutions are brought together through the *yatra* which reflects the heritage value of the landscape.

He mentioned there is a need for wider Communication/Dialogue with diverse stakeholders, building understanding on ground realities (Monitoring - Interactive mode), Bringing experiences and values with Inputs from a multidisciplinary team, and have a feel of short and long term impacts of Interventions by govt. and NGO programmes). He identified readiness for the future/ responsiveness, Landscape leadership, power relationships and conflict management as areas for further improvement.

Dr. Shekhar Pathak, Former Professor of History at Kumaon University and Padma Sri Awardee, and who has travelled to Kailash three times, said that the most powerful aspect of KSL is that it is multi-cultural, multi-religion, and multi-national destination. In this respect it is totally unique in the globe. It is neither Ayodhya nor Jerusalem. He mentioned that during his first Kailash Yatra in 1990, apart from all geology, tectonics, scheme of rivers and lakes, the first thing that became most prominent to him was this aspect of KSL. He said that when ICIMOD came up with the idea, he also grew with it.

Elaborating on selected dimension, of the many dimensions of Kailash, Dr. Pathak said that from historical point of view, the transhumance movement is important. This involves history of how Mongloids came down, how they interacted with Khasar (who were pre-Vedic Aryans) who were the dominant race from Europe to Asia; how these ethnic groups intermingled; how they adjusted with the caste system in India. Basically, the history of how ethnic migration happened, and how trade happened. He said that the history of trade routes is definitely older than the history of pilgrim routes. Barter opened the gateways for pilgrimage. He said that the first traders must have been the discoverers of Gods in Kailash. He said there is 200 years of recorded history to illustrate this aspect including the documents prepared by British, Germans, and Swiss geologists.

From this larger idea to KSL, Dr. Pathak said, we now focus on KSL India and KSL Nepal, both of which are more closely connected. Both sides have the river Kali. Same culture lives in two different nations. Bandaris, Rangs, Khasars and Caste Hindus live on both sides of the river Kali. Even goats live on both sides. He mentioned that marital relations exist on both sides where people from across the

river marry each other. He said that this kind of relationship is not visible with Tibet because the movement across the countries was interrupted so many times due to historical forces including conflict with China. He mentioned that it would be important to look into the turning points in Indo-Nepal- China relationship. In 1815, once the Treaty of Sugauli was signed between the East India Company and the ruling Nepal Alliance, the river Kali became the international border between British India and Nepal. This led to Chongu and Tinker, which were very much a part of scheme of villages of upper Bias in India, emerge as two isolated villages in Nepal which are not connected with the rest of Nepal. Nature also played a powerful role. Because of the Api Nampa Mountains these villages cannot be entered directly. One has to either go around the mountains from Tibet side to enter Nepal or cross Dharchula. In 1960, the border clash with China became a turning point for history of people who were in transhumance and nomadism in their own area. The trade that they were doing suddenly stopped. Chamoli, Pithoragarh and Uttarkashi districts were also created in 1960. After 1960 when the doors between Indo-China were closed, the pilgrimage also stopped; the Indo-Tibet trans-valley trade was stopped which impacted the highlanders of Himalayas (Bhutiyas, Shaukas, Joharis, Tokka, Marcha, Jats etc). In 1967 Indian Constitution gave the Scheduled Tribe status to people who were observing transhumance and nomadism they became part of 'India Naukri System' through recruitment in Indian forest system, Railway system etc. They were compelled to leave their original roots in India. This has both positive and negative connotations. In 1981 GOI and Government of China reopened pilgrimage to China. A few years later they re-opened Indo-Tibet trade. This became the international trade between the two nations of Asia. Whenever ICIMOD will bring people from three countries to discuss larger KSL nomination these events will be discussed in more detail.

He said that while discussing KSL India, Almora becomes an important site as the journey starts from Almora and then goes to different passes to reach *Kailash Maths* and finally Kailash Mansarovar. He mentioned that KSL India is very rich in biodiversity. Socio-cultural diversity wise too it is unique. There are Shaukas who later got nick-named as Bhutiyas Highlanders, there are Rang- people of three different valleys, and there are Vanrajee—oldest aboriginals of India with a population of 400-700 as per the last Census. He said that the Indian part of Himalayas also has the oldest human stream as well as the oldest language which is pre-Indo European, pre-Tibetan, pre-Southern language. The region is in-fact known for its linguistic diversity. According to the Linguistic Survey of India published its Uttarakhand report last year, this area is linguistically the richest. Both the oldest language and the youngest language are found here. According to ICIMOD's publication 2600 languages are being spoken in the Hindu Kush Himalayan region.

Dr. Pathak also stressed on the region being rich in terms of indigenous arts and sciences. From ironsmith to silver ornaments, from wool to bamboo and stone. He insisted that skills are still known and surviving even if old cultural routes are lost.

He also pointed out the architectural diversity of KSL India. The region has Post-Gupta architectural style temples; Chongu has the only mountain temple in Himalayas, Naga Temple, and Buddhist arts etc. He said that right now the route via Badrinath to Kailash is not being discussed, where one can see Buddhist art in the Badrinath Temple, and the focus is only on the route along Kali River where temple and cave diversity is seen. He said that so many caves exist in KSL India region that they can give shelter to nearly 500 people.

He pointed out that the intimacy of Indo-Nepal relations is visible in our folklores. It also visible in autobiographies of our heroes and celebrities especially explorers (both local and non-local).

He stressed on visiting KSL to understand ground realities of the site. He said there is a need to know the entire area more deeply, including its geology, ecology, folklores and history, art and literature, and then identify a way to combine these to present our logic for nomination. He explained that KSL is one of the most ignored parts in Asia. According to him, the priorities of stakeholders should be bottom-up- primarily local people living around KSL, secondarily people living in regions in the vicinity of KSL, thirdly people of the countries and finally people those of the continent.

Dr. B.M.S Rathore identified Five Ws from these expert perspectives for further discussion– First, What Type of Nomination – Natural, Cultural or Mixed? National or Transnational – Should we all go national and then meet somewhere a year later or start as transboundary nomination from the very start. Second, where do we locate our sites? Third, what are those OUVs? Fourth, what benefits does inscription of KSL India provide to stakeholders? Fifth, what kind of governance and site management plans are required, and what are the next steps?

To clarify process on transnational nominations, **Dr Mechtild Rössler** said that if countries decide to go for transnational nomination, whether now or in future, they will need to prepare a framework for a nomination of transnational sites because different countries may go for different categories which make it difficult to reconcile the sites at a later stage. For instance if India goes for Cultural Landscape and China for Mixed Site it makes it very difficult for longer future to put the two sites together as one site. Also, she clarified that due to a legal provision Outstanding Universal Value is always considered singular, not plural. Within it there are different sets of values – natural, cultural etc.

Mr. Ravindra Singh said we need to think if there is any OUV without Kailash or should we go in for nomination with Kailash in mind. For this, it is also important to clarify with all the countries concerned whether there is any issue related to the boundaries. In response, **Dr. Kotru** clarified that during the preparatory consultations on KSL the three countries agreed on a delineated area to start with, which has been presented by ICIMOD to the consultative dialogue. He said that they are aware

of other routes from Himachal and Leh but the project scope is restricted at the moment although in future extending the scope might be possible. However, the issue of boundary has been discussed with partners and several scientists and experts, many of whom are part of this consultative dialogue as well, focusing on the area delineated by the three countries. He explained that while each country will need to identify its own property and OUV for the nomination, ICIMOD tried its best in the first few years of preparatory phase for a transboundary nomination. However, due to sensitive geopolitical situations between the countries concerned it could not be pursued. The situation now looks promising, as illustrated by the fact that for the first time, due to the efforts from the team working on the issue in the three countries, China has allowed Tibetan Autonomous Region (TAR) to go for a Transboundary Tourism Corporation. Within this mandate, ICIMOD involvement has already been requested by government negotiations between Tibetan Autonomous Region and Nepal Government to work on Kailash Sacred Landscape Responsible Tourism. This, he insisted, is a very real initiative which could be further built upon. To this, Dr. Rathore added that that this programme has been able to foster regional cooperation across the three countries on different aspects.

On the issue of Pilgrim Routes, **Dr. Ravindra Singh** also said that we must not restrict ourselves to a route that is currently being used for Kailash Mansarovar Yatra, but also look into other routes, basically reading history backwards, unless there is a strong rationale for a specific route in terms of boundary. To this, **Dr G.S. Rawat** added that the current pilgrimage routes are important but while preparing the dossier we will need to strongly think about the history because some of the ancient trade routes were very important for local people. Also, now we have motor routes going to the interior valleys, but the present generations would want to trace what their ancestors did. So, these routes are the linkage between our ancestral knowledge and present generation and further to the future generation. He pointed out that in Uttarakhand, within KSL-India region there are five passes from which one can see Mount Kailash therefore as a local stakeholder his children might want to see Mount Kailash from these different passes just as he heard from his grandfathers about how beautiful Kailash looked from those passes. So, there is a need to explore the links between the passes in India and the Mount Kailash in TAR.

Building on this aspect of routes and passes, **Ms Gurmeet Rai** inquired if the Indian part of the area delineated within ICIMOD's KSCLDI is sufficient for delineation of the properties for consideration for World Heritage? Also, considering that India has pilgrim routes to Mt. Kailash from Kashmir, Himachal, Kedarnath, Uttarakhand, Sikkim and Lhasa, she suggested it would be useful to change the title of the nomination to 'Kailash Sacred Landscape & Pilgrimage Routes' so that the rationale for India's nomination could become clear. She said that the link with passes that Dr. Rawat mentioned brings the idea of 'Kailash' as leading towards the OUV. For instance, while considering books like Diana Eck's 'Sacred Geography of India' one could say that Mt. Kailash occurs in the landscape of the

subcontinent everywhere. For instance, she mentioned, she had the opportunity to look at the site management plan of the Ellora Caves where Cave No. 16 is the Kailash Temple. Later while reading a book on Kailash by Swami Pranava Nanda, who in 1940s had done over 25 trips to Mt. Kailash, she was amazed to find that the recognizable iconography that one sees in the landscape of Kailash and Mansarovar, through Swami Pranava Nanda's description, are the same as what builders of the Kailash Temple had done in Ellora. She said that it resonates with Lingaraja temple or Hindu sagar in Bhubaneswar, Orissa. Hindu sagar signifies Mansarovar, and this is the link to Kailash. Therefore, she emphasized that the idea of Kailash and what it means for Indian Subcontinent need to be articulated in our nomination for cultural landscape. The idea of Kailash and what it means for people in China may be different. So, it will be useful to highlight how the landscape is read differently in different countries.

Ms Nupur Prothi stressed that for the nomination of KSL as Cultural Landscape we need not limit the larger story around cultures routes, settlements, and intangible connections with Kailash. For nomination as WHS, she reinforced Dr. Shikha Jain's previous points about the need to first build clarity on the OUV, the boundaries and the partners because our story will also depend on the partners in the process. **Dr. B S Bonal** also supported the need for identification of partners and agencies from the very start. **Mr Manoj Matwal** pointed out that as landscape dynamics changes it will also change the village dynamics. Construction in the area is growing more with settlements. It is important to understand how natural and cultural values are decided. Also, he suggested, while all the routes in the KSL India region are protected by national law, it would be important to know if there are any legal provision/protection for the routes which are transboundary.

The presentations from different groups reflected a consensus on transboundary/transnational nomination of KSL where the relevance of the entire area as a whole is projected in terms of geological and socio-cultural aspects. It emerged that it would be best to look at the area as a whole because only then the OUV would stand out. The delegates suggested that India should prepare its own draft nomination and share it with Nepal and China, possibly with ICIMOD's involvement. A bilateral approach could also be explored.

Further, **Ms. Gurmeet Rai** and **Dr. Sonali Ghosh**, articulated the discussions on core collective capabilities 2 and 3 respectively. The discussions within the two groups (Group 1 and 2) highlighted that definition the property, which is most critical, should be dealt with first. The OUV of KSL as a confluence of the five religions, unique geology and geography, and most ancient of all pilgrim routes as well as the fact that route is through passes need to be emphasized. The property should be defined using mountains, rivers, passes and all other relevant tangible and intangible heritage associated with Kailash in each of the country to have a comparable view. This could be presented in a country wise table to assess if the property is trans-boundary or held by single country. For KSL

India, there were two key suggestions: First, to explore Network of Sacred Natural Sites and Criteria III. Although there is no clarity about the routes to the site at this point of time, there is enough clarity about sites. It would be better to focus on sites. Second, the name and area of the heritage site is very crucial and will define the institutions from within three countries which can be involved in the nominating process.

When asked about the suggestion to prioritize cultural sites over cultural routes, **Dr. Rössler** clarified with an example of a site in France where more than 100 sites were important (and then it extended into Spain). By taking the route with an extension of 300m on both sides, it was well nominated because sites were already protected by law. Sites are protected easily, but the routes need protection more. **Mr. Jai Raj** pointed that in India, along the route, it may be difficult to find OUVs to prove. **Mr. Ravindra Singh** insisted that we have to also keep in mind that once declared, development projects cannot be allowed and these issues could get addressed when the dossier is being drafted. Also routes keep changing and focus should be on staging points. **Dr. Shekhar Pathak** emphasized that it is the landscape and the route that is important. Because the whole landscape is the route to Kailash and without the route Kailash makes no sense. He stressed on the need the need to consider the area as a whole in the nomination as only then will India be seen as upholding that dimension of KSL which is 'universal'. He said that he felt the consideration of KSL as a heritage site is still in larval stage and more consultations especially with local communities are required.

