

《*Concluding Speech*》

Intangible Cultural Heritage and Its Link to Tangible Cultural and Natural Heritage

Rieks SMEETS
UNESCO

1. Introduction

1.1 *This Forum*

Like the other participants in this Forum, I am very happy to be here and to have experienced some wonderful days. We have not only been speaking and theorising about the complex management of elements of the tangible and intangible heritage, we also had the privilege of seeing and witnessing manifestations of the tangible and intangible heritage here on Okinawa, and, in great detail, on Taketomi-jima. We heard local authorities and other stakeholders explaining about the present day management of the sacred sites, the *Utaki*, and we were informed about plans for their future management. We heard about challenges and problems and we marveled at the way the inhabitants of Taketomi manage to sustain, to share and to put to advantage their heritage. As always, the Japanese experiences are telling. Furthermore, thanks to the participation in and the contributions to this Forum by experts in the field of the management of tangible and/or intangible heritage in a variety of South-East Asian countries, we were given the opportunity to place the Japanese experiences in the larger framework of the regional approaches to the management and safeguarding of cultural heritage.

1.2 *A new Convention*

I would like to congratulate the Prefecture of Okinawa and the Japan Foundation on the excellent organization of this timely and informative meeting and to thank them for the invitation to participate in it, which allows me to learn a great deal about Asian views on the link between tangible and intangible heritage and related subjects. It also made it possible for me to convey here - on the other

hand - views and experiences of experts, intergovernmental and other ones, that were pronounced at meetings and sessions at UNESCO Headquarters, during the preparation of the draft of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. That Convention was adopted unanimously by the Member States of UNESCO during the 32nd session of the Organization's General Conference in October 2003. Its adoption marked one of the highlights of last year's General Conference. The new Convention, which will enter into force three months after thirty countries will have ratified or will have adhered otherwise to it, is intended as the counterpart to UNESCO's very successful 1972 *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. The already mentioned experts stated time and again that overlap between the implementation of the two Conventions is to be avoided and that good co-operation, where and whenever possible is to be assured. This meeting is the more timely as UNESCO has now started preparing the implementation of the new Convention, which is often referred to as the 2003 Convention.

Mr. Mounir BOUCHENAKI, UNESCO's Assistant Director-General for Culture, regrets very much that he is not in a position to attend personally this event which, indeed, is the more important, since the promotion and the preparation of the implementation of the new 2003 Convention developed into core tasks of the Culture sector of UNESCO. However, he as well as UNESCO's Director-General, Mr. MATSUURA Koichiro, who has often initiated and who always intensely follows UNESCO's activities relating to the safeguarding of the cultural heritage, both send you their best wishes. You can be assured that they are looking forward to the results of this meeting. The Organization considers this meeting as yet another confirmation of the deep involvement of the Japanese authorities and society in, and keen interest for the promotion and the safeguarding of the intangible as well as the tangible cultural heritage, both in Japan and worldwide.

1.3 Background of UNESCO's activities in the domain of the intangible cultural heritage

The 2003 Convention was not the first standard setting text prepared by UNESCO in the field of the protection of the intangible cultural heritage. After almost two decades of intermittent debates and preparations, during which the attention often focused on the protection of intellectual property rights related to intangible cultural heritage, the year 1989 saw the adoption of the *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*. That recommendation proved to be less successful than hoped for in terms of follow-up

activities in Member States. An obvious reason for this was the soft, non-binding character that goes along with texts like recommendations and declarations. However, in the decade following its adoption, the text of the *Recommendation* was critically analyzed at a large number of regional meetings, culminating in a major evaluatory meeting at the Smithsonian Institution (Washington, 1999). The conclusions of these meetings resulted not only in a recommendation to prepare an instrument of a more binding character, but also, while doing so, to rethink fundamentally goals, target groups, definitions and approaches in relation to the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage.

UNESCO in the meantime created in 1992 a programme *Intangible Cultural Heritage*, initiated in 1993 the *Living Human Treasures* project and established in 1997 the programme of the *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*. After discussions at the 30th session of the General Conference (1999), and after debates at the May 2001 Session of the Executive Board, the 31st session of the General Conference decided in 2001 that a new standard-setting instrument, preferably a convention, was to be prepared. Only two years later, after a painstaking process of consultations, after three sessions, plus an intersession, of a meeting of intergovernmental experts, and after a favorable debate in the September 2003 session of the Executive Board, UNESCO's General Conference adopted the Convention in October 2003, not without heated debates, but still, without a dissenting vote. It did so two years before schedule.

