Developing our Toolkit

Purpose
The NSC-ICH proposes to develop a Toolkit to assist heritage practitioners address Intangible Cultural Heritage in relation to place. Ideas for the Toolkit include:

- definitions of Intangible Cultural Heritage
- Burra Charter Practice Note
- case studies
- resources and links.

A working group was appointed at the 2014 inaugural NSC meeting and work is underway towards a Practice Note. Australia ICOMOS Practice Notes are structured around current practice issues and can be revised and updated as new issues emerge. This is the model our NSC-ICH will use.

The Workshop was designed to explore challenges and possible responses to a series of issues in relation to ICH and place – drawing on the experience and perspectives of those attending – and offering these ideas to the Working Group.

Topics

Five topics were proposed and the workshop broke into small groups to tackle each topic. The groups were provided with prompts, and were asked to brainstorm challenges, define guiding principles, develop a response to one or more of the challenges. Each group was provided with a series of prompts to assist each group get into their topic.

1. Definition: How should we define ICH for Australian practice in relation to place?  
2. Identification and documenting  
3. Assessing significance  
4. Protecting ICH  
5. Managing for and sustaining ICH  

Attachment 1: Detailed notes on Issue 3 - Assessing significance
Issue 1: Defining ICH in relation to place

Background

What is included in ICH? Each Burra Charter criterion - aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and spiritual value – may have tangible and intangible aspects. (See Australia ICOMOS, 2013 Understanding and assessing cultural heritage practice note.) What is not included? ICH that is not related to place.

Three questions were posed to this group:

- How is the term “intangible” being used now?
- Another term that is being used is “intangible (cultural) heritage values”? What does the group think of this term?
- Are there other terms that we need to define to help people understand the concept of intangible cultural heritage in relation to place?

Examples of definitions

The term intangible has come into use in heritage management over recent decades, particularly since UNESCO developed and adopted its Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). The UNESCO definition is related to communities (see below), whereas Australia ICOMOS’ concern is with the intangible cultural heritage of places.

UNESCO definition: ‘The “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.’

A definition for use by the NSC was drafted by Sue Rosen and Paul Rappaport last year. It concluded:

Intangible cultural heritage relates people to place; it encompasses:

- Aspects of use, including activities, traditional and customary practices – such as ceremonies, fishing, hunting;
- Connections between people and place, including social or spiritual values and cultural obligations/responsibilities and right of access [custodianship?] to place
- What the place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses to people, such as symbolic qualities, stories and memories.

Another description was used in a recent report: ‘The terms tangible and intangible heritage attributes are now in common usage. Tangible refers to the physical elements of the place, and intangible to the human activities associated with the place (uses, traditions, rituals, performance etc). Both tangible and intangible attributes of a place may have particular associations and meanings for an individual, a community or cultural group.’
Report back: Defining ICH in relation to place

**Considerations in defining ICH**

- ICH is an ATTRIBUTE rather than a value.
- It may be found as a part of all values but is probably more apparent as an attribute of historic, social and aesthetic values.
- ICH has connections with memory and the past – a ‘sense of history’ (patina?) and the ability to ‘read’ a place.
- There are different aspects/dimensions of ICH which is a layered experience (writings / art / dance / atmosphere ... the ‘feel’ of a place). The way any one of these can relate to another perhaps.
- ICH is a shared experience with common understandings amongst a defined group.

**The definition**
ICH relates to people and place in terms of:

- aspects of use including activities, traditional and customary practices, knowledge and skills;
- connections between people and places including social or spiritual aspects and cultural obligations/responsibilities, shared understandings and memory; and
- what a place signifies, indicates, symbolises, evokes or expresses.

This could be expanded in a Practice Note in terms of authenticity and integrity and reference made to the Burra Charter and the UNESCO definition.

*Anne Claoue-Long reported back for the group. Participants included Sandy, Lex, Raelene, Ann and others.*

**Questions/discussion from the floor**

Sandy – We need consistent / agreed terms for attributes: e.g. attributes, aspects, characteristics, elements, layers, expressions.

Sandy - What about authenticity and integrity? The group did not tackle this.

Anne Warr – Our group thought that intangible was loose and undefinable – recognise/define the edges but don’t try and define it now.

Liz Vines – Shared heritage is an issue – we have over-privileged non-Aboriginal heritage and values.