Dr. Pankaj Tewari, shared the Group 3's discussion on core collective capability to create landscape market value. The group identified The Alpine Valleys as important for it includes trade and cultural sites as well as 'landscape yatra' (Kailash Mansarovar Yatra) and other cultural pilgrimage. Each alpine valley has own ecosystem and communities which adds to diversity. Social and Natural Tourism, both are relevant and have great potential for KSL India. For developing the market and trade it is crucial that the social and natural tourism be sustainable. There should be a focus on home stays and local architecture. Agro-pastoral systems could be revived and used for livelihood (sheep rearing, handicrafts, wild edibles). Wild plants grown by people and associated Traditional Ecological Knowledge should be explored. It would also help to develop alternative livelihoods. For prosperity and better livelihood for people in KSL India, effective and sustainable business models are required. For this, sustainable harvesting of local materials like cordyceps could be explored. Awareness on natural resource management practices of conscious entrepreneurship would be useful. Also, better interface with the government on developing market and supply chains would be important.

On core collective capability to manage landscape resources, Dr. G.C Negi presented the perspectives emerging from Group 4. The group discussed what different natural and socio-cultural resources are available in the landscape, and how these can be managed. There are several diverse biological, physical and cultural resources exist, and each has diverse use. It would be beneficial to project alpine valleys as transalpine valleys –with transnational and multicultural linkages. Some issues to look into include: Therapeutic/medicinal plants, salt, jaggery etc that were used for barter between the countries, connections between pastoral routes, connections in livestock resources, handicrafts and culture, religious and sacred sites. Dynamics of resources both temporally and spatially need to be observed. Interest group analysis and stakeholder analysis would help to identify the ways in which resources are being used, and with what interests. There is a need to revive old trade practices. It is imperative to sensitize stakeholders about cultural and religious values, their linkages, and about sustainable trade. Capacity building is needed for resource assessments. For managing landscape resources support from different institutions, which should be mapped out more elaborately, is necessary especially to formulate and implement legal frameworks. Together, these steps might help to resolve any disparity between landscape's socio-ecological components and the governance structure in place.

Dr. Rawal requested the professionals working on KSL to firstly collect data generated by all relevant institutions like ICIMOD. Then, he said that they should find gaps in the data through gap analysis and then gather primary data through research. Consultations with people who have worked on KSL would be very crucial. **Mr. Jai Raj**, PCCF, Govt. of Uttarakhand, said that much information has been generated during this consultation. He said that information will be crucial as Centre will use existing information with KSL partners for dossier. He said that if required agencies should generate knowledge to address gaps, if any. He stressed that the project is very much on and will continue in 2017. Centre can coordinate with partners for human resource. The state cultural department can also be invited on board. He stressed on the need for further consultations to communicate how benefits will be made accessible to local people. He assured full support from the Centre for this project. **Dr. Dhobal** said it is important to consider the unique biodiversity and effects on them due to climate change. He said that a landscape approach is better suited for India's nomination. The Uttarakhand Government, he said, will extend its full support.

Mr. Ravindra Singh added that nomination without clarifying the association with Kailash and Mansarovar is not possible. He said that Pilgrim Routes should be included in the nomenclature. He said that each of the three countries should prepare and exchange dossiers to ensure consistency in approach. He stressed that clarifications about national boundaries are of utmost importance in a

case like this. **Mr Kai Weise** argued that as the three countries have different governance system, we have to see what is common in all the three countries. Community participation and involvement should be one priority. We have to be clear as to why we need to nominate KSL. The management strategies of the three countries are different; we need to look through that as well. **Dr Ram Boojh** mentioned that Stakeholder's involvement is necessary including local governance which is crucial as local and indigenous knowledge is important.

In concluding remarks, Dr. Shalini Sharma said that the consultation was very productive in terms of resolving certain key issues around the type of nomination India should pursue at this point of time. She summarized the main consensus and concerns emerging from the discussion- *First*, India should pursue a transboundary/transnational nomination which looks at the KSL area as a whole so that how KSL India is integral to Kailash's OUV is apparent. This will place India at the core of the nomination narrative. It will also make India's nomination prominent in terms of upholding outstanding values which relates to humanity and can be considered universal. *Second*, the nomination title should be renamed as 'Kailash Sacred Landscape and Pilgrim Routes' to ensure it represents rationale of including KSL India in the Transboundary/Transnational nomination even as different countries initiate independent nomination processes. *Third*, In KSL India nomination which should be developed through staging process, potential OUV that could be looked at should include – geology, natural resources richness, pilgrimage routes including historical trade routes, passes and values related to them. It would be unique to look at how the three countries have communicated through passes and not just along rivers. It is imperative to redefine the 3 aspects of natural-social-cultural and make a road map in consultation with experts and partners. It would be useful to unpack the transboundary linkages between communities of the three countries through nature, culture and economy. *Fourth*, Stakeholder consultations, especially with local communities, would be crucial to ensure their consensus and cooperation towards the inscription process. The next immediate step is to place the initial nomination for the Tentative List by Feb'17. *Lastly*, while India should prepare its own nomination dossier it would be beneficial to have informal discussions with Nepal and China with the help of ICIMOD to explore feasibility of a transboundary or bilateral nomination.

Dr. V.B. Mathur closed the session by reinforcing the importance of KSL nomination as an iconic site. He said that the process requires meeting expectations and requirements of three parties. It is primarily our country, followed by our neighboring countries, and ultimately, it is the UNESCO which is the final authority on nomination. The guidelines are very clear in convention and they have to be thoroughly understood. He suggested forming an e-group to discuss the issues around KSL or a

working-group which would meet occasionally. Referring to the Western Ghats and its composite 39 sites, he said that these sites were like 39 different beads of a necklace, in which each bead has a unique value, only when placed together do they form a beautiful necklace. He was optimistic that for Kailash nomination, unique and unparalleled as it is, people from the concerned countries would find ways to come together.

III. THE WAY FORWARD

- The nomination title should be renamed as 'Kailash Sacred Landscape and Pilgrim Routes' considering that the significance of landscape and routes are intertwined.
- UNESCO C2C will take lead in preparation of Annex Form 2A for listing on India's Tentative List of nomination for KSL & Pilgrim Routes in consultation with expert groups and partner organizations. More research and information will be supplied to prepare the nomination dossier. The Indian nomination would continue following the staging process as outlined in World Heritage Nomination Manual.
- UNESCO C2C will organize more Stakeholder consultations in KSL India region i.e. Pitthoragarh and Bageshwar with support from MOEFCC and other local and regional partners so that the local communities understand the benefits and risks of the World Heritage Site and extend their consent and cooperation for the nomination.
- ICIMOD to pursue talks with Nepal and China informally about bilateral/transnational nomination.

Glimpses

Consultative Dialogue on Kailash Sacred Landscape

November 23, 2016



Picture 7. Group photo on Consultative Dialogue on Kailash Sacred Landscape



Picture 8. Dr. Amita Prasad, Addl. Secretary, MoEFCC presented opening remarks



Picture 9. Dr. Mechthild Rössler, Director – World Heritage Centre, Paris gave an overview of Cultural Landscape



Picture 10. Dr. Rajan Kotru, ICIMOD, Nepal gave a background on the Kailash Sacred Landscape



Picture 11. Group activity with participants of Kailash Sacred Landscape



Picture 12. Group activity with participants of Kailash Sacred Landscape

**CONSULTATIVE DIALOGUE ON CULTURAL LANDSCAPES, MIXED AND
TRANSBOUNDARY HERITAGE SITES**
24-25 NOVEMBER 2016

The 3rd and 4th days of international gathering at UNESCO C2C-NWHMT were dedicated to the Consultative Dialogue on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites. The dialogue had a thematic focus on the relevance of interdisciplinary and integrated approaches to the inscription and management of Cultural landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites, and challenges therein. In addition to expert remarks, the consultative dialogue also facilitated a forum where selected case studies on prospective heritage sites were presented before the attending delegates to enable cross-learning and to discuss the feasibility of their nomination.

I. SETTING THE CONTEXT: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

In his opening remarks, **Dr. V. B. Mathur**, Director UNESCO C2C-NWHMT & WII, emphasized on the importance of Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites. He drew attention to the fact that India got its first inscription of a mixed site in Khangchendzonga this year, and is now actively preparing for the inscription of its first sacred landscape in the form of Kailash nomination. He invited the delegates to collectively brainstorm the possibilities of each site under consideration for nomination, and identify potential solutions for challenges faced during nomination of Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites. He also insisted on the need for co-working in order to build capacities for dealing with mixed nominations and transboundary heritage sites.

Drawing attention to intricate connections between nature and culture and merits of institutional collaboration, **Mr. Navin Piplani**, Principal Director, INTACH, New Delhi pointed out that in India all cities and heritage sites have this very integral aspect of nature and culture together. He mentioned that especially in sacred cities and ritual cities, culture doesn't exist without nature, in fact they both symbiotically nurture each other. He stressed that while INTACH has been working towards conservation of cultural heritage for years, nature too has come to the forefront with the establishment of C2C-NWHMT. This, he said, is a very welcome and much needed step. For cultural context of India the interlinking of nature and culture is both interesting and important. He pointed out that that in 2004 INTACH Charter for conservation of unprotected architectural sites was prepared and adopted. The charter builds upon this aspect of nature-culture connect and the diversity that India has. It differentiates the conservation approaches and imperatives in India from the far-western context because nature is very much part of culture here and it is not possible to dissociate the two. The whole idea of authenticity, the charter says, arises out of diversity in cultural landscapes of India and the traditional knowledge building systems that come out of these cultural landscapes. It is not strictly related to monuments and sites, but the cultural context in which these sites and monuments are located. This basically forms the natural basis in the charter which gives a completely new way to see authenticity which relate to the creative and collective processes which

people have been following to create heritage mostly in response to the climate, ecology, culture at first for so many years. This charter, Dr. Piplani argued, opens a whole new way to look at authenticity, diversity and integrity rooted in cultural landscapes rather than monumental iconic sites. For instance, one can't dissociate Taj Mahal and Humayun Tomb from river Yamuna even though these have been primarily recognized as buildings. The design and architecture of these iconic buildings was inspired by and adapted to their natural setting. So, while examining their authenticity nature would come at the top and then the whole building design/architecture would follow. He informed about various courses being conducted by INTACH on heritage conservation, archaeology, landscape conservation and living heritage. In the end he stressed on importance of future collaborations between INTACH and UNESCO C2C, benefiting from decades of field experience and technical knowledge of the two institutions, to emphasize upon the integrative aspects of heritage where nature talks to culture.

Building on this discussion, **Mr Rohit Jigyasu**, President of ICOMOS-India, upheld this ongoing dialogue on culture landscapes in mixed and transboundary heritage sites as really crucial. He referred to his work in 2010 on UNESCO World Heritage Resource Manual on Managing Disasters which should have had components of nature and culture both, but the experts from the two fields could not come to a common view. This, he thought, remains a concern because more disasters will continue to occur unless we keep our ecology and ecosystems alive. He mentioned that history demonstrates the interaction between human and nature, and a lot of skillful use of natural resources in traditional societies. Therefore, he stressed, understanding how one can sustain the relationship between nature and culture, where the former is impacted by human intervention and the latter by natural factors, is crucial to address contemporary challenges of sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and climate adaptations. Here, he pointed out the relevance of traditional knowledge pertaining to both nature and culture which is yet to be discovered comprehensively and therefore more research on indigenous/traditional knowledge is required. He mentioned that learning from indigenous communities and their co-existence with nature will be a prominent theme of the ICOMOS cultural assembly under the larger focus on democracy and heritage. He hoped that a dialogue similar to this consultation will also take place in the ICOMOS Assembly in 2017. He stressed that more interaction between natural heritage and cultural heritage experts will take place which hopefully will also bridge gaps between their disciplinary vocabularies. He expressed hope that ICOMOS and WII will work together as strong partners on this process.

Drawing attention to the relevance of continuity, collaboration and community engagement in conservation of ordinary landscapes, **Ms. Nupur Prothi**, Voting Member (India), ICOMOS IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes, shared insights from her field experience spanning two decades. She said that in terms of continuity it is essential to work with contexts and reading the landscape. She cited her work in Whitefields, Bangalore where many of the tanks

(commonly called as lakes) have disappeared along with the catchments due to rapid and unbridled urbanization to point out the dismal state of ordinary landscapes. She cited a study published by the Institute of Social and Economic Change on the worsening condition of water bodies in the area, increase in flooding, and reclamation and encroachment of lakes for various developmental activities resulting into a loss of interconnectivity in the district. Field surveys show that 54% tanks/lakes are encroached for building purposes, 66% are sewage-fed, 14% are surrounded by slums, and 72% showed loss of catchment area. She cited her work in a small village called Ramvandanahathi on the outskirts of Bangalore where she was intrigued about the rows of flower beds, and learnt ten years later, that historically Tipu Sultan had got a team of cultural horticultural workers into Bangalore from border districts to do work on Lalbagh gardens in late-1700s. Once the Lalbagh garden work was complete, these workers spread across Bangalore residing in different parts including Ramvandanahathi. 200 years later, the practice of horticulture continues in the village, but she and other landscape architects lost the opportunity of telling the story in the original project. While working in Lalbagh, they realized the intricate layers of history that defined the natural and cultural landscape surrounding the Botanical Garden. For instance, the people of Pingala community who live close to Lalbagh still maintain the annual horticulture festival even though not many urban Bangalorean may know about it. She insisted that any work on cultural landscapes is first about understanding the story of the landscape, and then intertwining it with our interventions.

