

activities”.

It is hoped that the Pacific region will be able to get their voices heard at the third SIDS Conference and turn their aspirations into reality for a sustainable future.



Appendix
Summary of Discussion
Profile of Participants

Summary of Discussion
Reflection on the Efforts to Safeguard ICH
and Prospects for the Future

27 September 2013

Gwangju, Korea

Session 1. What effects has the 2003 Convention had in the Asia-Pacific region?

Chairperson Professor Noriko Aikawa opened the conference by welcoming all of the participants. She explained the topic of the first session and introduced the first two speakers: Dr. Tim Curtis and Professor Amareswar Galla. She then invited the first presenter, Dr. Curtis, to give his presentation.

Dr. Curtis's presentation provided data on where ICHCAP stands and what has been accomplished so far. ICHCAP is getting close to including the entire Asia-Pacific region. Dr. Curtis's data showed that this region is particularly active, representing almost half of the listings worldwide. Dr. Curtis argued that the unprecedented rapid increase in popularity ICHCAP has experienced means that it has responded to a need.

Dr. Curtis's data showed that ICHCAP has been successful in raising awareness. However, he argued that while awareness is necessary for progress, it is not sufficient. He explained that people may be aware of the need to safeguard ICH but it is difficult to measure how successful ICHCAP has been in actually safeguarding ICH.

Next, Professor Galla defined the paradigm shifts that are necessary in order to

progress: from object to knowledge, from an exclusive approach to an inclusive one, from passive to active, from static to dynamic, and from monologic to pluralistic. He argued that the methodologies for dealing with ICH have to be very different from those used for TCH preservation because of the need for practice and context, and for the practitioners to be able to continue to practice in their environments. The fact that ICH is living implies several difficulties for safeguarding. Professor Galla ended his presentation by asking the question: Are we museumizing?

COMMENTS BY DAWNHEE YIM

Professor Dawnhee Yim started the discussion by emphasizing the role that the communities must play in the safeguarding of ICH. ICHCAP's efforts in safeguarding ICH have been beneficial to communities by allowing them to better define their identities and to continue to express themselves through the practice of ICH. A sense of identity is important in order to keep communities united and for them to continue to practice their traditions.

Professor Yim expressed the importance of making sure the communities remain the main priority in the safeguarding of ICH. She explained that it is crucial to avoid hierarchies. Hierarchies create conflict between communities. Communities sometimes believe that a specific ICH element belongs to them and that another community is attempting to steal it from them. In order to avoid this type of conflict, Professor Yim argued for the goal to move away from a hierarchy system and toward a sharing mentality. ICH should be used to bring communities together and empower them rather than create further conflict between them.

Professor Yim acknowledged the problem of museumization explained by Professor Galla. ICH is a living heritage and must therefore be safeguarded by being practiced. The measures taken to safeguard ICH may seem artificial, but Professor Yim argued that doing nothing means losing everything.

COMMENTS BY GAURA MANCACARITADIPURA

Mr. Gaura Mancacaritadipura explained that all the speakers come from different backgrounds and therefore see ICH from a different point of view. Dr. Curtis gave

a lot of quantitative data while Professor Galla focused on community involvement by providing three examples. Mr. Mancacaritadipura repeated Dr. Curtis's point that an increase in the number of items on the lists does not necessarily mean that there is an increase in safeguarding. Recently, the idea of inventories has been rethought. Not everyone agrees that the lists are the most efficient method for the safeguarding of ICH. There has always been a less formal approach to ICH than to TCH, yet Dr. Curtis argued that more university courses and formal research could benefit ICH safeguarding.

Mr. Mancacaritadipura went on to discuss the paradigm shifts as described by Professor Galla. He agreed that the methods for ICH could not be the same as the ones for TCH. Mr. Mancacaritadipura gave an additional example—from Indonesia—to illustrate Professor Galla's point. A large cultural space was built in Indonesia where local communities may practice their ICH activities in order to promote the safeguarding of ICH. While this may be seen as artificial, Mr. Mancacaritadipura argued that it is better to have an artificial version of ICH than to have ICH disappear completely.

Mr. Mancacaritadipura finished by reminding us of the importance of keeping safeguarding in mind and remembering what the term really means. The placard is not the end of the story. While some may see the nomination system as the motivating factor and getting the placard as a success, it is not the end of the process, but rather, its beginning. Using the nominations as a motivator is not necessarily bad as long as one keeps in mind that successful nomination does not always equate successful safeguarding.