Several people responded that shared means between a cultural group or within a community, noting that there may be different groups each holding specific values and having important ICH attributes in relation to place.
Issue 2 – Identification and documenting

Prompts

- What are the attributes of ICH, and how might we be able to quickly recognise the likelihood that ICH exists in a place?
- Is there a preferred approach to the identification of ICH – ie is it better to work from place to ICH or from community consultation to identify practices, events, etc, and hence, the place/s?
- Which values might have an ICH attribute? All of the Burra Charter values – aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and spiritual values - or just some? Can you think of examples?
- What techniques can be used? - existing studies and reports, media, and specific community meetings, surveys, interviews with traditional owners/elders and related groups, oral histories, information gathered from associated people away from the place.
- How do you determine place boundaries for intangible heritage attributes?
- Documenting ICH? – how do you describe and record it and its relationship to the place – (archival) evidentiary documentation requirements (eg audio, video) etc?

Report back:
Inherent to the process of identifying intangible heritage is the proving of the case, making the argument.

This is heavily reliant on community input as well as documentary research of all kinds, including specific knowledge and perspectives, art, literature, music, and the usual archival sources and oral history.

Although one may not always start with place, it is usually the case that you do and its often a specific place. Intangible heritage can be based on a feeling/sense of place. It can be a response to the physical, the tangible and is related to meanings – and meanings are intangible.

As professionals investigating a place we should start with basic historical research including a site visit and then build the research program from there. We need to draw on the People and Documents (referred to earlier) and the Place. The interactions of all three are important in the development of understandings. It should be kept in mind that intangible heritage can be dynamic, and of varying scope and scale.

The findings can be skewed by the purpose of the study, so perhaps there can never be a “fixed in concrete” finding.

Sue Rosen reported back for the group. Participants included Georgia, Abi, Yuhan, Leanne, Richard, Chris, Neale, Elizabeth, Kellie

Questions/discussion from the floor
Georgia – The group focused on professional practice processes – what is the AI role in Practice Note development – to guide practice for us? What about for communities?

Liz Vines – Is ICH a gap that needs specific studies?
Sue – Or is it that when we are assessing places in the current types of studies, we need to keep an eye out of ICH attributes.

Robyn – Where does ICH “come from”? Who owns if? Who creates it? What is ICH needs to come from “them” (the owners/custodian/knowledge holders) not from “us”.

Raelene – “sense of place” has been used extensively in the community arts sector – look at links with the arts sector and resources too.

Richard – links to the arts and artists who are dong cultural mapping as part of their practice. Make links with them.

Robyn – also make links with urban design.

Neale – ICH is an integral part of Aboriginal cultural heritage and knowledge holders must be consulted – this is required under Commonwealth legislation. He noted a WA Supreme Court decision, and that legislation across Australia is uneven on this and that often work done by consultants is constrained by a “limited framework of enquiry”.

Lex – Referring to 1970s and community arts practice – perhaps community-owned investigations can help overcome heritage as an “imposition”.
**Issue 3 – Assessing significance**

**Prompts**

- **Which criteria might have an ICH attribute? All or just some?** Use the NHL/HERCON criteria? Can you think of examples? Is it adequate to identify social and spiritual values only?
- **What are the measures/tests/indicators of significance?**
- **Are there different thresholds for ICH?**
- **Is it possible (and desirable) to undertake a comparative significance assessment for ICH attributes?**
- **What about factors such as:** Longevity of tradition or practice, degree of robustness, degree of skill, changing traditions, proven great strength of attachment by related/associated people to the particular aspect of ICH, including consistent resistance to pressures/threats.
- **Is rarity/threat of ICH an appropriate consideration in assessing significance?**
- **Do intangible attributes need to be separately mentioned or defined (in a report or statement of significance)?**

**HERCON criteria (Heritage Council Victoria version)**

- Criterion A: Importance to the course, or pattern, of our cultural or natural history.
- Criterion B: Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of our cultural or natural history.
- Criterion C: Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of our cultural or natural history.
- Criterion D: Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural or natural places or environments.
- Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.
- Criterion F: Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.
- Criterion G: Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions.
- Criterion H: Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our history.

**Report back:**

The group discussion on assessing the significance of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) developed a number of principles. These include:

- Each of the five Burra Charter values and all HERCON criteria (i.e., A-H) may be used to assess ICH attributes.
- Almost all ICH can be linked to one or more places, but equally may be expressed through large landscapes or cultural routes. It may be complex, perhaps unnecessary, to establish fixed boundaries.
• Equally, ICH is often most powerfully held at local and personal levels in its form, depth of association, and expression. While most Australian heritage systems give focus to cultural groups or communities, Australia ICOMOS has a concern for both personal and collective forms of ICH.

