



INDIGENOUS CULTURAL HERITAGE: DEVELOPING NEW APPROACHES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR WORLD HERITAGE BASED ON INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVES AND VALUES

Proceedings, Recommendations, and Outcomes of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee Conference and Forum on Indigenous Cultural Heritage, 2019

ARCHIBALD Diane ¹

¹ dr Diane Archibald, Heritage Expert Member and Vice-President ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration

ABSTRACT: In support of advancing the recognition and inclusion of Indigenous Cultural Heritage in all its diverse forms within the UNESCO World Heritage Convention and World Heritage Site designations, this paper documents and discusses the presentations, Indigenous-led Forum, and recommendations of the International Conference on Indigenous Cultural Heritage organized by the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Theory and Philosophy of Restoration and Conservation in partnership with the First Nations House of Learning, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, in November 2019

KEY WORDS: Indigenous, heritage, architecture, landscape, culture

Since the ICOMOS Nara Document of 1994¹ there have been significant advancements at the international level with regard to cultural inclusivity in heritage criteria, restoration, and conservation. These advancements are reflected in ongoing changes to the Operational Guidelines of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention over the last twenty years as to inclusivity of diversity of cultures, authenticity and integrity of cultural evidence, that is separate to technical and material evidence, as well as the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage, and cultural landscape. Further to these advancements ICOMOS led a study in 2005 to identify gaps in World Heritage designations. Amongst the gaps identified were the region of the Pacific Coast and Indigenous Cultural Heritage globally². In addition, there have been a number of declarations and conventions specifically focusing on heritage and cultural diversity and cultural expression: the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2001; the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003; the UN Development Group on the Human Rights Based Approach, 2003; and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2005. Of significance in advancing the inclusion of Indigenous Cultural Heritage is the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) adopted in 2007, and the UNESCO Policy on Engaging with Indigenous Peoples, 2018.

In support of advancing the recognition and inclusion of Indigenous Cultural Heritage in all its diverse forms within the UNESCO World Heritage Convention and World Heritage Site designations, this paper discusses the conference presentations, Indigenous-led forum, and recommendations of the participants of the International Conference and Forum on Indigenous Cultural Heritage.

The conference and forum was organized by the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration in partnership with the Indigenous institute, the First Nations House of Learning, at the University of British Columbia, on the Pacific Northwest coast of Canada. This was the first International ICOMOS conference on Indigenous Cultural Heritage to be held in Canada. In keeping with the principle objective, the conference and forum were inclusive of Indigenous representation both locally and internationally, both individual and community representation. This paper examines and discusses the topics presented at the conference and the outcomes and recommendations of the forum discussion.

Holding the conference on the Pacific Northwest coast of Canada addressed two of the gaps identified in the ICOMOS 2005 study. The Pacific coast of Canada is the ancestral home of over 200 First Nations, making up one third of all First Nations in Canada, representing diverse Indigenous cultures, histories, and traditions.

¹ The Nara Document on Authenticity, International Council on Monuments and Sites, Nara, Japan, 1994.

² Jokilehto J. et al., *The World Heritage List: Filling the gaps - An action plan for the future*, 2005. La Liste du Patrimoine Mondial: Comblent les lacunes - Un plan d'action pour le futur. ICOMOS, München, 189p. Monuments & Sites (2001-), Vol. XII.

Within the framing of the ICOMOS New Delhi Resolution on Indigenous Heritage 19GA 2017/27, the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's Report on Calls to Action, 2015, one of the principle aims of the conference was to provide a forum for dialogue with Indigenous communities in developing new approaches and best practices for World Heritage criteria, valourisation, conservation and restoration that both recognises and ensures the protection of Indigenous Cultural Heritage in all its diverse forms.

UNDRIP: Article 11

Indigenous peoples have the right to practise and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature³

The UNESCO Policy on Engaging with Indigenous Peoples⁴ reinforces the rights of Indigenous Peoples to their traditional lands, territories and recognizes traditional management systems as part of new management approaches. It describes Indigenous peoples as stewards of a significant part of the world's biological, cultural and linguistic diversity and as partners in site conservation and protection activities. The Policy supports the efforts of the UNESCO Secretariat to implement UNDRIP across all relevant programme areas and states in reference to cultural heritage, knowledge, traditional cultural expressions and languages:

Article 31:

Indigenous Peoples also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions⁵.