OPEN DISCUSSION

The floor expressed concern as to how one can safeguard an ICH element yet still allow it to develop and encourage creativity. The act of talking about ICH without the practitioners present could lead to "museumization" because people are talking and analyzing when living heritage needs to be practiced. A second question concerned protection of the fields. Not only are ICH elements disappearing, but so are the fields where they are practiced.

Dr. Curtis responded by saying that both questions were related to the practical aspects of safeguarding. He argued again that, in an ideal world, there would be no

need for governments to get involved and no effort would be needed to protect ICH, but that unfortunately, that was not the case in reality. He explained that ICH has been disappearing for a variety of reasons, especially financial ones. He expressed concern that the impacts of the convention happen at the international level instead of having more of an impact at the field level. He emphasized the need to move beyond inventory to fix this problem. He then compared approaches to ICH with approaches to TCH: when a temple is falling apart, one doesn't simply take pictures of it and then let it fall apart. He used this comparison to illustrate the insufficiency of inventory making and the changes that need to happen in order to truly have an impact in the safeguarding of ICH.

Professor Yim responded by agreeing that ICH is living and therefore constantly evolving, but that doing nothing means losing everything. How much change should be allowed and how creativity can be encouraged without corrupting tradition is still under debate.

Professor Yim pointed out that Dr. Curtis's data shows that we are still in the learning process of how to approach ICH safeguarding. Old frameworks are being used or improved upon, and new laws and policies are being developed. The methodologies are still evolving. Therefore, the efforts made so far can not be seen as successes or failures, but as steps within a larger process.

Session 2. Why ICH should be safeguarded?

Chairperson Dr. Tim Curtis introduced the two presenters, Dr. Samuel Lee and Professor Lourdes Arizpe. Due to technical difficulties, Dr. Lee's presentation was given first, and Professor Arizpe's second.

Dr. Lee gave a brief history of the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. He described some of the challenges the mission to safeguard ICH has faced and is still facing. While there is more awareness of the need to safeguard ICH, preservation of old customs is not always well received by younger generations, who may see steps towards protecting cultural heritage as obstacles to progress. Yet Dr. Lee argued that there were many reasons and benefits to safeguarding ICH. He went on to give detailed explanations of the goals and benefits of ICH. He focused on three main reasons: to provide communities with a sense of identity and continuity, to encourage human creativity, and to promote sustainable development.

Professor Arizpe was unable to attend the conference but provided the audience with a video of her presentation. She gave a detailed account of how the terminology the Convention settled on came to be. Coming from an anthropological perspective, she pointed out the importance of choosing words carefully, especially when dealing with intangible elements because of the difficulty in defining certain terms and the different implications they may carry depending on the culture.

COMMENTS BY KYUNG-KOO HAN

Professor Kyung-koo Han found that Professor Arizpe's and Dr. Lee's presentations brought up some disturbing points. First, Professor Han spoke of the international politics that affect the safeguarding of ICH. Currently, it is the state's responsibility to decide what is worth safeguarding. While the UNESCO was established in order to promote peace, there is competition between the states. By leaving the decision of what to safeguard to the states, Professor Han argued that the needs and interests of the states, rather than those of the communities and actual cultural bearers, are being fulfilled. Professor Han asked Dr. Lee to elaborate on this issue and to offer an evaluation of how this has played out in Korea by explaining which elements were selected for safeguarding and how the selection was made.

Professor Han then expressed his disturbance at another issue: the problem of identity, authenticity, and creativity. While ICH is a living heritage and creativity should be encouraged, it is difficult to determine when the authenticity of an ICH element becomes compromised. Since ICH is used to help communities define their own identity, authenticity is sometimes difficult to determine until the community is fully involved in the safeguarding of their ICH.

Professor Han expressed his appreciation of Professor Arizpe presentation and ideas because she comes from an anthropological point of view. As an anthropologist, Professor Arizpe did not simply observe; she acted. Professor Han was intrigued by the concept of popular cultures being very different from what we normally expect. He wished to learn more about the different meanings of popular cultures. He specifically mentioned the notion of there being diversity not only between various cultures but also within a single culture.