She also highlighted that one of the most challenging aspects of cultural landscapes is identification of boundaries. She cited her PhD work on relevance of boundaries and buffers in World Heritage Sites. She also gave examples from her work on small, clearly defined ordinary landscapes like the Badshahi garden, a small garden at the outskirts of Agra, which is probably the only garden attributed to Aurangzeb. Their initial work was related only to the documentation of garden, but they also researched on the surrounding landscape and context. The garden was not protected, parts were already used for construction, and new plans of housing were underway. Her team was intrigued by the road networks leading to the garden and the reasons why the garden was built at that particular location. Their research revealed that it was built when Aurangzeb was commemorating its victory and taking over Agra from his father. The garden was strategically built at the location linking it with the Shahi Talaab (a small pond), Sarai (small lodge/guesthouse), and the town in a straight line. Therefore, she and her team recommended protecting the garden along with these links that are completely oblivious to public at present. She emphasized on the importance of these aspects for developing interpretation strategies for public. One may not recover the physical links, but one can at least keep the links in public memory alive. She stressed on the significance of offering solutions which look at a larger picture even though immediate work might be in a limited area.

Talking about landscapes of memory, she gave an example of the Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar, Punjab which witnessed massacre of freedom fighters by British Colonel Dyer, and which sits next to the Golden Temple. The public behavior and engagement with the site does not match its historical and cultural significance. It exists in our memories, but physically it remains non-synchronized with our memories of it. She insisted that on the importance of thinking beyond the physical memorials to connect to our collective memories, towards alternatives for interpretations which recreate the larger event occurring in a given landscape in our minds to assert its actual significance.

She also talked about the borrowed landscapes citing her experience with the Pinjore Garden, which is one of the Mughal Gardens, where largely the rationale of step architecture of this garden with two levels was seen as enabling a full view of the landscape. Years later she learnt that the Pinjore garden is built on a geological faultline and watered through natural springs underneath the landscape. Her work on this garden made her realized the importance of geometry in Mughal architecture, but more significantly the relevance of active engagement with the landscape especially in current times when unplanned urbanization and developmental activities threaten the authenticity and integrity of the landscape. She added that most of the historic monuments are not even protected and lots of buildings are being created along the boundaries of the historical and cultural monuments. Ms. Prothi, also strongly insisted on learning from horticulture practices in heritage sites and applying them in current scenario. She suggested growing native and wild vegetation and refraining from growing artificial vegetation in order to counter the tyranny of uniformity, and maintain the authenticity and natural beauty of the heritage sites. This also leads to, she argued, the need for law and policy about heritage conservation especially where plantation is concerned.

In response, **Dr. G.S. Rawat**, asked if there is any law to prevent or prohibit new/modern constructions that compromise the local traditions. This he said is a major concern in the Himalayan region where the traditional small houses merged well with the landscape, while the new buildings add to its vulnerabilities. **Ms. Gurmeet Rai** pointed out that while nature is privileged in terms of having many laws and a legal regime in the country responding to its protection; it is miniscule where culture is concerned. She said that law in itself is not adequate unless it leads into creation of an organisation with a certain structural systems to implement the laws. But, in culture sector only Archaeological Survey of India and state govt have a role largely restricted to buildings. She pointed out that few states have come out with creative thinking on the issue of heritage and law concerning habitat and human settlements. For instance, Mumbai in Maharashtra (focus on human settlements), Ahmedabad in Gujarat (focus on cultural economics) and Kashmir launched an Act in 2010 which makes integration of preservation of identified precincts with developmental projects possible to protect historical areas, but components about nature is missing in the Act. She insisted

that there is a need to identify the gaps in laws about nature and laws about culture to find ways for both to work together.

Building on this further, **Ms. Nupur Prothi** said that while laws and guidelines are important, we also need to understand why are people giving up beautiful, healthy, resilient buildings and opting for concrete blocks. This is important to address because while the world is looking towards us for learning about traditional, vernacular architecture, here at the grassroots level people are opting for ecological destruction, and giving up their traditional knowledge and practices. She stressed it is crucial to address this misplaced aspiration. She cited examples of several contemporary sites and scenarios to highlight the threats to urban landscape planning due to prevailing disconnect with history and traditional science, and piecemeal approach to research. This becomes very crucial to understand evolving landscapes and work towards resilience. When asked about the repercussions of romanticizing the tradition ecological knowledge, Dr. Nupur Prothi said that it is important to romanticize and take away from the past what is important. However, we have to understand how to plug it into the present reality and what is the future we are thinking of our larger landscape and its resilience.

She also urged to initiate community driven projects instead of community centric projects for long-term sustainability of heritage conservation efforts. She called for a community driven approach to cultural landscape conservation which is for/by the people based on ownership and trust based conservation. In response, **Mr. Ravindra Singh** supported the need and significance of contemplating about how we should re-imagine the landscapes. He provided different examples of religious and spiritual beliefs of communities and looking at the bigger picture in order to approach the change. He also recommended adopting an approach that includes interventions from different institutions working in the related fields.

Dr Amareswar Galla, Executive Director of International Institute for Inclusive Museum, gave an autobiographical account of his work on world heritage and inclusive museums, and also his experience with capacity building and community organization. Dr Galla came from a scheduled tribe in India. He was the first of his community to go to university and has since continued fighting for indigenous rights. He described his work with indigenous communities of Bhimbetka, Madhya Pradesh and talked about the importance of acknowledging the rights of the local people. He added that using the knowledge of the locals is a crucial step in developing a World Heritage Site and that their voices are crucial. He also talked about his experience with the Ha Long World Heritage site, Vietnam in the Gulf of Tonkin, which includes some 1,600 islands and islets, forming a spectacular seascape of limestone pillars. He focused on the importance of capacity building and the importance of safeguarding tangible and intangible natural, cultural, movable, and immovable heritage. Speaking about the challenges faced at Ha Long bay, he mentioned that there wasn't a single

document about World Heritage at Ha Long bay when he worked there. He mentioned that the Ecomuseum Hub established at the Ha Long World Heritage site is a positive step in the process of education and capacity building for the area. He stressed upon the importance of citizen participation in the process, and the need for this process to be inclusive. He then spoke about his published volume *Benefits Without Borders*, which is a thematic collection of case studies of World Heritage Sites providing an understanding of their OUVs and stakeholder benefits. He said that management of world heritage sites has cross-disciplinary scope and is a meeting point for natural and social scientists and researchers. He stressed on the relevance of learning from case studies, and shared that *Benefits without Borders* has case studies representing a global spread of constructive and engaging examples.

II. THE AGENDA: CROSS-LEARNING FROM CASE STUDIES

This session sought to facilitate a forum for cross-learning on selected case studies on existing and prospective heritage sites with a focus on nomination process. It was also envisaged as enabling capacity building and collaborations through dialogues among attending delegates cutting across different expertise and experience with inscription and management of heritage site. For this purpose, discussion was conducted in form of three overlapping technical sessions, spread across two days. A combined report is presented below separating inscribed sites from new proposals:

Technical Session I: Case studies on Cultural Landscapes and Mixed Nominations

Technical Session I: Case studies on Cultural Landscapes and Mixed Nominations (continued)

Technical Session II: Mixed Heritage and Transboundary Sites Management Frameworks

Describing the **challenges faced in cultural landscapes and mixed nomination**, **Dr. Shikha Jain** reflecting on her experience in India with revision and requirements of India's Tentative List, challenges faced during inscription of the Khangchendzonga National Park as Mixed Site, and Fortifications and fortified Cultural Landscapes. She gave a brief overview of her work with Tentative List Working Group (TLWG) formed in February 2012, which undertook the revision of India's tentative list between 2012 and 2015. This entailed evaluation of existing tentative list, updating and re-organizing the tentative list as per priorities and gap analysis, and recommending a new revised list to the Committee as well as suggesting process for application /approval and monitoring of properties on the Tentative List.

For gap analysis she explained that TLWG considered the recommendations made by ICOMOS and IUCN Gap Analysis in 2004 in terms of examining sites through chronological, regional and thematic frameworks. The recommendations also called for improving quality of Tentative List by providing relevant information, comparative analysis, maps demarcating boundaries and complying with

OG'11 of WHC' 72 as well as the need to harmonize tentative lists of regional States Parties to focus on similar proposals and existing gaps.

The list was last revised in 1998 and had only 8 natural sites and 1 cultural landscape. South and Central Zones had no natural sites on tentative list. This prompted the TLWG to look at global strategies that called for rectification of the imbalances on the List between regions of the world, types of monuments, and periods, and that advocated a move away from a purely architectural view of the cultural heritage of humanity towards one that was more anthropological, multifunctional and universal.

The gap analysis helped to understand the underrepresented categories which included nomadic pastoralist cultures/Transhumance; agricultural landscapes relating to staple or other economic crops, earlier stages in farming practice or land tenure; sacred and/or symbolic significance of certain natural features such as mountains, volcanoes, forests, groves; vernacular architecture and settlements; religious properties based on strong thematic studies of the monuments of religions, indicating criteria for their current selection and evaluation; technological properties and modern heritage property. She also shared the outcomes of Stakeholders' Workshops of different zones in India. The gap analysis of typological framework for India revealed that while archaeological heritage and historic buildings were over represented, cultural routes, landscapes and symbolic properties remained under-represented. The gap analysis of typological framework for South Asia showed that archeological heritage and religious sites were over-represented while modern heritage and vernacular architecture were under-represented.

Dr. Jain also mentioned the key outcomes of stakeholder workshops conducted in six zones of the country. The *West Zone* expressed need for better coordination between Central and State level agencies, documentation and expert involvement in the process as well as need to identify and lay greater emphasis on Mixed category sites. The *North Zone* expressed requirement of technical assistance to prepare nomination dossiers and need to prioritise serial nominations while also expressing apprehensions over inclusion of anthropologically vulnerable sites. The *East Zone* expressed concerns about absence of frameworks for protection and management of urban heritage/living heritage sites. It called for sustainability in heritage management especially with respect to tourism so that its benefits are reaped by the local community. The *Central Zone* mentioned the need to simplify the definition and process of articulating OUV, and insisted that there should be better understanding of indigenous definitions and systems for protection and management in South Asian context. The *South Zone* articulated the need to simplify the definition and process of articulating OUV, the need for better management of sites that are on tentative list, the need to value heritage at local, regional and national levels, and on the issue of unclear ownerships and fragmented/multiple jurisdictions at heritage sites. The North-East zone highlighted

strong presence of the intangible attributes in North East region and state role in protection and management of heritage sites. Total 238 properties were proposed in these zonal stakeholder workshops out of which 76 were under Natural, Mixed or Cultural Landscape Categories (N/M/CL).

The Revised Tentative List had 57 Properties of which 36 were Cultural and 21 were under N/M/CL significantly improving upon the previous list which had few Natural sites, fewer CL and no Mixed category sites. It also proposed 30 Thematic Studies of which 19 were Cultural and 11 were N/M/CL. It recommended the remaining as Properties of National Value for a National List.

Talking about the challenges in inscribing Khangchendzonga National Park as mixed heritage site Dr. Jain shared the cultural maps showing locations of cultural properties within KNP and its surrounding and also the extended buffer zone boundary of the proposed site for inscription into WHS. The site derives its name from Mountain deity Dzonga. There were two main challenges faced during the process. Firstly, it was difficult to articulate OUV for Cultural Sites within KNP as mythological stories are associated with this mountain and with a great number of natural elements (caves, rivers, lakes, etc.) that are the objects of worship by the indigenous people of Sikkim. The sacred meanings of these stories and practices have been integrated with Buddhist beliefs and constitute the basis for Sikkimese identity. Secondly, Finalizing buffer zones was tricky because other human-made attributes that are functionally important as a support to the cultural significance of the property, its protection and its understanding, are located in the buffer zone, in the Khangchendzonga Biosphere Reserve, and in the wider setting of the property.

Finally, Dr. Jain explained the inscription of fortifications and Cultural Landscapes in India providing examples of 6 Hill Forts of Rajasthan as serial property, inscribed in 2013. She also mentioned the role of forts as clan capitals controlling passes in highlands which doubled as major trade routes and/or points of infiltration were identified as more important. She also explained different category of forts e.g. Hill-Summit Fort, Hill-Slope Fort, Hill-Valley Fort, Hill Water Fort, Hill Forest Fort, Hill Desert Fort and Ground Fort (Elevated) providing examples from Rajasthan. In the end she talked about the generic planning principles and specific attributes which include a) *Physiographical aspects* as the forts are adapted and optimize to various kinds of hill terrain, b) *Centres of power* because the forts have strong associational values as centres of Rajput power and control, and as centres of Rajput courtly culture and patronage, and also as former centres of learning, art and music, c) *Sacred aspects* because the Rajput hill forts are also sacred sites, and d) *Urban Settlements* because most forts were designed to protect the populace and not only the court and military guard.

In response, **Dr. Mechtild Rössler** remarked that the outlined process appears good, and asked if there are any reviews available beyond the national authorities. She was also concerned that usually the OUVs of sites in countries based on state system are geographically not equally distributed which leads to an irrational competition of nominating sites overriding the fundamental idea of

contributing towards universal, not nation specific, heritage. In response **Dr. Shikha Jain** replied that ICOMOS-India was part of TLWG and contributed to the process. Responding to the concerns about state-wise representation of sites, Dr. Jain mentioned that the TLWG only highlighted the under-represented categories to bring some balance between cultural sites and those under N/M/CL. **Dr. Ravindra Singh** highlighted the problem that currently India has only a WHS list and nothing else for recognizing national heritage. He suggested that responsibilities should be distributed among INTACH, WII, ASI etc for creating other Registers for Recognition at national level. He also asked to explore role of forts in opium trade in 18th and 19th century period such as in Maharashtra. Finally, He also suggested that there is a need to identify the transnational boundaries before any such nominations could be pursued.