This conference and forum presented an opportunity for Indigenous peoples to play significant roles in the process of defining the scope and nature of an Indigenous Heritage site or contribution. The format of the conference was developed in partnership with the First Nations House of Learning with invited Indigenous speakers, peer-reviewed presentations, Indigenous-led panel discussion and a forum that provided a platform for discussion by and with representatives of diverse Indigenous communities.

Within the scope of this conference, the principle themes were inclusive of the following:

1. Recognizing and identifying the diverse and multiple forms of Indigenous Cultural Heritage representation, including sites that represent heritage as the combination of natural and cultural

³ United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2008, Article 11. UNDRIP was adopted by the General Assembly on 13 September 2007; published 2008.

⁴ UNESCO Policy On Engaging With Indigenous Peoples, 2018.

⁵ UNESCO Policy On Engaging With Indigenous Peoples, Article 31, 2018.

heritage. Recognizing that Indigenous cultural heritage is represented through multiple forms such as art, architecture, urban settings, trade routes, sacred places, traditional knowledge, and heritage landscapes.

2. Developing new approaches and best practices for World Heritage criteria, valorisation, conservation, restoration that are inclusive and commensurate with Indigenous heritage perspectives and values.

3. Developing new approaches and best practices for heritage sites that represent the co-existence of tangible and intangible heritage. How is intangible Indigenous Cultural Heritage represented? What are the challenges of conserving Indigenous intangible cultural heritage?

4. Recognizing the theoretical and practical challenges facing conservation and restoration of Indigenous Cultural Heritage sites that represent heritage as the combination of natural and cultural heritage as in 'cultural landscape'.

Recognising the intrinsic significance of Indigenous Cultural Heritage and 'connectedness to the land', to 'place'.

5. Developing new approaches and criteria that recognise Traditional Knowledge as Cultural Heritage.

The presentations focused on Indigenous Cultural Heritage as Indigenous ways of knowing, perspectives, values, traditional knowledge systems, sustainable cultural eco-systems, Indigenous-based architecture, built heritage as an organism, reclaiming Indigenous building traditions, co-existence of cultural and natural heritage, tangible and intangible heritage, and living heritage.

The plenary session led by Karen Aird, President of the National Indigenous Heritage Circle⁶ and Heritage Manager of the First Peoples Cultural Council of British Columbia⁷ with Kamala Todd, Indigenous Arts and Culture Planner, City of Vancouver focused on national, provincial, and municipal efforts to safeguard Indigenous Cultural Heritage.

Karen Aird is a member of the Salteau First Nations of BC and has worked extensively towards the recognition of sense of place in Indigenous landscapes, encompassing the stories, legal traditions and the living and tangible elements in Indigenous cultural heritage. Her presentation focused on the Policy Paper, "Recognizing and Including Indigenous Cultural Heritage in BC" published by the First Peoples' Cultural Council in 2019.

The objective of the Policy Paper is to present a compelling and informed position for supporting an Indigenous-led organization that can address gaps in cultural heritage legislation and policy and support heritage related initiatives in Indigenous communities to achieve measurable goals. Intended audiences for the paper include provincial and federal governments, heritage professionals and organizations, Knowledge Keepers and Indigenous leaders, Indigenous communities and organizations, non-government

⁶ National Indigenous Heritage Circle, Canada.

⁷ First Peoples' Cultural Council of British Columbia, Canada.

organizations, and academics and academic institutions.

Heritage protection approaches led by academic theory and methods based on Eurocentric values can eclipse and ultimately be detrimental to Indigenous systems of knowledge by erasing or mischaracterizing Indigenous values and relationships with the past and the land⁸.

Aird emphasized the importance of recognizing Indigenous perspectives, values, ways of knowing, and Indigenous forms of expression connected to places and land with respect to multi-layered protocols in managing the land. It is critical to recognize that Indigenous cultural heritage is also intangible, living heritage as in the performing arts.