Professor Han summarized the two presentations by saying that both papers raise not

just the question of why ICH should be safeguarded but rather, which practices should be chosen and who should choose them. While there is general agreement that ICH should be safeguarded and that the reasons are numerous, the questions of who and how are more difficult to answer, and further discussion is needed.

Professor Han then expressed his disappointment that there wasn't more discussion of multiculturalism. Practices are copied and shared, and an element is not the property of a single group. He wished for future discussions on this topic.

Professor Han finished by quoting George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945): "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." He believes that this quote illustrates ICHCAP's approach to ICH in that, while ICHCAP claims that all ICH is important, states choose and decide which elements should be prioritized, thus causing some to be considered more important than others.

COMMENTS BY ADI MERETUI RATUNABUABUA

Ms. Adi Meretui Ratunabuabua described the convention as a catalyst to getting countries to do something about their cultural heritage policies. She explained that many countries in the Pacific are small and not as powerful as countries in other regions, which is why it has taken so long for the Pacific region to join.

While some may have been surprised by the mention of language and the need to address terminology, Ms. Ratunabuabua said that she agreed with Professor Arizpe and believed it was an important issue. She argued that defining terms and agreeing on which to use allowed for a better understanding of goals and the development of better methods to reach those goals. The number of discussions that have resulted from bringing up the problem of terminology is proof that talks were, in fact, needed.

Ms. Ratunabuabua expressed the need for the younger generations to get involved in ICH safeguarding. Both papers raised the question as to how to go about motivating younger people and educating them on the importance of ICH safeguarding. Ms. Ratunabuabua asked not just the question "Why do we need to safeguard ICH?" but also "What if we don't?" By looking at the consequences of failing to safeguard ICH, the reasons for which ICH must be safeguarded become obvious.

Ms. Ratunabuabua reminded the audience that Dr. Curtis had said in his presentation that the ICH elements of various countries can go on the lists, but that in order for an

element to be safeguarded, it must work at the community level. According to Ms. Ratunabuabua, it is crucial that one look at the methods used when safeguarding ICH, and one important strategy that must be considered is the involvement of the younger generations.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Professor Tu Weiming agreed with Ms. Ratunabuabua that getting young people involved should be taken seriously. He pointed out that ICH is not just a topic for intellectuals but that it is affected and affects government officials, NGOs, and community members.

He continued by saying that ICH represents a shift from space to time compared to TCH. When dealing with ICH, one is dealing with an ever-changing landscape that is evolving. In this sense, according to Professor Weiming, there is no need to worry about "museumization" because there is a complicated interplay between space and time. There is a link between modernization and tradition, between mind and body, and between secular and sacred. Professor Weiming argued that this was liberating, not confining, and that ICH was not difficult to appreciate, as the "Arirang" performance that was given at the beginning of the conference demonstrated.

According to Professor Weiming, there has been a shift from an overwhelming majority to an overwhelming minority. There is a new understanding of multiculturalism, and by safeguarding ICH and continuing to get the communities involved, communities can develop a stronger sense of "we." While a sense of identity is often equated to nationalism or patriotism, Professor Weiming argued that self-reflectivity can be enhanced in order to also promote critical self-consciousness.

Dr. Lee then responded to the discussion by first also expressing his appreciation of Professor Arizpe's anthropological approach. He pointed out the importance of defining the terms culture, heritage, tangible, intangible, as well as many others. According to Dr. Lee, while consensus may be reached on which word to use in a specific context, there is still debate concerning the interpretation of the concept the word expresses.

Dr. Lee agreed that ICH safeguarding required community involvement. However, in response to Professor Han's remarks about state involvement, Dr. Lee pointed out that the states are the ones who have to implement methods. The states are the

ones who are sponsoring conferences, creating inventories, and therefore, who must determine the priorities. Dr. Lee argued that if governments were to step away, it would be difficult for NGOs and local communities to accomplish much as they do not have the budgets necessary. Therefore, according to Dr. Lee, having the states run things is the realistic and practical way to approach the problem. Unfortunately, not everything can be saved, and so countries must pick and choose what to prioritize, and difficult decisions must be made. Each country has its own standards and policies because each country has a unique set of ICH elements, and the sizes and scopes of inventories vary from country to country. Dr. Lee explained that cultural heritage is not there to serve the interests of the states; however, practically speaking, the states must make decisions which sometimes seem to be function based.