1.4 UNESCO present-day activities in the field of Intangible Cultural Heritage

The section at Headquarters that specifically deals with matters relating to the intangible cultural heritage manages various programmes; apart from traditional music and endangered languages the section also deals with a programme that assists Member States in setting up systems for the protection of *Living Human Treasures* and, most importantly, with the programme of the *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*. I will come to speak extensively about the Masterpieces programme.

A new task of our section is to contribute to the promotion of the 2003 Convention, that is to raise awareness about its importance and to encourage its rapid ratification,* and to prepare its future implementation.

* By the end of August 2004 five States already ratified the 2003 Convention: Algeria, Mauritius, Japan, Gabon and Panama.

2. The 2003 Convention

2.1 *Defining intangible cultural heritage*

Article 2 of the 2003 Convention defines the intangible cultural heritage; the second paragraph of that article presents a non-exhaustive but useful list of five domains in which the intangible heritage is manifested:

- (i) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;
- (ii) performing arts;
- (iii) social practices, rituals and festive events;
- (iv) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;
- (v) traditional craftsmanship.

It goes without saying that these domains show a great deal of overlap; a musical expression belongs by definition to the performing arts, may form part of an oral tradition, may be part of a ritual or festive event, may convey knowledge about nature of the universe, whereas traditional craftsmanship may be involved in the production of the necessary musical instrument.

The first paragraph of that same article is more of a descriptive nature. It defines the intangible cultural heritage as:

“the practices, representations and expressions”, that is as a set of temporary manifestations, “knowledge and skills”, that is people’s learned and evolving capacities necessary for the enactment of those manifestations, “as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts”, that is movable supporting elements, sometimes resulting from traditional craftsmanship, “and cultural spaces associated therewith”, that is built or natural settings, or specific junctures of time on a calendar, that may be indispensable for the enactment of a manifestation, “that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage.”

Paragraph 2.1 states further that this intangible cultural heritage is transmitted from generation to generation, that it is constantly recreated and that it provides its bearers with a sense of identity and continuity. The paragraph finally informs the reader that, under this Convention:

“consideration will be given only to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with international human rights instruments, as well as with requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sus-

tainable development.”

2.2 Focus and accents of the 2003 Convention

The 2003 Convention intends to safeguard *living* intangible cultural heritage, that is such manifestations that are spontaneously transmitted from generation to generation, that are liable to change at every manifestation and that are characteristic for the groups and societies for whose sense of identity and continuity they are of primary importance. This means among other things that the Convention cannot be called upon for the protection of decontextualised, frozen or staged forms of intangible cultural heritage. Since the term “folklore” in quite some contexts is used to denote staged and/or less spontaneous manifestations of the intangible cultural heritage, the intergovernmental experts preferred not to use this term in the new Convention. This orientation of the Convention may also imply that, if choices have to be made, preference will have to be given to safeguarding measures *in situ*, that is within the habitat of the communities concerned, rather than to representations outside the context of the community of the traditional enactors.

Article 2.3 of the Convention defines the term “safeguarding”, which in the first place means “measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage”. These measures are said to include “the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage”. It draws the attention that a large part of these measures aim at the protection or the creation of the conditions that ensure continued enactment and transmission of intangible cultural heritage practices and expressions. The Convention is primarily concerned with processes and it intends, unlike the 1989 Recommendation to benefit in the first place performers and tradition bearers. The Convention explicitly expects States Parties to the Convention to involve in their national safeguarding activities the groups and communities who are the holders and transmitters of the elements that are to be safeguarded.

2.3 Safeguarding at the international level

The States Parties to the 2003 Convention will jointly constitute the Convention’s General Assembly. That General Assembly will, immediately after the entry into force of the 2003 Convention elect from their midst an 18 member Intergovernmental Committee. Articles 16 and 17 of the 2003 Convention stipulate that the Intergovernmental Committee that will have to implement the 2003 Convention shall establish a *Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of*

Humanity and a List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding; it will also prepare criteria for the inscription of elements of the intangible cultural heritage on those lists.