In Kamela Todd's presentation, "Current Conversations on Decolonizing Heritage in Vancouver" she discusses the significance of the First Peoples' Cultural Council (FPCC) Policy Paper and its implementation in her everyday work at the municipal government level in deconstructing the colonial settler history and reclaiming Indigenous history. Todd utilizes her work experience at the municipal level as a case study in the transition of policy into best practice. She advocates for the recognition and continuity of Indigenous history, which is absent in the history of Canada⁹. The challenges at the national level of reconstructing history to be inclusive of Indigenous histories were addressed in the presentation by Cody Groat "The Evolution of Federal Indigenous Designations in Canada: A Roadmap for ICOMOS". This presentation examined the history of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada's (HSMBC) commemorations of national historic sites relating to Indigenous history, whereby, the perspectives of Indigenous communities were often ignored or belittled, resulting in a western interpretation of Indigenous cultural landscapes that often failed to consider the significance of intangible values, including the holistic perception of land as central to the formation of identity within Indigenous communities. Groat emphasized the significance of the role of ICOMOS and UNESCO in developing best practices regarding the commemoration of Indigenous cultural landscapes internationally¹⁰.

One of the major issues discussed at the conference was the challenge for Indigenous Peoples to protect and safeguard their respective Indigenous Cultural Heritage when heritage protection approaches and processes are based on Eurocentric values, which can be "detrimental to Indigenous systems of knowledge by erasing or mischaracterizing Indigenous values and relationships with the past and the land"¹¹.

The keynote speech was given by Dr. Williams, Lorna Wanosts'a Williams, who is from the Lil'watul Nation of Mount Currie, the third largest First Nation in British Columbia. She is the recipient of many awards in safeguarding Indigenous languages and cultures and held the Canada Research Chair in Indigenous Knowledge and Learning at the University of Victoria, BC. Dr. Williams is known for her exemplary dedication to promoting, restoring, and saving

⁸ Karen Aird, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

⁹ Kamela Todd, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

¹⁰ Cody Groat, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

¹¹ Karen Aird, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

Indigenous knowledge and language regionally, nationally, and globally. She was one of the Indigenous representatives at the UNESCO International Conference on Indigenous languages in 2019.

In Dr. Lorna Williams compelling keynote presentation on “Nququqweln’tal’ Telling our stories, we share our world – seen and unseen” she calls for “Interruptions” to Euro-centric and colonial approaches that modify Indigenous cultural values and perspectives to the point they are “unrecognizable”. She advocates for recognition and respect for Indigenous cultural heritage as also intangible, living heritage. Recognition of Indigenous knowledge systems, the interrelationships between language and culture, and the significance of Indigenous languages to identity and culture are all of the utmost importance. She further emphasized the significance of Indigenous oral histories, stories, the different systems of stories amongst Indigenous cultures, and the need for institutional spaces that support Indigenous ways of knowing. Dr. Williams recommends opportunities to locally and globally learn about Indigenous ways of knowing, “patterns of how we do it” and “opportunities to see what we are”. She advocates a shared sense November, 2019 of community with Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and to give each other’s cultures “the space and time”¹².

One of the main themes of the conference was that Indigenous Cultural Heritage representation often includes sites that represent heritage as the combination of natural and cultural heritage. Three international Indigenous case studies were presented, which demonstrated the ‘interconnectedness’ of cultural and natural heritage represented in Indigenous sites as the forest-mountain landscape conservation of the Mangyan Iraya tribe of the Philippines, the cultural landscapes of the Innu in the Lac Saint-Jean and North Shore regions of Quebec, Canada, and the Māori sacred and ancestral places and cultural landscapes in Aotearoa New Zealand.

In the case study on the forest-mountain landscape conservation of the Mangyan Iraya tribe of Occidental Mindoro in the Philippines presented by Charl Justine Darapisa, he analyzes the “Transcendental Values Through Nature Appropriation as a Cultural-Environmental Nexus in Forest-Mountain Landscape Conservation”. Through this case study he demonstrates that lived experiences and cultural-historical accounts are paramount in reasoning the key drivers in cultural-environmental heritage nexus of conservation. In his paper, he analyzes the different belief systems of the diverse Indigenous cultural groups within this region and explores different concepts of nature appropriation to determine the middle ground in conserving cultural and environmental heritage through rich accounts from the perspective of Indigenous people¹³.