Dr. Lee concluded by saying that the involvement of states is unavoidable. However, he agreed that governments must work hard to bring in the participation of the communities as much as possible.

Session 3. What have been the effects of the UNESCO ICH lists?

Chairperson Professor Amareswar Galla gave a brief overview of the third session's topic. The third session was dedicated to a fundamental aspect of methodology that has been implemented so far: the listing system. Professor Galla then introduced the two speakers, Professor Norito Aikawa and Mr. Fernando Villafuerte Medina.

Professor Aikawa gave a short history of how the Convention came to the decision of using the listing system. She explained that, at first, most Asian and African states were in favor of using the listing system while most states in Europe and Latin America were against. Professor Aikawa talked about the unprecedented enthusiasm with which the lists were met. However, she pointed to a number of limitations and disadvantages of using such a system.

Mr. Medina stressed the importance of understanding that the lists have both advantages and disadvantages, and that they must be assessed from several points of view in order for one to accurately understand every aspect of them. Two main problems of the listing system are that some regions are overrepresented and that the lists are reliant on good faith. Mr. Medina argued that it was, however, still too early to fully assess the impact the lists have had and their rate of success in safeguarding ICH.

COMMENTS BY YANG ZHI

Mr. Yang Zhi opened the discussion by suggesting looking at the list system implemented by the convention as a tool in context. Mr. Zhi explained his metaphor by pointing out that how well a tool performs depends on several things, including the task that needs to be accomplished, the person who is using the tool, and the way in which the person is using the tool. Mr. Zhi urged the conference not to judge the lists as inherently good or bad. The lists alone cannot be evaluated. They must be judged in context, meaning that one must take into consideration how they are being used, who is constructing them, and what one is trying to accomplish through them. Mr. Zhi also argued against viewing the listing system as either successful or unsuccessful, but rather as a method that can be adjusted and fine-tuned or implemented in different ways.

Mr. Zhi agreed with Mr. Medina that it was still too early to accurately evaluate the efficacy of the lists. He further argued that there is a need for improvement in the forms of report. Because the listing system is still young and because the methods of report still need work, it is premature to pass any judgment on the effects the lists have had on ICH safeguarding.

COMMENTS BY SANGMEE BAK

Professor Sangmee Bak said that, as an anthropologist, she had her own reservations as far as using a listing system for ICH. However, she recognized that the lists have done a great job in raising awareness. She also acknowledged that the lists may encourage hierarchy among cultures, which is problematic. She agreed that the lists have both good and bad sides.

Besides the issue of hierarchy, according to Professor Bak, the implementation of the listing system has other flaws. Once an element is on a list, there is little monitoring that happens. Therefore, it is difficult to judge the efficacy of the lists after the inscription of elements. She explained that other systems should be made and implemented in the near future.

Professor Bak went on to highlight some of the advantages of the listing system. Despite the fact that the lists are currently being created at the state level, they can be

used to enable different layers of agencies: the local or practitioner level, the state level, and the global level.

Professor Bak expressed her hope that the listing system will be maintained as part of the convention. Yet she also mentioned the need to become wiser and to find a way to work through the layers she described. As it stands now, with the states in charge of the lists and their implementation, the local communities may not be fairly represented. The UNESCO is working closely with the states to prevent hierarchies and misrepresentation as much as possible. However, Professor Bak insisted on the need to channel expertise and financial resources to the communities.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Once the discussion was opened to the floor, an audience member expressed his concern about the lack of effort being made to safeguard ICH elements after they have been inscribed on the list. He gave the example of “Arirang,” a Korean song that is inscribed on the list, and asked what measures were being taken to preserve it.

The floor also asked what can be done in order to protect and preserve the lives of the people from local communities in the face of globalization. They asked which aspects of these lives can and should be preserved.

Professor Bak answered that the livelihood of the people of the communities was at the center of the UNESCO’s concerns. She insisted that members of small communities and the safeguarding of their lifestyles in addition to their ICH traditions remained the main priority. Safeguarding ICH does not mean simply safeguarding individual traditions, but means safeguarding an entire culture and protecting communities by empowering them and allowing them to better define their own identities.