The Committee will further select for granting of international assistance various activities for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, focusing on intangible cultural heritage inscribed on the *List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding* and on the preparation of inventories. The primary source for these grants will be the *Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund* (article 25).

2.4 Operational Directives

Before the Intergovernmental Committee can start implementing the Convention, it will have to prepare, for approval by the General Assembly, a series of proposals that will guide the interpretation and the implementation of the 2003 Convention.

The Convention in this respect explicitly mentions a draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund, operational directives for the implementation of the Convention, a proposal for the accreditation of non-governmental organizations with recognized competence in the field of the intangible cultural heritage, and criteria for the establishment, updating and publication of the two Lists foreseen by the Convention (articles 7.c, 7.e, 9, 16 and 17).

The Convention does not prescribe in great detail the system of world-wide cooperation for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage it advocates. This is not just due to the fact that, like any other international Convention, this Convention contains elements of compromise. It has also to do with the novelty of the subject - this is the first binding standard-setting text in this field. Another reason for occasional reticence in the Convention is the recognition by the intergovernmental experts who prepared the draft of this Convention, that not only the intangible cultural heritage itself is evolving, but that also the views about it and about its safeguarding, which already differ from region to region, are bound to change over time. It may be expected that eventually, as is the case with the 1972 Convention, the operational directives will constitute a larger body of text than the Convention itself and that they will be subject to regular updating and adjustment.

One may suppose that that Committee will need a full year to finalize the draft documents in question, which would mean that, if the first Committee is elected by early summer 2006, the General Assembly might convene a second time during the General Conference of UNESCO of Autumn 2007 in order to discuss for adoption the proposals prepared by the Committee. The

Intergovernmental Committee as well as the General Assembly will be able to profit greatly by that time from the experiences the Jury of the Proclamation programme and the Secretariat of UNESCO will have gathered thanks to the implementation of the Masterpieces programme.

3. Masterpieces

3.1 *Three proclamations*

As said before, UNESCO's main programme so far in the field of intangible cultural heritage is that of the Proclamation of Masterpieces. The first Proclamation took place in May 2001; then 19 out of 31 proposals were retained. In November 2003 another 28, out of 56 proposals, were proclaimed a *Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* by UNESCO's Director-General. As you no doubt know, the Nohgaku Theatre was proclaimed a Masterpiece during the first and the Ningyo Johruri Bunraku Puppet Theatre during the second proclamation. The third and, most probably, last Proclamation is scheduled for 2005 - as the 2003 Convention regulates that no further Proclamation will be made after the entry into force of the 2003 Convention. We expect a large number of candidature files for the programme's third round and we are looking forward to receive Japan's next proposal.

Article 31 of the 2003 Convention regulates that the Masterpieces proclaimed before the entry into force of the Convention will be incorporated in the *Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity*. The Masterpieces probably will not all be inserted in the Representative List in one go. It seems to stand to reason that only the Masterpieces present on the territory of States Parties to the Convention will be incorporated.

3.2 *Outstanding versus Representative*

The candidatures for proclamation as a masterpiece "are judged on their outstanding value as masterpieces of human creative genius, in that they represent: a strong concentration of intangible cultural heritage of outstanding value and a popular and traditional cultural expression of outstanding value from a historical, artistic, ethnological, linguistic or literary point of view." In order to be acceptable they must further satisfy some six more criteria, one of them being the risk of disappearance.

The intergovernmental experts who prepared the draft of the 2003 Convention agreed that one cannot and should not make, within the realm of the

intangible cultural heritage, distinctions between more and less outstanding, or between outstanding and not outstanding items. The term was considered discriminatory for other elements of the intangible cultural heritage that are not proclaimed Masterpieces but are equally crucial for the identity of groups and communities. That is also the reason why, after heated debate, it was decided to speak of a Representative List rather than, for instance, about a list of outstanding items of the intangible cultural heritage, or of Masterpieces.

The implementation of the masterpieces programme allowed the programme's Jury and the secretariat of UNESCO to acquire a lot of extremely valuable experience, not only concerning definitions and criteria, but also concerning the priorities of States and, for instance, the drafting of action plans for safeguarding actions. Some of that experience is used in the next section in which I will try to deal with differences and similarities between tangible and intangible heritage and between approaches towards their safeguarding.