In the case study on "Indigenous Heritage and Transmission in Industrialised Landscapes: A View from Innu Rivers in Quebec, Canada", Caroline Desbien discusses the reclaiming and revitalizing of the cultural landscapes by the Innu. The case study is based on collaborative research conducted with Innu communities on rivers that have been transformed by hydroelectric development in the region. She explores the challenges and opportunities for maintaining,

¹² Dr Lorna Williams, Keynote, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

¹³ Charl Justine Darapisa, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

revitalising, and valourising indigenous cultural heritage in industrialised landscapes¹⁴.

Xavier Forde continued the theme on the revitalization of Indigenous cultural landscapes in his presentation on “Indigenous Cultural Revitalization through the Recognition of Māori Sacred and Ancestral Places and Cultural Landscapes in Aotearoa New Zealand”. His case study, Tongariro National Park, was the first UNESCO World Heritage site to be designated for both its cultural and natural values in 1993, as an example in working with Indigenous peoples and supporting traditional custodianship over ancestral places. The site, which is representative of a “holistic approach to cultural recognition and conservation, through an indigenous lens, can also assist with pushing back against modern European fragmentative discourses and abstract distinctions between culture and nature, tangible and intangible, living peoples and their ancestral narratives spoken throughout the landscape”¹⁵.

Traditional knowledge both in its culture and nature, tangible and intangible forms, is integral to Indigenous Cultural Heritage worldwide. It is, therefore, critical to develop new approaches and criteria that recognise traditional knowledge as cultural heritage, and recognize the co-existence of tangible and intangible traditional knowledge.

In her presentation “Discussion on the Protection and Utilization Mode of Traditional Wooden Structure Building in the Historic District of South Jiangsu, China”, Gao Chen analyzed two case studies; the Protection of Qingguo Old Lane Historic District in Changzhou and the Former Residence of Ganxi in Nanjing. Both case studies are representative of the co-existence of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. The traditional cultural center of South Jiangsu is significant for its historical district representative of the continuity of its architectural heritage of wood structures that exist in a relatively complete architectural spatial pattern representative of traditional residential areas. Intangible heritage also plays a significant role within this historical urban environment inclusive of cultural traditions. Chen examined the role of traditional knowledge both in its tangible and intangible forms on the conservation approaches to safeguarding these historic districts¹⁶.

Architect Nancy Mackin has worked closely with Indigenous communities in Canada in revitalising and reconstructing Indigenous architectural heritage based on traditional knowledge inclusive of cultural and built traditions. In her presentation “Reconstructing Indigenous Architectural Heritage in Northern and Western Canada”, Dr. Mackin discusses a collaborative project that spanned over a decade with Inuit and First Nations knowledge-holders to reconstruct tradition-based shelters and housing in diverse communities in selected northern and western Canadian sites. Throughout this process she emphasized “recognizing intrinsic significance of Indigenous sense of place and knowledge of the land: Through architectural reconstructions, advanced concepts of materials usage and forms are envisioned and understood by the young people who helped with gathering materials and building.” These architectural reconstructions continue to be critical teaching tools in revitalizing Indigenous traditional building methods and

¹⁴ Caroline Desbien, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

¹⁵ Xavier Forde, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

¹⁶ Gao Chen, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

materials and appreciation by younger generations of the “mathematic ingenuity of tradition-based dwellings such as those with elliptic paraboloid shape”. The collaborative process of the reconstruction of Indigenous architectural heritage based on traditional knowledge of the land, environment, materials, and methods is key to revitalizing and safeguarding Indigenous cultural heritage¹⁷.

With the extensive loss of Indigenous built heritage along the Pacific Northwest Coast of Canada, the safeguarding of Indigenous built heritage through building traditions, concepts, materials, and technology by the knowledge-keepers of Indigenous communities is critical to revitalizing and protecting Indigenous cultural heritage and traditional knowledge.

