RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERT MEETING ON CULTURAL HERITAGE AND DISASTER RESILIENT COMMUNITIIES

14 March, Tokyo, Japan

Background

An International Expert Meeting on Cultural Heritage and Disaster Resilient Communities was organized in Tokyo and Sendai, Japan, on 11-17 March 2015 by UNESCO, ICCROM, the Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan (ACA) and the National Institutes of Cultural Heritage (NICH) with the cooperation of ICOMOS-International Committee of Risk Preparedness (ICOMOS-ICORP) and ICOM-Disaster Relief Task Force (ICOM-DRTF).

This meeting was held within the framework of the third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (the 3rd WCDRR) that was organized in Sendai, Japan, on 14-18 March 2015 by UNISDR, and included the following events:

(1) Tokyo Strategy Meeting (11-13 March, Tokyo) to discuss how cultural heritage could be better integrated with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030;

(2) Tokyo Symposium (13 March, Tokyo) to share the experiences in rescue and recovery of heritage damaged by the Great East Japan Earthquake;

(3) The 3rd WCDRR Intergovernmental Working Session on Resilient Cultural Heritage (15 March, Sendai) prepared by UNISDR, UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS-ICORP, ACA and NICH;

(4) Sendai Symposium (16 March, Sendai) to share results of the above-mentioned with the public.

Over 50 participants attended the Tokyo Strategy Meeting, coming from all regions of the world and included representatives of the abovementioned organizations and institutes. During this meeting in Tokyo, participants discussed issues related to cultural heritage and disaster risk reduction (DRR) and developed a set of recommendations to address how to better connect heritage to the evolving DRR agenda and to ensure a culturally–sensitive approach in strengthen DRR effectiveness. These recommendations, following the organizing structure of *the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*, are aimed at local, national, regional and international partners and cover a period of 15-year.

The participants of the meeting express their thanks to:

- The United Nations, the Government of Japan and the Sendai City for hosting the 3rd WCDRR;
- UNESCO, ICCROM, ACA and NICH for organizing the International Expert Meeting;
- and all the organizations and institutes that provided its cooperation in organizing the meeting, particularly ICOMOS-ICORP, ICOM-DRTF, Miyagi Prefecture, Iwate Prefecture, Fukushima Prefecture, Kesen-numa City (Miyagi) and Hiraizumi-Town (Iwate).

The participants of the meeting further express their condolences to and solidarity with those persons affected by the Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami of 11 March 2011, as well as Cyclone Pam that hit Vanuatu during the 3rd WCDRR.

Context

Taking into consideration the review of Hyogo Framework for Action and the expected outcomes and goals of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030[1], the meeting participants considered the role of cultural heritage and cultural practices of communities in ensuring disaster resilient communities.

Cultural heritage is important in its own right as evidence of people and their development over time. But, cultural contexts are constantly evolving as a result of change, modernization, displacement and migration, sometimes leading to tensions and latent conflict which increase vulnerability to disasters, especially within larger urban contexts and in developing regions.

Cultural heritage can therefore be seen as a source of strength and resilience for communities and is a useful tool in helping communities deal with disasters at all phases (e.g. planning, mitigation, response, recovery). Cultural heritage is not just something to be saved in time of emergency, but something that can be an effective tool for disaster recovery and more importantly for sustainable development.

Cultural heritage should be defined broadly to include:
- Immovable (e.g. monuments, architectural works, vernacular architecture, archaeological sites)
- Movable (e.g. objects in museums, homes and elsewhere)
- Urban areas and landscapes
- Archives and libraries
- Intangible (e.g. know-how, traditions, rituals, festivals, languages, traditional techniques, social structures)

Stakeholders in disaster risk management are wide and varied. Local communities, including women, children and indigenous peoples, play a very particular and important role in the process and should be recognized as a core constituency for disaster risk management. Other stakeholders can be found in the fields of heritage and environmental protection, infrastructure planning and development, first response, humanitarian aid, the military, social services and education, among others. Roles for these stakeholders include decision-making, professional activity and academic research.

There is a need to understand what motivates people and what roles they play in order to create synergies that work amongst all those involved. Moreover, there is a need to create good means of communication, cooperation and coordination amongst all stakeholders from the earliest stages and throughout all phases of the iterative process.