4. Intangible and Tangible Heritage: Differences and Similarities

4.1 *One Heritage*

It is common place to claim that all heritage is one. That claim may be true for some purposes, it does not hold for all purposes, one reason being that prototypical elements of the tangible and the intangible heritage have quite different characteristics, requiring different approaches to safeguarding. In certain cases, however, integrated approaches may be appropriate and I'll come back to that subject in section 4.5 of this contribution. I hope I am already here allowed to make a comparison: patients who deeply feel that body and mind are one, still know when to look for mental assistance, when to go to a dentist, and when to ask for mental and physical assistance at the same time.

In UNESCO's approach a main distinction is made, within the domain of the tangible heritage, between cultural and natural heritage, which then as a whole is opposed to intangible heritage. Elements of the cultural and natural heritage that are recognized as being of outstanding universal value fall under the protection of the *World Heritage Convention* of 1972, other elements of the tangible heritage do not. For intangible heritage to fall under the protection of the 2003 Convention outstanding universal value is not a prerequisite. We have to do here with a major difference between the 1972 and the 2003 Conventions.

During the early preparation of what eventually would become known under the name of the 2003 Convention, experts speaking in their personal capacity and

intergovernmental experts devoted many hours of discussions to the necessity of having a separate convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, rather than, for instance, broaden the scope of the 1972 Convention. Their conclusion was that, indeed, a separate instrument was needed. The main reason for that opinion were not the huge technical and administrative difficulties that one would have had to surmount in order to reformulate large parts of the 1972 Convention and getting them accepted, but rather the deeply felt understanding that in spite of links and interdependencies there are major and fundamental differences between tangible and intangible heritage.

4.2 Links and Interdependencies

The 1972 *World Heritage Convention* quite understandably does not yet speak about intangible heritage, or about associative elements, or values. Later on, during reformulations of the operational guidelines that regulate the implementation of that Convention, associative elements have gradually been introduced.

The 2003 Convention does refer to the 1972 Convention: article 3 states that nothing in the new Convention may be interpreted as “altering the status or diminishing the level of protection under the 1972 Convention ... of World Heritage properties with which an item of the intangible cultural heritage is directly associated”. The Preamble of the 2003 Convention speaks about a “deep-seated interdependence between the intangible cultural heritage and the tangible cultural heritage”.

In the body of the text of the 2003 Convention this statement is substantiated: article 2.1 states that, for the purposes of the Convention, the intangible cultural heritage means not only manifestations and knowledge and skills, but also “the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith”. The substantiation is to be found in the expression “cultural spaces”. Cultural spaces are not defined in the text of the Convention itself but may be understood as man-made or natural settings that are indispensable for the enactment of manifestations of the intangible cultural heritage. Within the context of the Proclamation programme “cultural space” may also have temporal meaning, referring to a specific juncture of time on a calendar. Often manifestations of the intangible cultural heritage take place at a specific time in a specific place; however, more often no specific location is needed for the enactment of elements of the intangible cultural heritage. The reference to “cultural spaces” also seems to be the motivation for the insertion of the earlier quoted statement in article 3 of the 2003 Convention that nothing in that Convention may be interpreted as altering the status or diminishing the level of protection under the 1972 Convention.

4.3 *Characteristics of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*

- Frequent absence of link with specific location

The statement that all heritage is one, is often substantiated by claiming that all tangible heritage is associated with intangible elements and, vice versa, all intangible heritage with tangible heritage. However, many, if not most manifestations of the intangible cultural heritage do not depend for their enactment on a specific building or, for that matter, on a specific place in the open air. This goes for instance for most traditional music, for most oral traditions and knowledge about nature and the universe. Georgian polyphonic songs may be sung any place where those who have the performers together. In the same vein the Indonesian masters who perform the Wayang theatre, to name another *Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, can do so in any village, lest there is an audience. In cases where there is a special link, where the enactment of elements of the intangible cultural heritage does depend on specific locations, the built or natural space that presents a condition for such enactment usually can not be characterized as being of outstanding universal value.

The other way around, there are also elements of the cultural or natural heritage that do not have a direct link with manifestations of the intangible cultural heritage of modern communities and groups. This goes for instance for many archeological sites and for a sizable number of historical monuments and natural sites. Associative values of monuments and sites that once were relevant but that do not belong to the living heritage of the people living in or near them, are not covered by the 2003 Convention, however interesting and well documented they may be.