Architect Patrick Stewart’s presentation “knowing the sacred” focuses on an “indigenous approach to thinking about indigenous knowledge as sacred knowledge grounded within indigenous nations. Indigenous knowledge is elemental/environmental/rhisomatal - it is a decolonial/ anticolonial context that privileges indigenous environments/ architectures/ landscapes/knowledges.” Dr. Stewart poses a number of critical questions: “Why use the word colonial at all? Is this simply a reactionary force/concept? Thinking of this gathering here on the northwest coast in British Columbia does icomos have a place here? Why should we as indigenous peoples be involved with icomos? What are they trying to do? Do they commodify culture? How can we protect our culture? Is an international forum on culture important?” In his presentation Dr. Stewart offers case studies of the use of Indigenous knowledge in design that weigh the challenges facing Indigenous knowledge in the face of continuing colonialism, for example: “the national historic site at xa:ytem offers a time lapse of 9 000 years with a story that continues today; the administration and recreation building at seabird island first nation is an example of community strength; the dave pranteau aboriginal children’s village is the spirit and voice of a new generation finding their way in spite of continued colonialism;” and “bringing home the children is leading the way for a generation of stolen children embracing indigenous knowledge to find their way to a better future”¹⁸.

Trevor Boddy’s paper, “Alfred Waugh’s Formlines: A New Architecture of Indigenuity” focuses on one of the most prominent buildings in Canada completed by Indigenous architect Alfred Waugh; the Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre at the heart of the University of British Columbia campus. In his paper, Boddy analyzes the challenges of designing a building representative of historic memory and political processes that impacted all Indigenous communities within Canada by the forced implementation of residential schools by the Canadian government and religious institutes. To achieve this Waugh relies on more abstract architectural language, which is representative of intangible Indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage, as the integration of the building with the landscape; the cultural symbolism of the collection and projection of rainwater as metaphor for the tears of suffering; and the symbolism of the building materials. Boddy’s analysis posits an interesting argument for the safeguarding and continuity of Indigenous built heritage in that the “Indigenizing of architecture requires

¹⁷ Dr. Nancy Mackin, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

¹⁸ Dr. Patrick R. Stewart, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

a deeper connection to the spiritual and natural realms, fostering designs that integrate spatial experiences with memory and transmission of culture. Boddy suggests that Waugh's work may be an important model for this task¹⁹.

In the final session on "Indigenous Architecture, Traditional Knowledge, and Cultural Heritage", architect Alfred Waugh discusses his concept of "Indigenuity" as a world concept in that we all have "Indigenuity", as how we live with "mother earth, nature-centered, not human-centered." He advocates for reconciliation with Indigenous peoples and the world we live in, Indigenous ways of knowing with the universe at the centre, and regaining a connection to nature. Through a series of case studies of his built work he discusses the significant elements of Indigenous-based architecture as the use of appropriate materials, honesty to integrity of materials, community-based approach utilizing the resources and skills of the community, respecting the environment, building as an organism, and respecting the symbolic use of materials, and the building process.²⁰

Indigenous Cultural Heritage Forum

The conference culminated with an Indigenous-led Forum on developing new approaches and best practices for World Heritage criteria, valorisation, conservation and restoration that are inclusive of Indigenous participation, perspectives, values, and ways of knowing. Throughout the Forum discussion there was an emphasis on the significance of the inclusivity of the representation and participation of Indigenous peoples on local, national, and international heritage committees, as well as, policy-making, capacity building, and clarity and access to World Heritage processes.

The discussions, recommendations, and outcomes of the Forum reflect the perspectives, values, and views of the Indigenous participants. In keeping with Indigenous protocol, the Indigenous participants of the Forum and the respective Nations are identified.

Part I: Discussion

Cody Groat, Mohawk Nation: "ICOMOS/ IUCN, nature/culture divide does not appropriately represent Indigenous heritage in Canada."

Caroline Desbiens: "An Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage (IIPFWH) was launched at the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee in Bahrain. Why isn't ICOMOS working more with that Forum?"

Cody Groat: "The idea of Cultural Landscapes as they relate to cases such as the United Kingdom's Lake District do not equate to Indigenous Cultural Landscapes in the Canadian context, in which personal and community identity is intrinsically tied to traditional territories."

Cody Groat: "World Heritage nominations can cost communities upwards of \$250,000 and

¹⁹ Trevor Boddy, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

²⁰ Alfred Waugh, Abstract, ICOMOS ISC ICH conference presentation, Vancouver, November, 2019.

can take nearly 10 years, which could be nearly impossible for some Indigenous communities focusing on realities like boil water advisories and housing crises. How can this be addressed?”