Drawing attention to **Cultural Routes and Landscapes**, **Ms Gurmeet Rai**, Vice-President, ICOMOS-India, presented the case of Mughal Imperial Highway, India focusing on Punjab. The brand identity of Punjab being promoted by PHTPB as 'Punjab- India begins here' considering that Punjab is the cradle of Indus valley civilization, and also the point of origin of the Grand Trunk Road or the Imperial Highway at the Indo Pakistan border which connects India by land with the western civilization.

She said that the Government of Punjab wanted to develop a plan for Cultural Heritage Management and Tourism Development for the Mughal Imperial Highway and the Grand Trunk Road in Punjab, which are trans- national and trans-boundary. The Grand Trunk Road connects four nations i.e. Afghanistan, Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. The Mughal Imperial Highway and the Grand Trunk Road find a unique reference in the tourism development road map for the state.

The Main Aim of the Cultural Heritage Management and Tourism Development Plan for the Mughal Imperial Highway and the Grand Trunk Road in Punjab is to protect and conserve the architectural heritage, Increase public awareness among the local community, sustainable approach to the future management, promote the use of culture as a tool for peace in the region, to identify the economic and cultural benefits, and to suggest a prioritized programme of action. Ms. Rai highlighted the need for protection of the historic precincts as many significant parts of the historic precincts continue to exist unprotected and consequently vulnerable to being erased completely.

She also explained the inter-relationship of sites for cultural heritage tourism planning. She briefed about the process of preparation of Cultural Heritage Management and Tourism Development Plan for the Mughal Imperial Highway and the Grand Trunk Road in Punjab, its various aspects, management issues, use of GIS information, land use map of different locations along the highway and resource assessment. The key management issues included protection and conservation of the built heritage of the Mughal period, landscape and setting of the monuments, community access and sustainability, visitor management and infrastructure, opportunities and constraints for future

management (the legal regime) and branding the road- cultural heritage tourism product development. She elaborated upon the history of the transnational and Trans boundary cultural route along the Mughal Imperial highway and GT road distinguishing three Cultural Zones and various clusters A variety of cultural properties—monuments, cities, cultural landscapes, and industrial heritage, on and around these roads have emerged from both peaceful and hostile encounters. Each of these cultural properties brings to us a unique dynamic of evolving interactive processes of human cultures. On account of the rich contributions of a variety of peoples these roads transcend their original function. She insisted that the cultural routes are tangible and intangible heritage, which comprise of zones and clusters, within them lie individual monuments and groups of monuments set in landscape, that are linked to each other through socio cultural and historic narratives. She said that the interpretation would be a key step to appreciate the region's cultural plurality, and to recognize the richness of diversity and syncretic traditions. She also discussed possible ways to examine the authenticity and integrity of the cultural routes. Finally, Ms. Rai highlighted recommendations for conservation of these cultural routes, and emphasized on the need to be familiar with the Operational Guidelines of World Heritage Convention.

In response, **Dr. Mechtild Rosseler** clarified that the concepts of cultural routes is a big one in terms of sites and linking up different parts, but UNESCO currently doesn't use the term. Cultural Routes is a term used by ICOMOS, but UNESCO uses the term 'Heritage Routes' although recently in one case cultural route term has been accepted. **Dr. Kai Weise** mentioned that the whole concepts of route make it interesting to think beyond world heritage inscription. It helps to bring out the little important things into the route that together illuminate a larger point that usually gets lost in public comprehension. He insisted that 'cultural routes' should be explored as a tool **Dr. Inaba Nobuku** suggested that the concept of cultural route is very important and useful for grasping bigger sites and bigger stories. In Japan there are many sites and it is important to encourage these projects because these describe a story much larger than physical objects. **Dr. Nupur Prothi** said that the idea of continuum and layering through cultural routes is important. She also said the heritage is not a priority in planning right now and needs to be included. **Dr. Lokesh Ohri** mentioned that most of the sites and landscapes that we are looking at, probably we should keep away the listing and really direct our efforts into documenting the sites and their heritage value. The gap analysis needs to be done for sites. Citing his observations about the foot route to Kedarnath shrine, he stressed that for KSL we need to look at foot pilgrimage in addition to natural and cultural properties.

Describing **the Cultural Landscapes of Nepal and Myanmar**, **Mr. Kai Weise**, Architect, Pahar Nepal, explained the categories of movable and immovable tangible cultural heritage sites. In movable cultural tangible heritage sites he provided example of Tilaurakot, Nepal as hidden landscapes. He mentioned that while working on the idea that the World Heritage Site is only 120 by 150 metres, they decided to reduce the total area of WHS to cover an area upto Lumbini- the place where

Gautam Buddha was born. However, the actual landscape extends throughout the whole southern Terai landscape which includes factories, over 50 km away, that are affecting the sites. Therefore, Mr. Weise insisted, the landscape planning near these sites need to address the large areas and the impact that causes on the site.

He gave a brief overview of chronological development of Kathmandu valley, and his current work in agriculture landscape of Bagan, Myanmar. This landscape is defined as cadastre contains over three thousand monuments scattered across an area of over 100 km², at the bank of Irrawady River and is in the process of being nominated. This landscape still practices traditional form of agriculture. The landscape has the monuments, archaeology below the surface and the entire traditional crops but now the government is initiating the greening of the area in order to increase the vegetation which can impact the originality of the landscape affecting the traditional agriculture practices and monuments which can lead to an overall change in the landscape. The local market has started including products from different countries in order to increase the livelihood of communities which solves the question about how does the agriculture landscape link to the livelihood of the people to the entire products and marketing and how this all can be brought together to ensure that the system functions properly. He also highlighted the need for local communities to opt for other options of livelihood in order to survive, as agriculture is not sufficient. The overall impact on community will be critical as the community is very poor and they are looking for other options for livelihood.

He mentioned that the nomination process for Lo Manthang began a few years ago but it came to halt mainly due to uncertainty of OUVs of the site and also due to the indifference of local communities with the authority. Lo Manthang in Upper Mustang, which is a part of upper Nepal, is a comprehensive landscape and a walled settlement. The unique landscape, consisting of various components including Cultural Landscapes, Archaeological site, Historic Area, and buildings and living heritage is still functional and people live in earthen settlement but things have begin to change now as people have started living outside the settlements. Therefore, in order to deal with all these components there is a need to put together all the tools and forming a comprehensive system.

He also mentioned that after the Nepal earthquake, more emphasis is on putting back the displaced objects (Movable Tangible Cultural sites) on their original locations which might have been replaced due to disasters. On the other hand, the living heritage, which is a link between tangible and intangible heritage sites, is an interesting and important concept. He emphasized upon the need for developing tools to understand a site with cultural as well as natural values and the links between the two, and dealing with living heritage in terms of natural values and cultural values. He stressed

that in order to understand the complexities of heritage sites there is a need for change in definition of the heritage and to develop the right tools for managing and safeguarding the sites.

He also mentioned the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway, West Bengal, India which is recognized as an industrial site but it also has a unique landscape which should become a part of heritage site. The management system is run by Indian Railways. He recommended learning lessons from the nomination process of Khangchendzonga National Park because in this case the cultural component was added later for the inscription. He recommended that for Cultural Landscapes there is a need to develop two different governance systems one for natural component and other for cultural component where both governance systems communicate and cooperate from the beginning for inscription.

The case of India's first Mixed Heritage site, the Khangchendzonga National Park, Sikkim was presented by Ms DechenLachungpa, Divisional Forest Officer, Government of Sikkim. She discussed her experiences of the nomination process and in identifying OUVs of the site. She said that it was presented as an Associative Cultural Landscape, where the material evidence inside the park is minimal while natural elements are abundant and strongly associated with religious artistic and cultural elements over centuries. She elaborated upon the natural attributes of the site. It is the only National Park of Sikkim. It has the world's 3rd highest peak, and it has altitude ranges from 1220m to 8586m within a small area. She also explained that the park belongs to two priority eco-regions – the Eastern Himalayan Broadleaf and Conifer Forests, and the Eastern Himalayan Alpine Meadows. Describing the cultural aspects of Khangchendzonga, she mentioned that the introduction of Buddhism to Sikkim in 8th century took place in this region. She discussed the concept of *Beyul* which entered Sikkim with the introduction of Buddhism. *Beyul* is a kind of paradise, a quiet place suited for meditation or a place of refuge where ordinary people can settle in times of political turmoil and war. She said that the highlands, midlands, and lowlands also each have their cultural values in the local community. She mentioned that acceptance for traditions is demonstrated from the fact that the mountain climbers that have braved Khangchendzonga peak always stopped short 6 feet from its summit, respecting the Sikkimese people's sentiments for the Mountain.

Ms. DechenLachungpa said that the strong case for Khangchendzonga's nomination was a product of rich cultural and historical narratives that bind Khangchendzonga today and give it its outstanding universal value. She mentioned that Khangchendzonga fulfilled Criteria VII and X for natural properties and Criteria III, VI and VII for cultural properties. She discussed the role of state parties as well involvement of ICOMOS in the process. She also mentioned the challenges faced especially in identifying the border area of the sites. She stressed on the need for collaboration between various stakeholders for successful protection of the park's natural and cultural heritage, and the need for developing an effective management plan based on the same.

Mr. M.K. Yadava presented the proposal for nomination of Majuli Cultural & Natural Landscape, Assam. He insisted on the ecological and cultural distinctiveness of the landscape. He stated that the nomination for Majuli Landscape as a Cultural Landscape has been submitted in 2004 under Criteria II, III, V & VI. He described that Majuli, one of the largest river islands in the world, is a fluvial landform (a riverine delta) in Brahmaputra river, which is a unique outcome of geomorphological forces of nature. The island extends for a length of about 80 km and for about 10-15 km north to south direction with a total area of about 875 Sq km. It is at the confluence of several tributaries of Brahmaputra river on the north and south banks housing numerous wetlands, river islands and grasslands. Majuli is home for straying Rhinos and elephants on move and is next door to the Kaziranga National Park & World Heritage Site. He also presented the current status of Majuli Landscape and the challenges that the landscape is facing. The island of Majuli today houses a total of 243 small and large villages, 210 are Cadastral Villages (where revenue is generated by the administration and supported with revenue maps) and 33 are Noncadastral village (these are villages with no revenue maps; in Majuli these are mostly resettled or rehabilitated villages shifted due to flood and erosion). There are a total of 30 Sattras in Majuli many of which are in the mainland, few of them are in Chapori areas, with a distinct spiritual influence region. These are located primarily towards the middle of the island. Each Sattra, represents, within its region, a centre for cultural activities and even acts as a democratic institution to settle local disputes. Most of the villages associate with respective Sattra, and the villagers partake in the activities of their own Sattra during festivals and occasions. He said that the newly elected Government has conservation of Majuli Cultural Landscape as a top priority. It has already initiated several conservation programmes and activities. Authority has been formed in this direction and there is a Comprehensive Development Plan prepared by Water and Power Consultancy Services (WAPCOS), India. Dr. Yadava also shared that the site could possibly be re-nominated under Mixed Landscape category, renaming the Project as Majuli Cultural and Natural Landscape and making wetlands, riverine islets, grasslands a part of the proposal.

In response, **Dr. Mechtild Rössler** suggested that the Majuli landscape proposal doesn't need to be a natural or mixed one as complying with natural value with the stated criteria would not be possible. She advised GOI to look for recommendations available on UNESCO website. She also suggested nominating Sattras as intangible heritage. **Dr. Shalini Sharma**, informed about the historical transboundary movement of Mishing tribe from tri-junction between China-Mongolia-India that led them to their present location in Majuli in Assam, and where environmental change and cultural adaptation played an important role. This, she said, could open another way to look at the nomination process. **Dr. Shikha Jain** recommended seeking support from the advisory groups like ICOMOS, INTACH and IUCN. **Mr. Navin Piplani and Ms. Nupur Prothi** suggested going to the roots and fundamentals of heritage site inscription and to start over with a fresh perspective for Majuli

Landscape. **Dr. Leticia Leitao** made a general recommendation to apply caution and not mistake 'unique' for 'Outstanding Universal Value'. She stressed that uniqueness does not always in itself justifies its OUV. She emphasized that getting heritage tag should not be a goal in itself. The real aim is to protect WHS.