- Human borne, hence mobile and ephemeral

The prototypical absence of a specific built or natural location for the enactment of elements of the intangible cultural heritage follows directly from a major difference between tangible and intangible heritage: the intangible cultural heritage is human borne and, therefore, mobile and ephemeral. The depository of the knowledge required for enacting and recreating intangible cultural heritage elements, and the regulatory system from where the necessary skills are activated, are located in the human mind, and the main means of expression of the intangible cultural heritage is the human body. The intangible cultural heritage literally is embodied. Pyramids, shrines, canals, castles and cathedrals stay where they were created (the monuments of Abu Simbel form a rare exception) and once they are declared monuments, or - better still - World Heritage, a deliberate choice is made as to the authentic form in which they have to be preserved. Such monuments do

not only have a fixed location, they are also always there, independently of the presence of human beings. Elements of the intangible cultural heritage typically do not have a historically correct form or a historically correct function or meaning.

- Limited in duration and evolving

Intangible expressions and representations have a limited duration partially conditioned by the limits of memory and more physical limitations on the part of the performers, and, of course, by the stamina of the audience. However, such expressions, if they belong to the living heritage, can and will be enacted again and again, but never exactly in the same way. No two manifestations of a specific element of the intangible cultural heritage are totally identical. The changes often have a systematic character and are not only due to human creativity but also to changes in the social context and the habitat of the tradition bearers. Both form and function of intangible heritage manifestations may change, ultimately such manifestations may change beyond recognition. If, in the process, the name of the element changes it is common usage to say that we have to do with different elements; if the name is not changed, we will rather say that the element still is the same.

This particular aspect of the intangible cultural heritage has led some experts to ask themselves whether it would not be appropriate to introduce a sunset clause, limiting the duration of the inscription of elements in the Representative List of the intangible cultural heritage, foreseen under article 16 of the 2003 Convention. An additional advantage of such a sunset clause might be that a Representative List that would never encompass more than, for instance, 300 elements, would remain easily manageable.

- To be transmitted from generation to generation

Mortality sees to it that the intangible heritage, or rather the knowledge and the skills required for intangible heritage items, together with the often tacit pre-suppositions about their function in the social texture of a community, have to be transmitted from generation to generation; needless to say that the process of transmission in itself is a guarantee for development and renewal.

This means, that authenticity in relation to intangible cultural heritage is a moot point; the future will tell whether it is a useful notion in the context of the safeguarding of that part of our heritage. We know by now that it cannot mean “historically correct” as intangible cultural heritage by definition is evolving.

The main remark to be made here, however, concerns transmission: the intangible cultural heritage is prototypically transmitted orally from generation to

generation and is mainly acquired by means of mimetic techniques by the younger generations. When it comes to safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage, it is the protection or the revitalization of traditional transmission systems and/or the development of new transmission systems that is in order.

- Often spread over large areas or dispersed

Since human beings, who are the carriers of the intangible cultural heritage, tend to live in groups, often in large groups, and since cultural manifestations are easily borrowed between groups, many elements of the intangible cultural heritage can be found spread over large territories, often belonging to different States. What is more, since people are inclined to travel and often to migrate, many elements of the intangible cultural heritage can also be found in non contiguous areas and in non contiguous States. The safeguarding of intangible heritage manifestations that, due to migrations, find themselves on the territory of more than one state ask for specific approaches, including arrangements between the states concerned.

- Not safeguarded as living heritage by means of documentation

The definition of safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage given in the 2003 Convention includes inter alia documentation and archiving. Time and again one can read that documentation implies making the intangible tangible; this, however, is not a happy way of saying things. Documentation means that one discrete enactment of an intangible item, or a series of them, is put down on paper, or on another, for instance, audiovisual bearer. If the element lives, it will continue to develop and its documentation will have historical value. Such documentation is important; it may be necessary for research, it contributes to the memory of a group or community, which is especially important if the element in question is threatened in its continued existence. Finally, when the transmission of intangible cultural heritage is in danger, due to sharp changes in social conditions, documentation may be instrumental in finding new ways of transmission.