There are many different types of hazards that we face as a society that can affect our heritage, our communities and our livelihoods including earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, drought, famine, disease, landslides, fire and deliberate acts of vandalism, conflict and terrorism. Disasters are often complex and linked to socio-economic and political considerations with vulnerability to one type of hazard increased due to the occurrence of another, creating domino effects.

---

[1] See the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, particularly from Paragraph 3 to Paragraph 18.

Taking account of the above, cultural heritage and disaster risk management organizations should be integrated at all levels of governance (e.g. sites, cities, national, regional, international) and should include an understanding of traditional, indigenous and local knowledge. In this way, communication, coordination and cooperation can be enhanced. Further, cultural heritage and disaster risk management organizations should develop and implement policies to ensure that they apply a culturally-aware and informed approach to their disaster risk programmes and activities, applying appropriate technology and knowledge transfer to achieve optimal results.

Recommendations

Using the priority areas indentified in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030, the meeting participants make the following recommendations.

Priority 1:   Understanding Disaster Risk

1.1   In order to better understand disaster risk and its context, multi-disciplinary studies should be carried out on the following topics:
- the positive and negative impacts of cultural beliefs on the attitudes and practices of people in relation to disaster risk;
- the positive and negative impacts of the organizational culture of cultural heritage and disaster risk management organizations on their effectiveness in carrying out their linked mandates;
- the evolution of cultures over time, in particular in relation to migration and conflict, and its effect on people's vulnerability to disasters;
- the usefulness of traditional knowledge systems in understanding disasters;
- the contribution of traditional building technologies and vernacular architecture to disaster risk reduction and sustainability.

1.2   Case studies should be developed to make the argument that prevention and mitigation are much more effective (including cost effective) over response and recovery for cultural heritage after disasters strike.

Priority 2:   Strengthening Disaster Risk Governance to Manage Disaster Risk

At the National and/or Local Levels

2.1   Heritage organizations should learn the terminologies of other sectors related to disaster risk management. At the same time, heritage organizations must make other sectors aware of our own specific terminology as it applies to disaster risk management.

2.2   National and local governments should establish focal points for cultural heritage and disaster risk management to coordinate information and networks relevant to both, and in particular, to be involved in the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA).

2.3   National governments should include cultural heritage issues in their progress reports on the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

2.4   National governments should promote professional qualification and certification for all professionals working in heritage and disaster risk management. Particular attention should be paid to architects and engineers who must certify structures as being safe for habitation and use.

2.5   National governments should support national and international networks such as Blue Shield and other networking platforms.

<u>At the Global and/or Regional Levels</u>

2.6   National governments and regional and international institutions should strengthen existing regional disaster risk information centres (e.g. on tsunamis, earthquakes and other types of disasters), and make them part of the institutional processes for disaster risk management. These centres should create strong links with cultural heritage institutions.

2.7   UNESCO and its partners, in cooperation with their Member States, should develop cross-cutting disaster risk management policies and reporting procedures for its heritage-related conventions, including standardized PDNA and disaster risk management methodologies.

2.8   International heritage organizations should develop and strengthen relationships with international and regional disaster risk, humanitarian, peace-building and development organizations in order to encourage a more integrated approach to cultural heritage and disaster risk management.

2.9   International heritage organizations should develop and disseminate model legal instruments to encourage a stronger link between cultural heritage and the disaster risk management at the national level.

Priority 3:   Investing in Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience

<u>At the National and/or Local Levels</u>

3.1   National and local governments and NGOs should improve social networking as a tool to disseminate knowledge on cultural heritage and disaster risk management at all levels, particularly for communities.

3.2   National governments should encourage investment through mechanisms such as financial assistance, tax incentives and loans to promote the protection of cultural heritage within disaster risk management framework.

3.3   National heritage authorities, assisted by international organizations, should raise awareness in finance and planning ministries in regard to the positive role that heritage can play within the disaster risk management framework (e.g. improved GDP, improved livelihoods, reduced need for financial assistance following a disaster event).

3.4   Heritage and disaster risk management organizations should develop pilot projects to test new methodologies that promote participatory approaches that include cultural heritage within the disaster risk management framework.