The proposal on Apatani Cultural Landscape was presented by Ms. Persis Farooqy, World Heritage Assistant at UNESCO C2C-NWHMT. She explained that this site is located in Ziro valley in Lower Subansiri district of Arunachal Pradesh, India. She said that the Apatani tribe is well known for its unique and traditional practice of paddy-cum-fish cultivation all over the world. This remarkable practice of yielding rice as well as fish by Apatani tribe has sustained over generations and has remained untouched by any modern technique in this valley. Due to their sustainable usage of natural resources, the fertility of the soil remained same over the years securing the livelihoods of the locals. It is also part of one of the three recognized biodiversity hotspots from India. The total population of 7 main villages of this valley is approximately 30, 000 out of which 90% belong to the Apatani tribe followed by other tribes. This landscape comes under the second category of Cultural Landscape i.e. organically evolved landscape. Ms. Farooqy said that since 2014, the Apatani Cultural Landscape is sitting on India's tentative list of UNESCO World Heritage Site under Criteria (iii) and (v). She shared that the Criteria (iii) is relevant to this site because the Apatanis are known for their effective traditional village council called *bulyañ*, which supervises, guides and have legal oversight over the activities of individuals that affect the community as a whole. They work by addressing to the conscience of the people rather than by instilling fear of the law, and by promoting prevention of unlawful activities rather than by punitive actions. The Apatanis are among the few tribes in the world who continue to worship nature. It is their relation with nature that regulates their cultural practices. In terms of Criteria (v), she explained that the cultivation of rice is also supplemented by millet cultivation on the elevated partition/ bunds between the rice plots. Citing the research of Dr.P.S. Ramakrishnan of Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, she said that this practice is energy efficient, ecologically efficient and economically efficient. She insisted that this site should be taken forward for final nomination as it holds immense potential and no other site in India holds similar features.

In response, **Dr. Mechtild Rössler** advised to see how this fish-rice system in Apatani compares with fish-rich systems being practiced elsewhere. **Dr. Shalini Sharma** suggested examining the linkages between traditional and modern technologies for instance, understanding whether ingredients/raw material used in traditional houses have changed over the years and how.

The proposal for nomination of the Nokrek - Balpakram Landscape, in Garo Hills, Meghalaya as a UNESCO Mixed Heritage site, was presented by Ms. Shikha Srikant, Conservation Biologist and PhD scholar at WII. The proposed area is located in the Indo-Malayan Biodiversity Hotspot and includes

the Garo Hills Elephant Reserve, Balpakram National Park, Siju Wildlife Sanctuary, Baghmara Pitcher Plant Sanctuary, Baghmara Reserve Forest, Nokrek National Citrus Gene Sanctuary and the Nokrek National Park. She presented evidence from her research to cite that the Garo Hills landscape fulfils Criteria V to X for nomination of a World Heritage site.

She described the natural, cultural, and evolutionary importance of the landscape. Physiographically, the Balpakram Landscape represent a remnant of an ancient plateau of the Pre-Cambrian peninsular shield - ammonite fossils that are millions of years old have also been found here. She said that the valley, plateau, and table land systems found in this landscape constitute its unique geographical diversity. She also explained that the unique limestone caves and isolated cave systems of this landscape contribute to its OUV.

She highlighted that Balpakkram was earlier inhabited by Soongsareks, an animistic tribe with unique traditions and cultural-sacred connections with the National Park. But the population is fast turning towards Christianity, and that there is a need to protect this living civilization.

Further, the local communities of this area have been practising Jhum Cultivation for generations, and have a unique relationship with the natural landscapes of Garo Hills. Additionally, the Nokrek National Citrus Gene Sanctuary and the Baghmara Pitcher plant sanctuary also constitute to the genetic importance of this landscape. A remarkable diversity of wild cats, small mammals and reptiles have been camera trapped in the Garo Hills. Presenting the above evidences for the nomination of Garo Hills as a Mixed World Heritage site, Ms Srikanth concluded her presentation after discussing the progress that has been done in the nomination process so far, and the timeline and challenges that lie ahead.

The Proposal for developing Keibul Lamjao as a Mixed Heritage Site was given by Mr. Dhruv Verma, World Heritage Assistant at the UNESCO C2C, WII. Located in the Bishnupur & Thoubal districts of the north eastern state of Manipur, the proposed area would include the areas of Keibul Lamjao National Park, Loktak Lake and Pumlun pat. He then cited evidences for Criteria V, VII, IX and X.

Referring to the OUVs of the site, he stated that there are several attributes of the landscape that deserve recognition. He spoke about the unique ecosystem of 'Phumdi' that is found in this landscape, which is also home to last viable population of *Sangai (Rucervus eldi eldi)*. The largest natural freshwater lake in North East India is also found in this proposed area. It is also an Important Bird and Biodiversity Area (IBA) and a RAMSAR site.

He cited various evidences for the fact that ethnic groups share a close bond with lake in terms of culture, history and life supporting resources, and that the sacred groves called *Umanglai* are

worshipped by locals. He also discussed the challenges that this landscape faces, like water pollution and water level drop, invasive weeds, Phumdi proliferation and Encroachment. He added that there lack sufficient resources and infrastructure for the forest staff and that the notification of the area as a World Heritage site would be helpful in bringing financial and technical support to the Keibul Lamjao region, as well as give it the widespread recognition it deserves.

The Proposal for Cultural Landscape of Bhutan was presented by Ms. Pema, Sr. Conservation Architect at Bhutan's Department of Culture. She talked about the Draft Cultural Heritage Bill of Bhutan. She mentioned that the Bill uniquely conceives the whole country and its setting as cultural landscape. As per UNESCO definition, cultural landscape is "...manifestation of interaction between humankind and its natural environment..." which can be evidently seen from the settlement and its surrounding including the agricultural landscape of Bhutan. Cultural Landscape can be understood as the interrelation between Human, Culture and Nature. Bhutan is known to other countries for its unique and noble development philosophy of Gross National Happiness (GNH), and sustainability of cultural landscape is an important factor for achieving GNH and evidently supports this noble philosophy. She said that success of conservation and management of cultural landscape for its sustenance directly depends on the four pillars of GNH: Sustainable and equitable socio-economic development, Environmental Conservation, Preservation and Promotion of Culture, and Good Governance. She shared that the initiative to develop a list of sites with community involvement was launched in 2012 in form of project- 'My Tentative List'.

She highlighted the fact that sustainability of cultural landscape is challenged by various issues mostly pertaining to the socio-economic development. Urbanization, rural-urban migration and human-wildlife conflict are some of the pertinent issues. Bhutan is one of the fastest developing countries in south Asia and as a consequence, spectacular agricultural landscapes with traditional settlements are lost to the concrete jungle. Rural-urban migration is a global phenomenon and Bhutan is noted to have the highest internal migration in the South Asian regions. This results in desertification and abandonment of villages which ultimately impacts the sustenance of cultural landscape of Bhutan. This, she said poses a difficult question- How to protect integrity and authenticity in absence of community and its living tradition? Human-wildlife conflict is one of the most common issue concerning the rural villages in Bhutan and it has been noted that farmers loses up to 70% of their annual harvest to wildlife, and ultimately choosing to leave the agricultural lands fallow, changing farming practices and migrating to other places. This again challenges the sustainability of cultural landscape. She mentioned that the Draft Cultural Heritage Bill is sensitive of these challenges and receptive towards suggestions.

In response, **Dr. Mechtild Rössler** suggested that it would be useful to consider a landscape approach and explore spiritual value. She also said that marketing of products from cultural landscape has several benefits as it adds to identity, continuity in practices, and food security. Also, she stressed, in this world of conflict to be able to live on one's land is a thing to aspire for. She was concerned about ongoing migration because young people not wanting to return to their homeland lead to generational loss of knowledge which eventually results into biodiversity loss. **Ms. Gurmeet Rai** stressed upon the need for scientific studies in these landscapes as scientists working with natural heritage have knowledge of natural processes and cultural scientists have traditional knowledge both of which are crucial to develop a holistic understanding of the landscape. Also, she mentioned that, good governance is very much required for conservation and management of these landscapes. **Dr. N.K Chapagain** appreciated Bhutan's approach of a considered view on World Heritage. He said that cultural landscapes should also be talked about without restricting yourself to political boundaries.

The Project Mausam and Indian Ocean Cultural Landscape was presented by Dr Shikha Jain. The Project focuses on cultural landscapes of the Indian Ocean, and is a project undertaken by the Ministry of Culture. She said that the project, launched by India in partnership with member states, will enable a significant step in recording and celebrating this important phase of world history from the African, Arab and Asian-world perspectives.

She explained that *Mausam* or *Arai Mawsim* refers to the season when ships would sail safely. This distinctive wind-system of the Indian Ocean region follows a regular pattern: southwest from May to September; and northeast from November to March. The English term 'Monsoon' come from Portuguese 'Monção', ostensibly from Arabic 'Mawsim'. The etymology of this word signifies the importance of this season to a variety of seafarers. This intertwining of natural phenomena, such as monsoon winds and the ways in which these were harnessed historically to create cultural networks form the building blocks of Project Mausam.

She discussed historical perspectives on early Indian imports through old Indian Ocean routes. This project, she said, aims to explore the multifaceted Indian Ocean 'World' to understand and record the diversity of cultural, commercial and religious interactions in the Indian Ocean through centuries – extending from East Africa, the Arabian Peninsula, the Indian subcontinent and Sri Lanka to the Southeast Asian archipelago. She explained that the central themes that hold Project 'Mausam' together are those of cultural routes and maritime landscapes that not only linked different parts of the Indian Ocean littoral, but also connected the coastal centres to their hinterlands. She explained that these countries can be linked by a common narrative by achieving transnational nomination of

these cultural sites. The goals of this project are to revive lost linkages with nations, creating links with to existing WHS across the countries that have shared ocean links with each other for several hundred years, redefining 'Cultural Landscapes', and achieving Transnational nomination under World Heritage.

She discussed the challenges that come up when working on transnational nominations - as several factors can't be discussed in transnational guidelines and searching for possible heritages routes requires travel to several countries, but that it is important to undertake this process to get data and research heritage routes. She gave a background on the evolution of concept of 'routes' from 'Routes of dialogue' to 'Heritage routes'. She said that the concept of 'Transnational Routes' remained confined to Annex 3 of the Operational Guidelines 2013, and as of now there is no official recognition of this category on the World Heritage List. It is difficult to tabulate how many routes exist on the World Heritage List. She said that while ICOMOS recommended adoption of the term 'Cultural Routes' and accepted routes as primarily a cultural phenomenon (different from cultural landscape as decided in the ICOMOS General Assembly, Spain, 2002); the Operational Guidelines use the term 'Heritage Routes'. She said that reviewing the perspective that guides researches on Routes is imperative. This will possibly allow us to review the impact of natural phenomena on routes in future. She suggested looking into the case of Silk Routes as well the existing retrospective statements on OUV by UNESCO. She emphasized on the relevance of Transboundary Council on World Heritage.

In response, **Mr. Kai Weise** said that there are several challenges to be considered such as that the fact the definition of heritage is changing, central government can't deal with local communities hence involvement of local governance is vital. There is a need for Transboundary Convention.

Dr Sonali Ghosh presented perspectives on Trans-Boundary landscapes with a focus on Manas Transboundary Landscape. She provided historical examples of Trans-boundary conservation initiatives from across the world, and their cultural and historical significance. She also discussed the various advantages that a landscape and its communities gain through transboundary protected areas.

Elaborating on the case of Manas Transboundary World Heritage Site, she described the various regions that are demarcated inside the World Heritage Site. She explained the crucial OUVs that this site has – specifically Criteria VII, IX and X. As a forest officer, Dr Ghosh has extensively worked in wildlife conservation of Manas Tiger Reserve. She explained that territories of tigers exist in both countries across the border – India and Bhutan. This allows for cross country collaboration. Dr Ghosh cited a case of tiger poaching, which is a serious issue in the Manas landscape. She discussed

the case of a seized tiger skin which was solved only because officials from both countries were willing to collaborate and shared intelligence and camera trap records, which helped to identify the poached tiger skin that had been seized. Officials could act against the poachers based on this proof. This discussion on transboundary tigers held the interest of several participants. The phase IV monitoring exercise of transboundary tigers revealed that there was active movement of tigers between the boundaries of Bhutan and India, and several delegates were surprised and amused to know the extent of transboundary routes that had been covered by these tigers. Dr. Ghosh then discussed the significance of the Manas World Heritage site and the need for the Manas Transboundary management model to be formalized. She briefly also discussed the challenges that come up in the inscription, protection and management of a transboundary World Heritage Site and the importance of having agreement from all state parties involved.

In response, **Dr Leticia Leita** discussed the complications of the nomination process, citing her experience of working in Portugal, where she was expected to get recommendations about the nomination process without interacting with the communities that lived in the area. She added that the nomination is a long, complicated process but it is important to have community participation and inclusiveness. **Dr Amareshwar Galla** remarked that the nomination process is now much more complicated, with nomination forms now being thousands of pages long. On being questioned by **Dr Shikha Jain** about how the communities at possible World Heritage Sites can be convinced of the advantages of nomination, Dr Galla mentioned that it is crucial to listen to the local people and understand their needs. **Dr V.B. Mathur** then added that looking at older inscriptions one will realize that most of the older sites wouldn't make the grade for re-nomination, which is why UNESCO took up the exercise of retrospective inventory of the statement of OUV. He added India's example, of the World Heritage nomination of the Western Ghats, where efforts were made to produce a map atlas of every feature of the nominated sites. He added that management plans are crucial and need to be revised and re-cast with new plans reflecting ideas to preserve OUV. In closing remarks, **Dr Rohit Jigyasu** stressed on the importance of the need for management plans to be effective on the ground, and that they need to be designed in a way that directly benefits the locals of a community.

Dr V.B. Mathur concluded the conference with a vote of thanks to all the representatives for their active participation and the organizing committee of UNESCO-C2C for making the event successful. He stressed that there was a need for the conversation to continue between the various representatives and organizations that had participated in this conference, so that we can keep developing some perspective on inscription, management and planning of our natural, mixed and cultural world heritage sites.