Mr. Zhi agreed with Professor Bak on the importance of the community members. As far as methodology goes, Mr. Zhi explained that when a community and its ICH are in danger, the barriers must be determined and defined. Then, a plan is developed in order to take down these barriers. For each community and its ICH, the situation is different. Rather than implementing the same strategy in every case, the barriers for each must be studied and analyzed in order to design a plan that is suited for the specific needs of the community.

Professor Noriko Aikawa offered a more specific response to the methods used to monitor progress after an element has been inscribed on a list. States must create reports describing what they have done in their country and how they have helped the ICH elements listed. The types of help that is provided to communities and the safeguarding of ICH vary. Help may come in the form of tax exemption, subsidies from the government, special recognition, and several other forms. All of these implementations must be described in the reports. Professor Aikawa argued that these reports put pressure on the governments to take measures that help the people of the communities. She explained that while it was not a perfect system, measures are, in fact, being taken and have had positive results.

Mr. Medina expressed his confidence in the UNESCO by explaining that placing emphasis on the community is what makes the convention special. He said that focus on local communities was one of the UNESCO’s strengths.

Professor Galla brought up the lack of talk about NGOs, which play an important role in ICH safeguarding. He highlighted the need for more networking and information sharing in order to better serve the needs of the communities by communicating about the needs, methods, and results of ICH safeguarding strategies.

Session 4. What are the ICH safeguarding tasks? Voices from the Asia-Pacific region

Chairperson Dr. Seong-Yong Park opened the fourth session. He explained that, in contrast with the previous day’s presentations—which were more theory oriented—presenters in the fourth session would give examples of the implementation of ICH safeguarding on the field by providing detailed case studies. He then introduced Mr. Urtnasan Norov, Dr. Le Thi Minh Ly, Mr. Dastan Derbishev (presenting for Dr. Faroghat Azizi), Ms. Ananya Bhattacharya, and Ms. Akatsuki Takahashi.

Mr. Norov described the success of the development of programs for ICH safeguarding in Mongolia and how cooperation on the international level—in this case between Korea and Mongolia— can help at the local level.

Dr. Ly reported on both the achievements and difficulties of ICH safeguarding and inventory making in Vietnam. She provided a good illustration as to why all of the

ideas brought up in the previous day's sessions needed to be further discussed and implemented. She stressed the importance of assessing the methodologies already implemented.

Mr. Derbishev presented Dr. Azizi's work and argued for the power of the teacher-apprentice relationship in Tajikistan, and how it can be easily applied in order to revive ICH and involve the community in an authentic and educational way.

Ms. Bhattacharya told the story of an element of ICH nearing extinction and being revived, finally becoming so popular it spread worldwide. However, she exposed the controversy caused by too much promotion and the taking out of context of ICH. She finished by asking when ICH became too commercialized and stressed the importance of maintaining authenticity.

Ms. Takahashi gave a brief history and a status update on the implementation of ICH safeguarding in the Asia-Pacific region, with a special emphasis on small island countries. Based on her findings, she argued in favor of large cultural events in order to promote the safeguarding of ICH in small island countries of the Pacific and explained how ICH safeguarding can help communities become more resilient and overcome challenges, including natural catastrophes.

Dr. Park summarized the main issues brought up by the five presenters. He explained the importance of considering case studies to illustrate the points made in the previous day's discussions. He expressed his appreciation for the traditional teacher-apprentice approach to practice but also pointed out the need for implementation of ICH safeguarding into higher educational institutions, as was suggested by Dr. Curtis the previous day. Dr. Park also expressed his appreciation for the five presenters' practical approach to ICH safeguarding by encouraging sustainable development, building community resilience, and working as the custodians of communities. He then introduced the discussants.

COMMENTS BY ROGER JANELLI

Professor Roger Janelli wished to bring up three issues. The first issue concerned the preservation of ICH. He asked whether it was possible to simply be an observant of ICH. Since ICH is a living heritage, it must be recognized by participating rather than simply observing.

The second issue he wished to bring up was the education of the younger generation. He agreed with previous participants that it was necessary to educate the younger generations in the need to preserve ICH and in the ways to go about doing so. Professor Janelli asked whether participants could share which methods had been implemented to promote ICH safeguarding among the younger people and whether a certain strategy was found to be more efficient than another.