4.4 Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage

From the above we may conclude that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage essentially asks for two idiosyncratic types of actions that are not shared with the tangible heritage: on the one hand material and societal conditions for continued enactment have to be secured, whereas on the other hand the intergenerational transmission is to be furthered. The material conditions may include the protection of a cultural space, the societal conditions may include awareness rais-

ing among the communities concerned and/or the authorities and institutions they have to deal with. Special measures and international cooperation will be needed in the case of elements that are located in different states.

The intergenerational transmission nowadays is seriously threatened by modernization or globalization processes. The introduction of general education, the world-wide penetration of cultural products that are mainly produced in a restricted number of economically dominant countries, and their influence on youth in large parts of the world, individualization and new forms of governance, all see to it that the traditional, usually oral transmission systems of the intangible cultural heritage are disrupted. New ways of transmission will have to be sought, besides methods to reinforce or reintroduce more traditional forms of transmission.

The specific characteristics of the intangible cultural heritage do not only ask for rethinking, for the purposes of its safeguarding, of such concepts as authenticity and integrity, or questions like commercialization and tourism (many elements of the intangible cultural heritage cannot stand large numbers of tourists) they also ask for a careful study of management of safeguarding projects. In that management the groups, communities and - in some cases - the individuals who are the bearers of that part of the heritage will have to be involved as main actors. The intergovernmental experts who prepared the draft of the Convention made it also perfectly clear that regional differences in understanding the intangible cultural heritage, and in safeguarding approaches have to be taken into account by the intergovernmental Committee that will have to implement the 2003 Convention. What is more, the wording of the Convention leaves individual States Parties a large margin of maneuver in determining its policies for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present on its territory.

4.5 Integrated Management

Once the characteristics of elements of the tangible heritage and of the intangible heritage that can be found in one location, and/or in one community, are known, it has to be established whether the continued existence of the one is a condition for the continued existence of the other. If that appears to be the case, an integrated safeguarding project is in order.

One group of such cases was already mentioned, that of the cultural spaces, i.e. built or natural environments that are essential for the enactment of one or more intangible cultural heritage elements. If a cultural space appears to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, and if the intangible heritage element that is narrowly associated to it, is protected under the 2003 Convention, then the two

Committees concerned will have to cooperate. This does not seem to be a frequent type of case: among the 47 Masterpieces proclaimed up till now, there is one such case: the Hudhud Chants of the Ifugao community (Philippines), proclaimed a Masterpiece in 2001, are strongly related to rice growing as practiced on the rice terraces of the Ifugao that already were listed as a World Heritage site. Taketomi Island in fact is another case in point: the preservation of the *Utaki* is a major condition for the continued existence and development of the traditional performances and rituals as they are still practiced on the island today. The open attitude of the islanders towards outsiders in general and newcomers in particular and their sense of community, called *utsugumi* as we were told, are of course other major factors that contribute to the continuation of traditional social and cultural practices on the island and to the very preservation of the *Utaki*.

Traditional knowledge about nature and traditional craftsmanship do not just fall under the domains of intangible cultural heritage as mentioned in the 2003 Convention, they are often essential for the protection or the traditional management of elements of the built or natural heritage. However, whereas the 2003 Convention will wish to safeguard such knowledge as it develops, the experts interested in using traditional methods for the protection or restoration of tangible heritage elements, will more often than not be interested in knowing and documenting specific frozen versions of such knowledge.

In the case of interdependent sites that are inscribed on the World Heritage List and intangible heritage elements that are going to be safeguarded under the 2003 Convention, common and integrated approaches will have to be developed. Integrated approaches should start from an inventory of both the tangible and the intangible heritage present within the specific setting of a region or a community.

A final remark should be made about Cultural Landscapes that are inscribed on the World Heritage List not because of cultural material evidence, but because of manifestations that belong to one or more of the domains of the intangible cultural heritage and that are enacted by traditional societies and local communities living on or near the sites in question. It will not be difficult to assure in such cases, too, if necessary, integrated management plans. However, if these plans have to be prepared and monitored under the cooperating 1972 and 2003 Conventions, then the two Committees concerned will have to study, and may be to bring in line, definitions and criteria as used in the operational guidelines that go with these Conventions, while at the same time assuring that these guidelines are not in contradiction with the texts of the Conventions themselves.