3.5   Cultural institutions, including museums and archives, heritage places and other repositories of heritage should promote awareness of hazards and disaster risks that can affect people, cultural landscapes or buildings and facilities to reposit, display or show heritage objects in the areas they serve.

3.6   Educational institutions, and in particular universities and research institutions, should provide capacity building programmes for disaster risk management at the national and local levels.

<u>At the Global and/or Regional Levels</u>

3.7   ICCROM, UNESCO, and likeminded heritage and disaster risk management organizations at the international, regional, and national levels should develop and implement an integrated, international, multi-partner capacity building programmes for cultural heritage and disaster risk management that uses appropriate technologies for learning and exchange.

3.8   International and regional organizations should identify funding sources to assist the mobility of relevant specialists in the cultural heritage and disaster risk management fields in case of emergency, and to provide seed money for innovative projects that illustrate integrated processes of management.

3.9   International heritage organizations should create stronger links to the UNISDR "Making Cities Resilient: My City Is Getting Ready!" campaign, and create opportunities for twinning of cities with a special interest in the link between heritage and disaster risk management.

3.10   International heritage organizations should create resource materials, short courses and other outreach activities for non-heritage stakeholders to ensure more integrated approaches.

Priority 4:   Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response, and to "Build Back Better" in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

At the National and/or Local Levels

4.1   National and local governments and NGOs should empower communities, particularly women and indigenous peoples, by developing methodologies for them to play a significant role in PDNA and recovery.

4.2   School systems should improve programmes in schools to help children become part of the overall disaster risk management process.

4.3   National and local heritage and disaster risk management organizations should establish and strengthen integrated networks which include representatives of local communities, cultural heritage professionals, disaster risk management professionals, first responders, the military and civil defense.

4.4   National and local heritage and disaster risk management organizations should better coordinate with religious and traditional community leaders.

4.5   National and local governments should ensure that cultural heritage expertise is included in post-disaster rescue teams.

4.6   National and local cultural institutions should see it as part of their mandate to promote an awareness of cultural heritage and disaster risk management. In this way, they can become repositories to conserve memories of previous disasters.

4.7   National and local heritage disaster risk management organizations should establish inventories and information systems for cultural heritage properties and cultural institutions, by using a standards-based system (e.g. open source such as ARCHES), and link them to larger disaster risk management information systems.

4.8   National and local heritage and development organizations should recognize and promote the importance of cultural heritage and cultural tourism as catalysts for post-disaster economic recovery.

4.9   National and local heritage organizations should investigate what preparation can be undertaken so that preventive archaeology plays a role in post-disaster recovery and reconstruction.

At the Global and/or Regional Levels

4.10   International and regional heritage organizations should promote, in the first place, better communication and integration amongst the various heritage sectors (e.g. movable and immovable, tangible and intangible).

4.11   International heritage organizations, working with disaster risk management organizations, should establish an international standard to quickly estimate damage and cost of recovery and rehabilitation of heritage.

4.12   International heritage organizations should establish guidelines for national governments to collect data related to damage/loss for the PDNA process.

4.13 International heritage organizations should work proactively in collaboration with national governments in danger of conflict or disaster to influence policy and doctrine towards better integration of cultural heritage concerns within the disaster risk management framework.

List of Participants

(1) Experts outside Japan (in Alphabetical order)