Caroline Desbiens: “involved with one community that would like [it’s heritage] to be added to the tentative list: they say there is a need for capacity building, community networks with other groups who are in the midst of this process, co-learning between communities. There is a lack of information and awareness about the top-down process.”

Chelsey Schmidtke, Cree, Metis: “[Indigenous] Communities are being pushed out of planning discussions, or don’t have the same level of power as governmental bodies. These designations are a way for communities to show an area is sacred. [They] can help to empower communities. Need to realize that these are community-based initiatives and discussions, and it’s hard to talk about international designations when you have issues nationally about even being recognized as a people.”

Cody Groat: “Most Indigenous sites need to be evaluated based on the ways of knowing of local experts; international experts cannot truly understand the full holistic or intangible significance.”

Vicki George, Wet’suwet’en Nation: “Indigenous peoples are the experts on Indigenous peoples. Our voices aren’t at the table - no Indigenous voices is oppressive.”

Margarita James, Mowachaht/Muchalaht First Nation of the Nuu-chah-nulth: “Can old [historic] sites and designations be revisited, to include Indigenous commemorations or [Indigenous] knowledge in designations that previously excluded them? *Past exclusions can actually be harmful now. Elder knowledge is sacred, cannot be put into words or quantified, for example, within nomination dossiers.”

*This was followed by a discussion by the Forum group on the World Heritage designation of Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks Site, as a ‘Natural’ World Heritage site, which excludes the cultural heritage of the Indigenous peoples and traditional land-based practices that are part of the heritage of the site.

Vicki George: “Who gets the right to judge these sites? Locals or external figures?”

Caroline Desbiens: “This [ICOMOS] session does not change the mindset of the national bodies, which is where the decolonization and changes need to take place first.”

Vicki George: “International organizations need to realize that, like national organizations, they need to work nation-to-nation with Indigenous peoples. There is immense diversity within Indigenous nations. There can be no ‘pan-Indigenous’ solution. Multiple nations oversee sites [Canadian, Indigenous], and they need to be equally consulted. They all need to have an equal say of who the ‘experts’ are.”

Emily Teh, Lakota: “It is important that the participants are identified by the nation they come from, and that this should be reflected in any documentation relating to these sessions.”

Cody Groat: “It is important the views expressed be positioned as the views of the limited Indigenous participants present at the session: not as the views of the Indigenous peoples of Canada, and not as the views of broader international Indigenous communities.”

Antonieta Mar-y-paz Rivera, Didxazon: “Need to move away from the use of ‘experts on Indigenous peoples’ who are non-Indigenous. Nothing should be done about Indigenous people without the presence and participation of Indigenous people, including nominations, evaluations, etc.”

Margarita James: “Unique nations with unique dialects, traditions, and beliefs. Community consultation is ‘flashy’ now, but there needs to be a whole-scale redefinition of what community consultation truly means, including a clear definition of Indigenous consent. Did the World Heritage Committee do a full-scale, line by line, audit of their policies in the context of UNDRIP?”

Vicki George: “Such an audit would need to be done by an Indigenous person, and such an audit should also consider the TRC” [Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s Report on Calls to Action, 2015].

Antonieta Mar-y-paz Rivera: “Western science and Indigenous ways of knowing are both fine as long as they are equally balanced.”

Chelsey Schmidtke: “Difficult that Indigenous communities need to work with State parties when, in some cases, there is an antagonistic relationship between Indigenous nations and State parties.”

Caroline Desbiens: “Important to note that this is an English language perspective. There are added layers when considering a French-Canadian and Indigenous peoples context.”

Cody Groat: “Canada hasn’t ratified the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, and this directly relates to any discussion of Indigenous culture. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention is more bottom-up, so Indigenous communities could have more of a say.”

Caroline Desbiens: “Canada has ratified, but not implemented, UNDRIP.” *Since the Forum, the province of British Columbia within Canada has ratified UNDRIP.

Cody Groat: “it is important that UNDRIP has specific provisions on culture and land.”

Antonieta Mar-y-paz Rivera: “A much larger national conference on this topic [Indigenous values in World Heritage] needs to be had.”