III. THE WAY FORWARD

Participants in the meeting agreed upon following recommendations:

- For better management of Mixed Heritage Sites it is imperative to understand and harmonize the laws governing natural properties and cultural properties.
- There is a need for developing the concept of 'Transnational Routes' mentioned in the Annex 3 of the Operational Guidelines 2013.
- It is required to harmonize the research findings from natural sciences and social sciences including cultural studies for better understanding of the landscape conservation and governance needs.
- Community participation, awareness and sensitization should be central to the nomination process.
- There is a need for effective site management plans that protect the landscape while also enhancing life quality of local communities. The site management plans should be revised and re-cast with new ideas to preserve the OUV of the site and to respond to the changing status of landscape and communities.

Glimspes

Consultative Dialogue on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites November 24-25, 2016



Picture 13. Group photo of Consultative Dialogue on cultural landscape, mixed and transboundary heritage sites



Picture 14. Discussion during Technical Session



Picture 15. Ms. Persis Farooqy gave presentation on Apatani Cultural Landscape, Arunachal Pradesh



Picture 16. Dr. M. K. Yadava, IFS gave presentation on Majuli Cultural Landscape, Assam



Picture 17. Dr. Manoj Nair, IFS leading the participants on Nature Trail, WII Campus



Picture 18. Cultural night performed by the students of D.A.V, Defense Colony, Dehradun

Consultative Dialogue on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites
November 24-25, 2016



Picture 19. Ms. Dechen Lachungpa described the inscription process of Khangchendzonga National Park



Picture 20. Ms. Shikha Srikant introduced a proposal to nominate Garo Hills as a Mixed Heritage Site



Picture 21. Mr. Dhruv Verma shared presentation on nomination of Keibul Lamjao national Park as a Mixed Heritage Site



Picture 22. Dr. Sonali Ghosh discussed the Manas Transboundary Landscape



Picture 23. Discussion during Technical Session 1



Picture 24. Dr. V. B. Mathur, Director, WHI & UNESCO Category 2 Centre – India gave concluding remarks

MEDIA COVERAGE

Source of news – The Pioneer

Date – 23 November 2016

URL – <http://www.dailypioneer.com/state-editions/dehradun/unesco-encourages-preservation-of-heritage-sites-official.html>



Search

HOME CITY NATION BUSINESS WORLD VIVACITY AVENUES SPORTS COLUMNISTS STATE EDITIONS SUNDAY EDITION

YOU ARE HERE : Home » State Editions » Dehradun

STATE EDITIONS

UNESCO ENCOURAGES PRESERVATION OF HERITAGE SITES: OFFICIAL

Wednesday, 23 November 2016 | PNS | Dehradun | in Dehradun

☆☆☆☆☆

Rising number of nominations from various countries across the world seeking the world heritage status from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) for different sites – many of which at times are devoid of any outstanding value is a cause for concern. The director of the Division for Heritage and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre Paris, Mechthild Rossler said this while speaking at the fifth annual coordination meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage-related Category 2 Institutes and Centres at the UNESCO Category 2 Centre on Natural World Heritage Management and Training here at the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) on Tuesday.

Elaborating on aspects required for the tag of UNESCO world heritage status, Rossler said that the organisation seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of such cultural and natural heritage around the world which is considered to be of outstanding value to humanity. Though such a site must possess outstanding universal value, there is a proclivity among nations to secure maximum number of sites for nomination in order to secure a position with world heritage status. As the countries compete for the UNESCO world heritage status tag for their sites, the accordance of this tag should be not more than one site a year for each nation, she opined. Explaining how the category 2 institutes and centres contribute to UNESCO's work in the field of culture and heritage, she said that these institutes and centres extend the reach and effectiveness of UNESCO's programmes and activities in the field of culture. They also serve as international or regional centres and poles of expertise and excellence, provide services and technical assistance like policy advice, research, documentation and capacity-building to member states, cooperation partners and UNESCO's network of field offices. These bodies act as resource hubs to foster regional and international collaboration, networking and synergies, she added.

Speaking on the occasion, the director of WII and UNESCO C2C for World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region, Vinod Mathur averred that work is being undertaken to bolster implementation of World Heritage Convention in Asia and the Pacific Region through capacity building of professionals and institutions associated with aspects of world heritage sites including protection, conservation and management. This is being facilitated through training, research, dissemination of information and network building, he added.

Technical sessions held later in the day focused on review of previous agenda and action taken from C2C coordination meetings, C2C report on progress and activities and road map for enhancing collaborations and cooperation among C2Cs.

The director general of Heritage Protection, Spain, Elisa de Cabo de la Vega and cultural heritage expert from the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage, Kingdom of Bahrain, Kamal Bittar along with representatives of UNESCO and other organisations were also present on the occasion.

E-PAPER



Hindi Edition
[Delhi](#)
[Lucknow](#)
[Raipur](#)

English Edition
[Delhi](#)
[Lucknow](#)
[Dehradun](#)
[Chandigarh](#)
[Ranchi](#)
[Raipur](#)
[Bhopal](#)
[Bhubaneswar](#)

China-Yunnan

STATE EDITIONS

BHOPAL BHUBANESWAR RANCHI
LUCKNOW CHANDIGARH DEHRADUN
RAIPUR

MORE STATE EDITIONS NEWS

» More Bharat online kiosks to open nationwide
21 Dec 2016 | in Bhopal

» Badal describes Cong as 'leadership bankrupt' party
21 Dec 2016 | PNS | in Chandigarh

» Pandemonium in HP Assembly
21 Dec 2016 | Kamal Joshi | in Chandigarh

» Haryana Govt to prepare biofuel from paddy stubble
21 Dec 2016 | PNS | in Chandigarh

» AAP suffers another jolt, party coordinator

:: 60 ::

Source of news – The Tribune

Date – 23 November 2016

URL – <http://www.tribuneindia.com/news/uttarakhand/community/applications-flood-unesco-for-heritage-tag-dr-rossler/326887.html>



Tribune News Service

Dehradun, November 22

Dr Mechtild Rossler, Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris Division, has expressed concern over rising number of nominations from various countries across the globe for getting UNESCO World Heritage status for several sites, many of which at times do not even have outstanding universal value.

Dr Rossler presided over the fifth annual coordination meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage category 2 centres and institutes at the Wildlife Institute of India here today.

"There has been a tendency among countries to get more and more sites for nominations in order to get them under the ambit of UNESCO World Heritage status. Sometimes it is a political push. It should not be more than one site for every country per year," she said.

According to Dr Rossler, fund raising is also a big challenge before the UNESCO. She disclosed that even UNESCO staff in Paris had to be retrenched due to shortage of funds.

Wildlife Institute of India's Director Vinod Mathur said the UNESCO Category 2 Centre (C2C) for World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region, which had been established at the WII, was working to strengthen the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Asia and the Pacific region by building the capacity of professionals and institutions involved with world natural heritage site protection, conservation and management, through training, research, dissemination of information and network building.

Elisa De Cabo, Director General of Heritage Protection, Spain; Kamal Bittar, cultural heritage expert, Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage, Bahrain; and Dr Lokesh Ohri, co-convenor INTACH Uttarakhand, also participated at the meeting.

Also in this section

Govt befooling people on flights from Naini Saini airstrip: BJP

Ambulance service in a shambles amid shortage of vehicles, funds

Ban constructions in Char Dham region: Shanti

Khyati Sharma to represent India in Miss Eco Universe

New police scheme to curb crime

Successful 5th Coordination Meeting of UNESCO World Heritage related category 2 centres held in Dehradun, India

Thursday, 24 November 2016



The 5th Annual Coordination Meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage related category 2 Institutes and Centres took place in Dehradun, India on 22 November 2016. The UNESCO Category 2 Centre (C2C) on Natural World Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region (NWHMT) at the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) hosted the meeting on its campus.

Four coordination meetings have taken place so far: in 2010 (Manama, Bahrain), 2012 (Milan, Italy), 2013 (Oslo, Norway) and 2014 (Shanghai, China). The objective of this year's meeting was to build institutional capacity through a focus on international cooperation and to build synergies for effective natural heritage conservation.

Nineteen representatives from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, Regional Institutes and Universities, UNESCO Chairs and four category 2 centres participated in the meeting. Dr. V.B. Mathur, Director UNESCO C2C at WII, welcomed the participants and briefed them about the purpose of the 5th Annual Coordination Meeting and also gave an overview of the mandate and activities of the newly established C2C at WII. In her inaugural address, Dr. Mechthild Rossler, Director of UNESCO World Heritage Centre, welcomed the excellent cooperation and warmly thanked the Indian authorities for hosting the coordination meeting and the conference in Dehradun. The meeting allowed for in-depth debates on new and emerging topics, including cultural landscapes, mixed sites and sacred places.

She also called for enhanced support for the work of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to assist States Parties, national authorities, and site managers and encouraged the C2Cs to strengthen cooperation in particular to allow for the implementation of the World Heritage sustainable development policy (2015) and the SDGs, as well as other key priorities for the years to come.

The meeting was organized in three technical sessions during which recommendations from previous C2C coordination meetings were reviewed; progress and activities of the category 2 centres and Institutes were shared and a road map for enhancing collaboration and cooperation amongst C2Cs was presented and discussed. A number of recommendations were made to strengthen cooperation, knowledge sharing, networking, capacity building and public awareness.

The UNESCO C2C at WII Monsoon bulletin was also launched during this meeting and is available on the following website link: http://www.wii.gov.in/UNESCO_C2C_Monsoon_Bulletin_2016.

The 5th Annual Coordination Meeting was followed by two Consultative Dialogues on “Kailash Sacred Landscape” and “Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites” on 23 November and 24 to 25 November 2016, respectively, with the participation of more than 100 representatives from UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS, INTACH and State Forest Departments and Universities. Topics discussed included sacred places, cultural landscapes, mixed and transboundary heritage sites, as well as sustainable development, tourism, and communities.

Villagers welcome Kailash world heritage site proposal

Want Sustainable Development That Aids Employment

Sharma, Seema
@timesgroup.com

Dehradun: The proposal to nominate the Kailash Mansarovar landscape on the Unesco World Heritage list, has been welcomed by the people living in villages that lie on the annual Kailash Mansarovar yatra route.

Most locals said that they were enthused about the idea provided it led to "sustainable development of their communities and not just of bigger towns like Pithoragarh."

Varinder Singh Brijwal, a hotel owner at Munsiyari, echoing the sentiments of a number of people in the area, told TOI, "We are happy that the region will get global attention, but it should not be merely for namesake. There should be sustainable development which benefits local people."

“The ancient route to Kailash passes through Uttarakhand, yet the state has not been able to project it strongly for promotion of tourism. As a result, other states like Ladakh and Sikkim have been able to lure tourists

GS RAWAT
Dean of WII

R P Almiya, a school teacher in Dharchula, added, "The real benefit of the move to include the Kailash Mansarovar landscape in the prestigious list will be when local people who are dependent on the yatra to the sacred spot, get enhanced means

ON GLOBAL MAP SOON?



➤ The real benefit of the move to include the Kailash Mansarovar landscape in the prestigious list will be when local people who are dependent on the yatra to the sacred spot, get enhanced means of livelihood and better income

➤ Environmentalists and experts, too, hailed the move. GS Rawat, dean of the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) termed the decision "long overdue."

➤ According to Doon-based heritage expert Lokesh Ohri, the move would especially benefit local communities of Pithoragarh district which had lost trade with Tibet due to the Indo-China war in 1962 and were now dependent on "collection of rare herbs like keera-jari for their livelihood"

➤ Mechtild Rossler, director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, said that a separate protocol will be developed for the Kailash Mansarovar landscape so that "international tourists visiting the sacred area do not offend the sentiments of local people through their dress or behaviour"

ans of livelihood and better income." Environmentalists and experts, too, hailed the move. GS Rawat, dean of the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) termed the decision "long overdue." "The ancient route to Kailash passes through Uttarakhand, yet the state has not been able to project it strongly for promotion of tourism. As a result, other states like Ladakh and Sikkim have been able to lure tourists." He added that involvement of local communities is an essential part of the world heritage site nomination process.

"The nomination dossier in this regard would be prepared by WII and other experts. A programme related to sensitizing and capacity building of the local communities would be held simultaneously as the endorsement of local people would be necessary for the clearance of the project at Unesco level."

Mechtild Rossler, director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, told TOI that a separate protocol will be developed for the Kailash Mansarovar landscape so that "international tourists visiting the

sacred area do not offend the sentiments of local people through their dress or behaviour." According to Doon-based heritage expert Lokesh Ohri, the move would especially benefit local communities of Pithoragarh district which had lost trade with Tibet due to the Indo-China war in 1962 and were now dependent on "collection of rare herbs like keera-jari for their livelihood." "The state will also benefit as the footfall of international tourists here will increase exponentially," he said.

02

hindustantimes

HINDUSTAN TIMES, NEW DELHI
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 2016

dehradun

WII seeks Unesco status for Kailash Sacred Landscape

CONSERVATION EFFORTS Experts say natural and cultural aspects of the area should be taken into consideration to inscribe landscape in the World Heritage Site

Nihl Sharma

nihl.sharma@hindustantimes.com

DEHRADUN: The Wildlife Institute of India (WII) will approach the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (Unesco) to inscribe the Kailash Sacred Landscape as a "Mixed" World Heritage Site, wild experts and environmentalists said.

Wildlife and environment experts deliberated on the merits of inscribing the landscape in the list of mixed world heritage sites during the 5th annual coordination meeting of the Unesco in Dehradun on Tuesday.

The inscription of the landscape in the list of Mixed World Heritage Site will help in mainstreaming sustainable ecosystem management, capacity building among others, said VB Mathur, director of WII.

"The Kailash Sacred Landscape is on the top of the list of our proposals that will be presented before Unesco chair committee next year," he told Hindustan Times.