No.	Name	Affiliation	Nationality
■ 1	ABHAKORN, M.R.Rujaya	SEAMEO SPAFA, Thailand	Thailand
■ 2	BARNS, Jeremy	National Museum of the Philippines, Philippines	Philippines
■ 3	BOCCARDI, Giovanni	UNESCO	Italy
■ 4	BRANTING, Scott	American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR), USA	USA
■ 5	CANNON, Terry	Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK	UK
■ 6	CHIEN, Shen-Wen	Central Police University, Taiwan	Taiwan
■ 7	CUMMINS, Alissandra	Barbados Museum & Historical Society, Barbados	Barbados
■ 8	CURTIS, Timothy	UNESCO Bangkok	Australia
■ 9	DE-CARO, Stefano	ICCROM	Italy
■ 10	DESMARAIS, France	ICOM	Canada
■ 11	DORJI, Nagtsho	Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs, Bhutan	Bhutan
■ 12	DOUGLAS, Diane	Climate Change International, USA	USA
■ 13	DU, Xiaofan	Fudan University, China	China
■ 14	HEADHAMMAR, Erika	Swedish National Heritage Board, Sweden	Sweden
■ 15	HOLLAND, Paula	Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Australia	Australia
■ 16	JIGYASU, Rohit	Ritsumeikan University, Japan	India
■ 17	KING, Joseph	ICCROM	USA
■ 18	LANGENBACH, Randolph	Conservationtech Consulting, USA	USA
■ 19	LARI, Yasmeen	Heritage Foundation of Pakistan, Pakistan	Pakistan
■ 20	LEE, Chung-Sheng	National Science and Technology Center for Disaster Reduction	Taiwan
■ 21	MARRION, Christopher	Marrion Fire & Risk Consulting, USA	USA
■ 22	NDORO, Webber	African World Heritage Fund, Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe
■ 23	NG, Henry Tzu	World Monuments Fund, USA	USA
■ 24	RIDDETT, Robyn	ICOMOS ICORP	Australia
■ 25	ROMAO, Xavier	University of Porto, Portugal	Portugal
■ 26	ROSEN, Fredrik	The Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Denmark	Denmark
■ 27	STONE, Peter	Newcastle University, UK	UK
■ 28	TAKAHASHI, Akatsuki	UNESCO APIA	Japan
■ 29	TANDON, Aparna	ICCROM	India
■ 30	TURNER, Michael	BEZALEL Academy of Arts and Design Jerusalem, Israel	Israel
■ 31	UMEZU, Akiko	ICCROM	Japan
■ 32	VARGAS-NEUMANN, Julio	Catholic University of Peru, Peru	Peru
■ 33	WEGENER, Corine	Smithsonian Institution, USA	USA
■ 34	WEICHART, Gabriele	University of Vienna, Austria	Austria

(2) Experts within Japan (in Alphabetical order)

	No.	Name	Affiliation
■	1	AOYAGI, Masanori	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan
■	2	GOTO, Osamu	Kogakuin University, Japan
■	3	HASEMI, Yuji	Waseda University, Japan
■	4	KIKUCHI, Kensaku	Agency for Cultural Affair, Japan
■	5	KOBAYASHI, Naoko	National Diet Library, Japan
■	6	KODANI, Ryusuke	Tohoku History Museum, Japan
■	7	KOSHIHARA, Mikio	The University of Tokyo, Japan
■	8	KOUZUMA, Yosei	Nara National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, Japan
■	9	KURIHARA, Yuji	National Institutes for Cultural Heritage, Japan
■	10	MASUDA, Kanefusa	National Institutes for Cultural Heritage, Japan
■	11	MUROSAKI, Yoshiteru	Kansei University, Japan
■	12	NISHIKAWA Eisuke	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan
■	13	OKUBO, Takeyuki	Ritsumeikan University, Japan
■	14	SAITO, Takamasa	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan
■	15	SASAKI, Johei	National Institutes for Cultural Heritage, Japan
■	16	SEKIZAWA, Ai	Tokyo University of Science, Japan
■	17	SHIMOTSUMA, Kumiko	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan
■	18	TANAKA, Akira	City of Takayama, Japan
■	19	TATEISHI, Toru	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan
■	20	TOKI, Kenzo	Ritsumeikan University, Japan
■	21	UDAGAWA Shigemasa	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan

(3) Secretariat

	No.	Name	Affiliation	Nationality
■	1	IKENO, Hiroyuki	National Institutes for Cultural Heritage, Japan	Japan
■	2	HAYASHI, Yohei	National Institutes for Cultural Heritage, Japan	Japan
■	3	OCHIAI, Hiromichi	National Institutes for Cultural Heritage, Japan	Japan
■	4	MELISSA, Rinne	Kyoto National Museum, Japan	USA
■	5	SAKAMOTO, Junichi	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan	Japan
■	6	FUJIMOTO, Shinya	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan	Japan
■	7	SHIMOYAMA, Yasuhiro	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan	Japan
■	8	TSUTSUMI, Kyoko	Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan	Japan
■	9	YAMAUCHI, Namiko	Tsukuba University	Japan
■	10	Intergroup CO.		