The third point Professor Janelli made was in regards to ethnic diversity. Because of the great number of communities that exist, there is a need to protect cultural diversity in the face of globalization. Moreover, different strategies may be necessary depending on the ethnic group in question. The methods of safeguarding must be tailored to each individual ethnic group in order to preserve diversity.

COMMENTS BY ADE FATIMA MEYLIALA

Ms. Ade Fatima Meyliala first addressed Mr. Norov and asked what percentage of the Mongolian people were nomadic. She then talked about the programs being implemented in Mongolia. She gave examples from her own experience in getting the younger generations involved by creating spaces purposefully made for the safeguarding of ICH. She asked Mr. Norov whether the government planned to open such spaces.

Ms. Meyliala then turned to Dr. Azizi's paper (presented by Mr. Dastan Derbishev) and expressed her appreciation for the teacher-apprentice model because it is a traditional way to safeguard tradition. She said she was in favor of the creation of traditional institutions for the passing on of traditional knowledge.

In response to Ms. Bhattacharya's presentation Ms. Meyliala gave examples from her own country (Indonesia) of successful performances that got the younger generations motivated to participate in the safeguarding of ICH. She explained that making a living through the practice of ICH is a highly motivating factor that can help communities become self-sufficient all the while safeguarding their heritage.

Ms. Meyliala then addressed Ms. Takahashi and pointed out that she understood the geographical implications and the challenges involved with working in a small-island country.

COMMENTS BY FLORA ELENA MIRANO

Professor Flora Elena Mirano began by giving examples from the Philippines to illustrate the significance of the impact ICH safeguarding has had on local communities. Small communities that previously received no attention from their government were now invited to Washington DC in celebration of the foundation of the nation.

However, Ms. Mirano explained that the methods of ICH safeguarding require constant adjustment, done through trial and error and continuous adaptation because of the constantly changing environment that the cultures live in and the living nature of ICH. She gave the example of the methods used in the northern Philippines, which differ from those used in the south of the Philippines. The situation is not the same, and therefore, the same methods cannot work. She explained that there are so many elements that come into play that, every day, a new strategy must be used.

Ms Mirano argued that the cultural worker must be aware of all of the forces at work that affect the communities and their cultures, including government plans, NGOs, local communities, country economy, commerce and industry, and many more.

Ms. Mirano noted that this constant negotiation required creativity in order to cater to each unique history and location by adapting and innovating to safeguard ICH despite the uncertainty of living in a fast-changing world.

COMMENTS BY HO CHEOL RYU

Professor Ho Cheol Ryu first addressed Mr. Norov in regards to the teaching programs for children that are a current national government project. These programs aim to teach and educate young people about ICH. Professor Ryu referred to the previous day's talks in regards to inventory, explaining that the creation of inventories should be considered neither an outcome nor a goal, but rather a tool to preserve ICH. He argued that to do this, it is fundamental that the younger generations be educated. They must be exposed to ICH so that they may become familiar with the idea of ICH safeguarding early on. Professor Ryu explained that, ICH being a living heritage, the limits of inventorying must be overcome, a concept that Mr. Norov explained in his presentation on Mongolia. Professor Ryu then asked whether anyone could share their experience

or knowledge about educating the younger generations through this type of project.

Professor Ryu then addressed Ms. Bhattacharya, who had given interesting examples from her culture. He explained that the popularity of ICH safeguarding is often due to the benefits it can provide the communities; for example, by stimulating their economy. This utilization of culture is widely promoted in Korea, where local communities are encouraged to share their traditions in order to increase social cohesion. Professor Ryu pointed out that Professor Yim was playing an important role in emphasizing the paradigm shift currently underway, from the idea that ICH needs to be preserved to the notion of living heritage, heritage that evolves and must be practiced and safeguarded rather than preserved. He explained that the problem with using ICH as a financial resource and a way to make communities self-sufficient is that one runs the risk of commercializing culture. The practitioners take their audience into consideration, and by doing so, they try to cater to that audience, which can undermine the value of their culture. Professor Ryu then asked Ms. Bhattacharya whether she had encountered this problem of commercialization in the communities she worked with.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Norov first responded to Ms. Meyliala by saying that over a third of Mongolians still lived nomadic lives. However, young people today often leave the nomadic lifestyle to go live in the cities and don't return to the rural sites. Because of this, ICH in Mongolia has come under threat. However, the government is working to safeguard ICH despite the declining nomadic population. A program started by the Mongolian government intends to open spaces reserved for younger generations so that they may practice ICH traditions. These spaces would encourage the teaching of skills and various ICH elements. Mr. Norov pointed out that these programs involved the government, NGOs, and practitioners, and that everyone had to play a part for ICH to survive.