Antonieta Mar-y-paz Rivera: “Indigenous peoples also need ‘allies’ with non-Indigenous peoples in moving forward with policy.”

Part 2: Recommendations

1. ICOMOS International to find ways to integrate UNDRIP and Indigenous Peoples voices into the World Heritage process, be it assessment, valorization and or best practices.
2. Recommend a more inclusive process of valorization in regard to Indigenous sites that is respectful of the local culture(s) and community. Indigenous Peoples should always be included in the WH designation process. Indigenous communities should be informed and acknowledged as to the existence of the UNESCO World Heritage processes and criteria.
3. Recommend capacity building in Indigenous communities be part of the World Heritage

application process. The cost of WH nomination application process should be reassessed. The benefits from a WH designation should be clear to the community.

4. Recommend when World Heritage nomination applications are rejected the reasons for rejections should be shared with the local community. This process is absent at the national level.

5. In terms of cultural valorization, recommend the 'NARA' document as a guiding document for cultural inclusivity to be implemented by heritage experts when assessing a site to make sure that the process is inclusive and respectful.

6. Recommend holding [ICOMOS] meetings outside Europe to decentralize. In working towards decentralization recommend new resolutions are developed in workshops globally.

7. Recommend the criteria, process, valorization, and best practices in heritage conservation be inclusive of the perspectives and the values of local Indigenous communities.

8. Recommend UNESCO World Heritage Convention recognize natural and cultural heritage are inseparable. The IUCN/ ICOMOS divide does not represent the perspective of Indigenous peoples in that their traditional territories/homelands are intrinsically tied to their identity.

9. Recommend the representation of Indigenous Peoples as members of ICOMOS International Scientific Committees and participation at International Heritage meetings.

10. Recommend a global mapping of what discussions are happening about Indigenous Heritage at the international level including ICOMOS meetings; scientific committee meetings and national meetings.

11. Recommend policy development about Indigenous Cultural Heritage should be inclusive of Indigenous peoples and community-based local Indigenous experts; knowledge-keepers, elders. It is disrespectful when policies are made about Indigenous heritage without the participation of Indigenous peoples.

12. Recommend UNESCO implement more community-based involvement with their projects. Dialogues need to happen with Indigenous communities where the community is the center of these dialogues. Local discussions are key to a more community-based involvement.

13. Recommend Nation to Nation discussions should happen because of the differences between Indigenous Peoples and their diverse cultures.

14. Recommend addressing the issues on the removal of shrines and transferring shrines and sacred structures/objects to other sites losing the sacredness and spiritual connection of such shrines. Recognizing spirituality is an important part of Indigenous culture and in many ways is tied to traditional territories.

15. Recommend a process for 'revisiting' previously designated historic sites to re-evaluate the historic significance and evidences of Indigenous Peoples and their important contribution as part of the heritage site listed.

16. Communities should always be well-informed about research results.

Part 3: Outcomes

- Developing strategic priorities within a community-based approach, and significance on a global scale to be examined.
- Inclusivity of Indigenous representation and voices in developing protocols and Indigenous-led stewardship for respective cultural heritage sites.
- Developing new approaches and best practices for heritage sites that represent the co-existence of tangible and intangible heritage.
- Recognising the intrinsic significance of Indigenous Cultural Heritage and 'connectedness to the land', to 'place'.
- Developing new approaches and criteria that recognise Traditional Knowledge as Cultural Heritage.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee Conference and Forum on Indigenous Cultural Heritage took place on the traditional, ancestral and unceded land of the Musqueam people.

The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration is especially grateful to the Indigenous community of the First Nations House of Learning at the University of British Columbia, Canada for their dedication, collaboration, guidance, and generosity of spirit throughout the conceptualization, planning, and organization of the conference and forum. We would like to acknowledge the significant contribution of the Forum participants and our appreciation to Cody Groat and Charl Justine Darapisa who transcribed the Forum discussion and recommendations.

We extend our thanks to the Fondazione Romualdo Del Bianco and the International Institute Life Beyond Tourism for their collaboration, and our supporters ICOMOS Canada and the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (ICIP). A special thanks to our sponsors Donald Luxton & Associates, Heritage BC, and the Museum of Anthropology (MOA) whose generosity made the conference and forum possible.