"The Kangchendzonga National Park in Sikkim has been inscribed as the first mixed



■ A view of Kailash Mansarovar. The Kailash Sacred Landscape Conservation and Development Initiative is a transboundary collaborative programme between China, India and Nepal HT FILE

World Heritage Site in India," he said. A "mixed site" contains elements of both natural and cultural significance, he said.

The Kailash Sacred Landscape Conservation and Development Initiative is a transboundary collaborative programme between China, India, and Nepal that has evolved through a participatory, iterative process among various local and national research and development institutions within these countries.

The programme aims to

achieve long-term conservation of ecosystems, habitats, and biodiversity while encouraging sustainable development, enhancing the resilience of communities in the landscape, and safeguarding the cultural linkages between local populations.

Located within the remote southwestern portion of the Tibet Autonomous Region of China, adjacent districts in the far-western region of Nepal, and the northeastern flank of

Uttarakhand, the Kailash Sacred Landscape is spread over an area of about 31,000 sq km and represents a diverse, multi-cultural, and fragile landscape.

Experts said that the natural and cultural importance of the area should be taken into consideration to inscribe the landscape in the World Heritage Site list.

There are 140 sacred natural sites, more than 15 glaciers, more than 20 ancient temples, more than four sacred peaks and six sacred confluences. The prominence of the landscape is both natural as well as cultural, say experts.

The International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) is the principle agency that is supporting the WII—a category-2 Centre of the Unesco—in implementing the programme.

The Kathmandu-based ICIMOD is a regional intergovernmental learning and knowledge sharing centre serving the eight member countries of the Hindu Kush Himalayas—Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Myanmar, Nepal and Pakistan. It is based at Kathmandu.



'KSL is a unique area with ecological, cultural and spiritual aspects'

PNS ■ DEHRADUN

The Kailash Sacred Landscape (KSL) is probably the only one of its kind of area in the world with a multi-faceted wealth of ecological, cultural, religious and spiritual aspects held sacred by followers of different religious faiths. The KSL involves three nations- India, Nepal and China—all with different systems of governance. In such a scenario, while China is clear about the important sites on its side of the landscape, there is lack of such clarity regarding such sites on the Indian side. Keeping these and other issues in mind, a framework needs to be created to address important aspects to ascertain if any of the three nations has any boundary issues and to ensure participation of and benefit to the local community.

These were some of the views expressed during a consultative dialogue on the sub-

ject of Kailash Sacred Landscape as a World Heritage Site among representatives of UNESCO World Heritage-related Category 2 institutes and centres at UNESCO Category 2 Centre on Natural World Heritage Management and Training at the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) here on Wednesday.

Speakers pointed out that the Kailash Sacred Landscape can be viewed broadly as comprising six different cultural areas. While preparing a road map for inscription of the Kailash Sacred Landscape as a World Heritage Site it needs to be ascertained as to under which category will the nomination be submitted though the general opinion appears to be more in favour of cultural heritage category. Pointing out that the presently used route to Kailash Mansarovar from India is one of the many routes used in the past, speakers elicited focus on the need to ascertain if any of the nations

involved has any boundary issues. Local governance in the area should be based upon local and indigenous traditional knowledge. An official representing the state government pointed out the drastic change in the landscape and village dynamics accompanied by changing practices like the replacement of traditionally cultivated crops.

Concern was also expressed on the detrimental effects of developments like the building constructed in the Mansarovar landscape and a hotel in another location along the route to this geotectonically and ecologically sensitive region with high cultural and religious value. Speakers pointed at the different systems of governance being implemented in India, China and Nepal while also emphasising on how to devolve and enable community involvement when it comes to aspects related to KSL in the three nations.

Source of news – The Times of India

Date – 24 November 2016

URL – <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/dehradun/Kailash-Mansarovar-landscape-likely-to-get-inscribed-as-UNESCO-World-Heritage-site/articleshow/55604043.cms>

THE TIMES OF INDIA CITY

Kailash Mansarovar landscape likely to get inscribed as UNESCO World Heritage site

Seema Sharma | TNN | Nov 24, 2016, 08:22 PM IST



A-

A+

Ad

Get job ready with Aptech

Aptech trains you in the latest technologies – Java, .NET, app & web development. Apply!



Kailash Mansarovar landscape.

DEHRADUN: Preparations are afoot to propose the inclusion of the Kailash Mansarovar landscape in the UNESCO World Heritage site list: At discussions held at the ongoing annual co-ordination meeting of UNESCO in the city on, the proposal steered by the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) and the Kathmandu-based International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, took shape. Experts say that if the proposal comes through, Uttarakhand which is a

major transit point of the annual Kailash Mansarovar yatra, will also benefit as communities living along the yatra route can be incorporated in the plan to develop sustainable tourism for the site.

Source of news – The Times of India

Date – 26 November 2016

URL – <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/dehradun/Locals-and-conservationists-happy-with-Kailash-Mansarovar-on-its-way-to-world-heritage-site/articleshow/55637820.cms>


THE TIMES OF INDIA

CITY

[City](#) [Dehradun](#) [Crime](#) [Civic Issues](#) [Politics](#) [Schools & Colleges](#) [Events](#)

News » City News » Dehradun News » Locals and conservationists happy with Kailash Mansarovar on its way to world heritage site

Locals and conservationists happy with Kailash Mansarovar on its way to world heritage site



Representative image.

DEHRADUN: The proposal to nominate the Kailash Mansarovar landscape as a Mixed World Heritage site, has been welcomed by the people living in villages that lie on the annual Kailash Mansarovar yatra route Pithoragarh

Varinder Singh Brijwal, hotel owner at Munsiyari town of Pithoragarh said, "We are happy that our towns will get global attention, but it should not be merely for name sake. There should be some development in our areas due to this so that local people should benefit from this entire exercise." Mixed site contains elements of both natural and cultural significance.

RP Almiya, school teacher in Dharchula was also elated when he said, "With tourism promotion at global level, the local people will get livelihood and income."

Mechtild Rossler, director UNESCO World Heritage Centre told TOI that a separate protocol will be developed for the sacred landscape of Kailash Mansarovar so that the international tourists do not offend the sentiments of local people through their dresses or behavior.

According to SS Rasailey, former chief conservator of Nanda Devi Biosphere and Valley of Flowers, the tag of world heritage site do not provide monetary assistance from the international agencies, however the technical support by them in preparing management plan for regulated tourism help the conservation of the site.

GS Rawat, dean of WII termed this decision long overdue. "The ancient route to Kailash passes through Uttarakhand yet the state has not been able to project it strongly for promotion of tourism and development. As a result, other states, Ladakh and Sikkim have been able to lure tourists to opt for routes in their states while our state lagged behind. Our state need to respect local culture and the most ancient heritage of this region. However the world reception will add value to it," he said.

Dean WII further added . "Nomination dossier in this regard would be prepared by WII and other experts. On parallel, program related to sensitizing and capacity building of the local communities would be held simultaneously , as the endorsement of local people would be necessary for the clearance of the project at Unesco level."

Lokesh Ohri, anthropologist said, that the local communities of Pithoragarh district which otherwise lost trade with Tibet due to Indo-China war and are now dependent on collection of keera-jari herbs for their livelihood would be able to benefit through tourism activity, after Kailash Mansarovar landscape is inscribed in World Heritage site. The state will also benefit as the footfall of international tourists will increase exponentially.

Source of news – Amar Ujala

Date – 26 November 2016

URL – <http://www.amarujala.com/dehradun/kailash-mansarovar-soon-will-be-in-world-heritage>

अमर उजाला



देश | शहर और राज्य | बॉलीवुड | फोटो गैलरी | क्रिकेट | वीडियो | क्राइम | > अ | LIVE

Home > Uttarakhand > Dehradun > Kailash Mansarovar Soon Will Be In World Heritage.

CITY & STATES | Dehradun

वर्ल्ड हेरिटेज बनने के करीब कैलास-मानसरोवर, यूनेस्को ने भर दी हामी



कैलास-मानसरोवर

कैलास-मानसरोवर पवित्र भू परिक्षेत्र को प्राकृतिक-सांस्कृतिक विश्व धरोहर बनाए जाने की पहली मंजिल तय हो गई है। यूनेस्को डिवीजन ऑफ वर्ल्ड हेरिटेज सेंटर समेत विश्व के दूसरे विश्व धरोहर सेंटरों ने संयुक्त रूप से इस पर हामी भर दी है।

इसके साथ ही यह भी तय हो गया कि कैलास-मानसरोवर तीन देशों की साझा विरासत रहेगी।

इसकी अगुवाई भारत करेगा। जल्दी ही भारत, चीन और नेपाल की सरकारों के प्रतिनिधि इस पर वार्ता करेंगे।

यूनेस्को केटेगरी-2 सेंटरों की विश्व स्तरीय पांचवीं कोऑर्डिनेशन मीटिंग के अंतिम दिन कैलास-मानसरोवर पवित्र भू परिक्षेत्र की पहली मंजिल तय हो गई।

ANNEXURE 1: CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

5thAnnual Coordination Meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage-related Category 2 Institutes and Centres Tuesday 22nd November, 2016	
0930-1100h	INAUGURAL SESSION <i>Chief Guest:</i> Dr.MechtildRössler , Director, Division for Heritage and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris <i>Guest of Honour:</i> Mr. Ravindra Singh , Former Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Government of India
1100-1130h	Group Photo and High Tea
1130-1230h	TECHNICAL SESSION – I Review of previous agenda and action taken from C2C Coordination Meetings <i>Chair:</i> Dr.MechtildRössler <i>Co-Chair:</i> Ms. Elisa de Cabo de la Vega , Director General of Heritage Protection, Spain UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM Representatives
1230-1400h	TECHNICAL SESSION – II C2C Report on Progress and Activities <i>Chair:</i> Dr.MechtildRössler <i>Co-Chair:</i> Ms. Susana Alvarado De la Torre , Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas, Mexico Presentations by Representatives of C2Cs
1400-1500h	Lunch break
1500-1545h	TECHNICAL SESSION – III Mandate and activities of UNESCO Chairs <i>Chair:</i> Dr. INABA Nobuko , Director / Professor, World Heritage Studies, University of Tsukuba, Japan <i>Co-Chair:</i> Mr. Kamal Bittar , Cultural Heritage Expert, Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage, Kingdom of Bahrain Representatives of UNESCO and UNESCO Chairs
1545-1700h	TECHNICAL SESSION – IV Road map for enhancing collaborations and cooperation amongst C2Cs <i>Chair:</i> Ms. Leticia Leitao , IUCN Representative & World Heritage Capacity Building Officer <i>Co-Chair:</i> Dr.ZhuZiyun , WHITRAP, China UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM and C2C Representatives
2000h	Dinner hosted by Director, WII & UNESCO C2C

Consultative Dialogue on Nomination of Kailash Sacred Landscape (KSL) as World Heritage, Wednesday 23rd November, 2016	
0930-1000h	INAUGURAL SESSION <i>Chief Guest:</i> Dr.Amita Prasad , Addl. Secretary, MoEFCC, Govt. of India <i>Guest of Honour:</i> Dr.MechtildRössler , Director World Heritage Centre, Paris Dr.Rajendra Dobhal , Director General, UCOST, Dehradun Mr. B.S. Bonal , Addl. DG (Wildlife) & Member-Secretary, NTCA
1000-1030h	<i>Presentation:</i> Cultural Landscapes: A Global Overview Dr.Mechtild Rössler , Director World Heritage Centre, Paris
1030-1100h	<i>Presentation:</i> Kailash Sacred Landscape: Outstanding Universal Values Dr. G.S. Rawat , Dean, Wildlife Institute of India
1100-1130h	Tea Break
1130-1300h	TECHNICAL SESSION – I Developing a World Heritage Landscape Governance Capacity Framework for Kailash Sacred Landscape: Capability to understand landscape dynamics <i>Chair:</i> Mr. B.M.S. Rathore , ICIMOD <i>Co-Chair:</i> Dr. Ram Boojh , Programme Specialist, Natural Sciences, UNESCO New Delhi Office <i>Speakers:</i> Nominating KSL on the World Heritage List Dr.Rajan Kotru , KSLCDI Coordinator, ICIMOD Dr. Shikha Jain , Director, DRONAH (Development and Research Organisation for Nature, Arts and Heritage)& former Member Secretary ACWHM, Govt of India Dr. R. S. Rawal , Scientist-F, GBPNIHESD
1300-1400h	Lunch Break
1400-1500h	TECHNICAL SESSION – II Group Exercise to discuss the Landscape Governance Capacity Dimensions Dr.Shalini Sharma & Mr. Niraj Kakati , UNESCO C2C-WII Group 1: Capability to achieve coherence in landscape diversity <i>Facilitator:</i> Ms. Gurmeet Rai (Vice-Chairperson, ICOMOS-India) Group 2: Capability to make institutions and policies work for the landscape <i>Facilitator:</i> Dr.B.M.S. Rathore , ICIMOD Group 3: Capability to create landscape market value <i>Facilitator:</i> Dr. Pankaj Tewari , CHEA Group 4: Capability to manage landscape resources <i>Facilitator:</i> Dr. G.C.S. Negi , GBPIHED
1500-1600h	TECHNICAL SESSION – III: Presentations from Group Work
1600-1615h	Tea break