In response to how progress was monitored in Vietnam, Dr. Ly described the system in place to assess the results of the efforts and to make sure that the communities are getting what they need. She explained that every year, local efforts must be reported to the municipal townships. Provinces and cities have to inform the department of cultural heritage, and the department reports to the government and to the UNESCO.

Ms. Takahashi then invited Ms. Ratunabuabua to provide insight on strategies that can be implemented in order to promote ICH safeguarding with the younger generations to address Professor Janelli's question about the methods that have been tried.

Ms. Ratunabuabua talked about village culture, where children live with their extended families. Parents, grandparents, and cousins all participate in the education of each child. Thus, the children learn about their cultural heritage and learn the traditional skills as they are trained by their relatives over several generations. However, Ms. Ratunabuabua explained that traditional skills are becoming lost as villages are disappearing. She then mentioned the idea of training workshops, with which spaces reserved for the safeguarding of ICH would help educate the younger generations. She argued that both formal and informal education could be helpful. A teacher-apprentice model as the one described in Dr. Azizi's presentation is effective, but Ms. Ratunabuabua expressed her belief that introducing ICH into formal education and using it in a social structure could also help. She asked Dr. Tim Curtis for insight on this matter as he expressed in his presentation the previous day that institutes of higher education and formal research needed to be done in order to further promote ICH safeguarding.

Dr. Curtis agreed that incorporating ICH safeguarding into secondary schools would be beneficial. However, he explained that the implementation was a difficult matter because the ministries of education are separate from the curriculum developers. Adding items to the curriculum is a complicated process that requires a convincing argument.

Dr. Curtis said that four countries across the Asia-Pacific region were currently working on a teaching module. However, he explained that when a country has hundreds of cultural groups, it is impossible to create a curriculum that covers everything. He argued that this is why it is so important to get the communities involved.

According to Dr. Curtis, the concept of incorporating ICH safeguarding into educational institutes is not flawed, but the problem comes with implementation, which in reality, is a complicated process. In fact, he said that a teaching module was developed, but that it had not yet been tested because of the difficulty in adding it to the curriculum.

Ms. Bhattacharya then answered the questions she received about using ICH to promote local economies while avoiding commercialization. She admitted that she had seen several examples of commercialization. Unfortunately, in order to cater to the audiences and to become self-sufficient, the communities must understand the market they are dealing with. This leads to loss of authenticity in certain cases. She gave the example of the scroll painters. While the tradition is being safeguarded, she makes the distinction between scroll painters and simple painters. While a painter may learn to create similar images to the ones the scroll painters make, they are still simply painters.

Dr. Curtis then spoke again, explaining that commercialization was sometimes inevitable. However, he argued that for every case of commercialization, there were several cases of lost ICH. According to Dr. Curtis, the loss of ICH happens when practitioners cannot make money from their skills. If an ICH element has no economic value for the community, it is lost. Therefore, he encouraged the continuation of encouraging ICH safeguarding while stimulating local communities' economies.

Professor Galla argued that separating practitioners from their environment did not work. He advocated for more research and sharing of case studies in order to avoid running into more cases of commercialization where the practitioners are out of context, and are therefore not safeguarding authentic ICH. He appreciated the sharing of case studies in which a method was shown to not work. He explained that it was necessary to learn from failure and that both good and bad practices needed to be studied in order to improve the methodologies. He encouraged the sharing of knowledge through networking.

Ms. Aikawa agreed that commercialization needed to be avoided as it was often abused. She explained that some individuals try to make profit from ICH, and that it wasn't always the practitioners. Governments, private companies, provisional governments, and others may try to abuse the system. She agreed with Professor Galla that it was therefore imperative to develop a network for the sharing of information.

Dr. Park closed the discussion by thanking all the participants and congratulating the discussants on a fruitful talk. He then invited Dr. Lee to give the plenary discussion, and Mr. Mancacaritadipura gave the closing remarks for the conference by presenting the rapporteur's report.

Recorded by Danielle Josset