1615-1745h	<p>TECHNICAL SESSION – IV Panel Discussion on Road Map for inscription of Kailash Sacred Landscape as a World Heritage Site</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Mr. Ravindra Singh, Former Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Government of India <i>Co-Chair:</i> Mr. Jai Raj, PCCF, Government of Uttarakhand Discussants: Mr. S. Ramaswamy, Chief Secretary, Govt. of UK; Mr. Manoj Chandran, Addl. Secy.(Forest & Environment) Govt. of UK; Dr. Shekhar Pathak, PAHAR; Mr. B.M.S. Rathore, ICIMOD; Dr. R. S. Rawal, GBPIHED; Dr. V. B. Mathur, WII</p>
2000h	Dinner at <i>The Grille</i> , Rajpur Road, Dehradun
<p align="center">Consultative Dialogue on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites Thursday 24th November, 2016</p>	
0930-1030h (Venue: Auditorium)	<p>INAUGURAL SESSION</p> <p><i>Chief Guest:</i> Mr. Ravindra Singh, Former Secretary, Ministry of Culture <i>Guest of Honour:</i> Mr. Navin Piplani, Principal Director, INTACH, New Delhi</p> <p><i>Speaker:</i> Conservation of Cultural Landscapes Ms. Nupur Prothi, Voting Member (India), ICOMOS IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes</p>
1030-1100h	Tea Break
1100-1330h (Venue: Porta Cabin)	<p>TECHNICAL SESSION – I Case studies on Cultural Landscapes and Mixed Nominations</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Mr. B.M.S. Rathore, ICIMOD <i>Co-Chair:</i> Dr. Lokesh Ohri, Convenor, INTACH Dehradun Chapter & Co-Convenor, INTACH Uttarakhand</p> <p><i>Speakers:</i> Challenges of Cultural Landscapes and Mixed Nomination in India Dr. Shikha Jain, Director, DRONAH (Development and Research Organisation for Nature, Arts and Heritage), ICOFORT NSc Coordinator, ICOMOS</p> <p>Majuli Cultural Landscape - Way Forward Mr. M.K. Yadaya, IFS APCCF & MD AEDC, Govt of Assam</p> <p>Cultural Routes and Landscapes Ms. Gurmeet S Rai, Vice President, ICOMOS-India</p> <p>Bhimbetka Cultural Landscape, India Dr. Amareshwar Galla, Executive Director, International Institute for the Inclusive Museum</p>
1330-1400h	Lunch Break
1400-1500h	<p>TECHNICAL SESSION – II continued Case studies on Cultural Landscapes and Mixed Nominations</p> <p><i>Chair:</i> Ms. Nupur Prothi, ICOMOS IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes <i>Co-Chair:</i> Dr. Neel Kamal Chapagain, CHM, Ahemadabad University</p> <p><i>Speakers:</i> Case study on Cultural Landscapes in Nepal and Cambodia Mr. Kai Weise, Architect, Pahar Nepal</p> <p>Apatani Cultural Landscape, India Ms. Persis Farooqy, UNESCO C2C NWHMT- Wildlife Institute of India</p> <p>Cultural Landscape of Bhutan Ms. Pema, Sr. Conservation Architect</p>

1500-1530h	Tea Break
1530-1700h	Visit to WII Nature Trail
1900-2000h	Cultural Programme at the Institute's Auditorium
2000h	Dinner
Consultative Dialogue on Cultural Landscapes, Mixed and Transboundary Heritage Sites (Continued) Friday 25th November, 2016	
0930-1030h (Venue: Auditorium)	INAUGURAL SESSION <i>Chief Guest:</i> Mr. Rohit Jigyasu , President, ICOMOS-India <i>Guest of Honour:</i> Dr. Amareshwar Galla , Executive Director, International Institute for the Inclusive Museum <i>Speaker:</i> Project Mausam and Indian Ocean Cultural Landscapes Dr. Shikha Jain , Director, DRONAH & Former Member Secretary ACWHM, Govt of India
1030-1100h	Tea Break
1100-1430h (Venue: Porta Cabin)	TECHNICAL SESSION – I Mixed Heritage and Transboundary Sites Management Frameworks - Case studies <i>Chair:</i> Mr. Kai Weise , Architect, Pahar Nepal <i>Co-Chair:</i> Mr. Probestine R. Marak , Conservator of Forest, Wildlife & Territorial, Garo Hills Region, Meghalaya <i>Speaker:</i> Nomination of Khangchendzonga National Park Ms. Dechen Lachungpa , Divisional Forest Officer (SBFC-BC), Government of Sikkim Proposal for developing Garo Hills as a Mixed Heritage Site Ms. Shikha Srikant , Wildlife Institute of India Proposal for developing Keibul Lamjao as a Mixed Heritage Site Mr. Dhruv Verma , UNESCO C2C NWHMT -Wildlife Institute of India Manas Transboundary Landscape Dr. Sonali Ghosh , Scientist-F, WII-UNESCO C2C
1430	Session Concludes

ANNEXURE 2: DELEGATE SNAPSHOTS

(in no particular order)

S. No	Name	Designation and Organisation	Contact Details
1	Ms. Susana Alvarado De la Torre	Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas under the auspices of UNESCO, MEXICO	susana.alvarado10@gmail.com
2	Dr. Elisa de Cabo de la Vega	Director General of Heritage Protection, SPAIN	elisa.decabo@mecd.es
3	Dr. Kamal Bittar	Cultural Heritage Expert, Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage, BAHRAIN	k.Bittar@arcwh.org
4	Dr. ZHU Ziyun	Research Assistant, Peking University, China	pkuzhuziyun@sina.com
5	Dr. Mechtild Rossler	Director - World Heritage Centre, Paris, FRANCE	M.Rossler@unesco.org
6	Ms. Leticia Leitao	World Heritage Capacity Building Officer, IUCN, SWITZERLAND	leticia.leitao@iucn.org
7	Mr. B.S. Bonal	Addl. Director General (WL), MoEFCC & Member Secretary – NTCA, New Delhi	adgwl-mef@nic.in
9	Dr. B.M.S. Rathore	Chief Policy Advisor, ICIMOD Kathmandu, NEPAL	Brij.Rathore@icimod.org
10	Dr. Rajan Kotru	Regional Programme Manager, ICIMOD, Kathmandu, NEPAL	Rajan.Kotru@icimod.org
11	Dr. Shekhar Pathak	Pahar People's Association for Himalaya Area Research Parkrama NAINITAL	pahar.org@gmail.com
12	Dr. R. S. Rawal	Scientist-F, G.B. Pant National Institute of Himalayan Environment and Sustainable Development (GBPNIHESD) Almora, UTTARAKHAND	psdir@gbpihed.nic.in
13	Prof. Rohit Jigyasu	UNESCO Chair on Cultural Heritage and Risk Management, Ritsumeikan University, JAPAN	rohit.jigyasu@gmail.com
14	Dr Rajendra Dobhal	Director General, Uttarakhand State Council for Science and Technology, Dehradun	dq@ucost.in
15	Ms. Nupur Prothi Khanna	ICOMOS NSc CL Coordinator, INDIA	nupurprothi@gmail.com
16	Dr. Shikha Jain	Director, DRONAH (Development and Research Organisation for Nature, Arts and Heritage), Gurgaon	dronah@gmail.com
17	Dr. Pankaj Tiwari	Central Himalayan Environment Association (CHEA), Nainital	pankutewari@gmail.com

S. No	Name	Designation and Organisation	Contact Details
18	Dr. P. Hareesh Chandra	Project Specialist Scientist, NMHS, Mountain Division, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, New Delhi	hareeshchandu@gmail.com
19	Dr. Shalini Sharma	Assistant Professor Tata Institute of Social Sciences Guwahati, Assam	shalini.workspace@gmail.com
20	Dr. G.C.S. Negi	Scientist-F & Theme Head (BCM & ES) GBPNIHESD, Almora, Uttarakhand	negigcs@gmail.com
21	Dr. Amita Prasad	Additional Secretary Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change New Delhi	asap.moefcc@gov.in
22	Dr. G.S. Rawat	Dean, FWS Wildlife Institute of India Chandrabani, Dehradun	rawatg@wii.gov.in
23	Shri Manoj Matwal	Secretary, Harela Society Nainital	manudafaali@gmail.com
24	Dr. B. S. Adhikari	Scientist- F, Wildlife Institute of India Chandrabani, Dehradun	adhikaribs@wii.gov.in
25	Ms. Anubha Kakroo	Dean, Dehradun Institute of Technology	dean.architecture@dituniversity.edu.in
26	Dr. Lokesh Ohri	Founder REACH (Rural Entrepreneurship for Art & Cultural Heritage), Dehradun , Uttarakhand	lokeshohri.reach@gmail.com
27	Ms. Gurmeet Rai	Vice President, ICOMOS-India	g.rai@crci.co.in
28	Dr. Inaba Nobuko	Director / Professor, World Heritage Studies, University of Tsukuba, Japan	inaba@heritage.tsukuba.ac.jp
29	Mr. Kai Weise	Architect, Pahar Nepal	paharnepal@gmail.com
30	Ms. Dechen Lachungpa	Divisional Forest Officer (Biodiversity Conservation & North East), Government of Sikkim	dlachungpa@gmail.com
31	Dr. Ram Boojh	Programme Specialist, Natural Sciences UNESCO Cluster Office for South Asia B 5/29 Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi - 110029	r.boojh@unesco.org , ramboojh1@yahoo.com
32	Dr. Ravindra Singh	Former Secretary, Ministry of Culture Lucknow	addlsecy.culture@gmail.com
33	Ms Pema	Department of Culture, Bhutan	pema_architect@mohca.gov.bt

S. No	Name	Designation and Organisation	Contact Details
34	Dr. Amareshwar Galla	International Heritage Advisor to Chief Minister Andhra Pradesh, Government of Andhra Pradesh	director@inclusivemuseum.org
35	Shri M.S. Garbyal	President, Rang Society Dehradun	garbyalddn@gmail.com
36	Mr. Gajendra Singh.	Scientist-SC Uttarakhand Space Application Centre Dehradun	gajendrawat@yahoo.com
37	Shri Navin Piplani	Principal Director INTACH, New Delhi	pd.iha@intach.org
38	Mr. Manoj Chandran	Additional Secretary Forest and Environment Department Govt. Of Uttarakhand	chandranmanoj@hotmail.com , manoj077-ifs@gmail.com
39	Ms. Sargam Mehra	INTACH, Dehradun	sargam_mehra@yahoo.com
40	Shri Ghanshyam Pande	Central Himalayan Environment Association (CHEA) Mallital, Nainital, Uttarakhand	gp.chea@gmail.com
41	Dr. T. P. Singh	ICFRE, Dehradun	tpsingh@icfre.org
42	Dr. V. R. S. Rawat	ICFRE, Dehradun	rawatvrs@gmail.com
43	Ms. Imrana Khan	Green Hub	imranarkhan@gmail.com
44	Ms. Ankana Sen	Harela Society	sen.ankana@gmail.com
45	Mr. Ajaz Hussain	Research Biologist, Kailash SL Project, WII	spengku1913@gmail.com
46	Mr. Sumit Arya	Research Biologist, Kailash SL Project, WII	-
47	Ms Arti Kala	Senior Research Biologist, Kailash SL Project, WII	toartikala@gmail.com
48	Ms Mona Chauhan	Research Biologist, Kailash SL Project, WII	mona@wii.gov.in
49	Shri P. R. Marak	Conservator of Forest, Garo Hills Region, Meghalaya	probestinemarak@yahoo.com
50	Dr. Neel Kamal Chapagain	Centre for Heritage Management, Ahmedabad University	neel.kamal@ahduni.edu.in
51	Mr. M. K. Yadava	APCCF & MD AEDC Government of Assam	mkyadava@gmail.com
52	Dr. V. B. Mathur	Director, UNESCO C2C & WII	dwii@wii.gov.in
53	Dr. Sonali Ghosh	Scientist F & Faculty UNESCO C2C	ghoshsonali@wii.gov.in
54	Mr. Manoj Nair	Scientist F & Faculty UNESCO C2C	manojnair@wii.gov.in
55	Mr. Niraj Kakati	Technical Officer UNESCO C2C	nirajkakati@wii.gov.in
56	Dr. Bhumesh Singh	Technical Officer UNESCO C2C	bhumesh@wii.gov.in

S. No	Name	Designation and Organisation	Contact Details
57	Mr. Anukul Nath	Assistant Technical Officer UNESCO C2C	anukul@wii.gov.in
58	Dr. Chitiz Joshi	Assistant Technical Officer UNESCO C2C	chitiz@wii.gov.in
59	Ms. Jyoti Negi	World Heritage Assistant UNESCO C2C	negijyoti@wii.gov.in
60	Ms. Rupa	World Heritage Assistant UNESCO C2C	rupa@wii.gov.in
61	Ms .Persis Farooqy	World Heritage Assistant UNESCO C2C	persis@wii.gov.in
62	Mr. Dhruv Verma	World Heritage Assistant UNESCO C2C	dhruv18@wii.gov.in
63	Mr. Vivek Sarkar	Project Biologist UNESCO C2C	vivek@wii.gov.in
64	Ms. Mamatha Prasad	Research Fellow Assam State Biodiversity Action Plan UNESCO C2C	mamatha.rp@gmail.com
65	Ms. Vaishali Rawat	Intern UNESCO C2C	vaishali.rawat@gmail.com
66	Ms. Shikha Srikant	PhD Scholar Wildlife Institute of India	shikha.srikant821@gmail.com
67	Mr. Parth Joshi	INTACH, Dehradun	paaarthjoshi@gmail.com
68	Mr. Omanshu Saini	INTACH, Dehradun	saini.omanshu@gmail.com