• ICH will have a distinctive Australian expression when ethnically diverse migrant individuals and groups locally adapt ‘homeland’ traditions and practices.

• In identifying and documenting ICH, there may be no requirement to assess if it is not intended that it should be the subject of a legislative or regulatory protection and management regime.

Notes on discussion prepared by Steve Brown. Participants: Kirsty Altenburg, Tanya Park, Neale Draper, Steve Brown, Kellie Clayton, Georgia Melville.

There are also detailed notes from this group: see Attachment 1.

Questions/discussion from the floor
There were no comments or questions.
Issue 4 – Protecting ICH

Prompts

- Is legislation and listing a good way to protect ICH attributes of places? Why or why not?
- Is legislation and listing currently used &/or available to protect ICH attributes of recognised heritage places? What are the strengths and weakness of current legislation? Which legislation offers the best model?
- Are there typical requirements associated with protecting ICH in relation to place? E.g. ongoing consultation with interested parties, protection of and possibly maintenance of access by related groups to any relevant fabric in which the ICH may be inherent, attached to or which is integral to the ICH continuing, monitoring of condition/status of ICH, etc.
- Different associations with a place may result in shared, different or conflicting ICH. What approaches can be used to recognise and protect diverse expressions of ICH?

Report back:
Key questions considered:

The applicability of the use of legislation
Is the listing a way of protection? Yes – due to the fact that it is a respected and understood method used in Australia since the 1970s. Legislation – is about maintaining the respected and recognised method of protection in our western society.

Role of traditional owners and community need to be considered in any legislation to take into consideration of cultural sensitivity.

Issues with the use of the current legislation
Aboriginal legislation covers intangible heritable but doesn’t actually deal with the triggers for the recognition - and usually is the result of containing the place to reduce the area of consideration for the intangible heritage – needs another paragraph or similar in an expanded version of the legislation

e.g convict sites and boundaries – can’t cope with this without boundaries - - needs to allow for intangible values within an area that can be protected.

Causing harm – legislation to stop harm is not about sustaining a place necessarily.

People don’t want things to be listed - - the way of thinking needs to change so that intangible heritage is considered just as important as fabric – change definition will mean it is more valued.

Legislation is important – but it needs to be tailored.

Need an accurate definition in the legislation.

Typical requirements
Legislation needs to allow for sustaining and managing not just preventing harm to a place but supporting the practices in the legislation and by the appropriate people who practice the heritage activities but not forced ownership of the practice.
Allow for change - encouragement of community - community need to feel empowered to describe it before it comes under threat; and to allow the owners of the intangible heritage to allow not force them to sustain it – they need to decide what they want done with it.

So the difference is that managing IH needs to be a fluid process – it may just result in guidelines on how this can occur.

Legislation needs to allow owners to be part of a use by another group – e.g. eels fishing by indigenous people and the fruit (can’t remember the exact species) that is being farmed by indigenous people in Queensland.

**Shared, different or conflicting ICH**  
Need to allow for different groups to own the same place with a different intangible heritage - e.g. different religions in a church - different times of use say – based on arbitration and legal process via consultation – requires listing with an appropriate threshold.

Definition of the place – needs to define intangible heritage area e.g. a buffer zone or similar idea for protection that is not so onerous to manage.

*Notes by Robyn Clinch 6 June 2015. Participants Robyn Clinch and Simon Crocker.*

**Questions/discussion from the floor**  
There were no comments or questions.
Issue 5 – Managing for and sustaining ICH

Prompts

• What does it mean to “sustain” ICH?
• ICH may change with time – how is change managed in relation to ICH? Typical changes could include: – e.g. generational change, introduction of new uses, visitation/tourism, inappropriate external control, lack of continuing community ownership/engagement, attempting to freeze a cultural practice in a certain form, unrecognised and unrespected intellectual property rights, etc. Are these significant concerns in sustaining ICH and how might they be addressed?
• What impact might the removal of fabric – i.e. the tangible elements of a place – have on the intangible aspects of place? What are the connections between the tangible and the intangible? Sometimes the removal of fabric – even a whole place – is justified because the fabric is not considered to provide tangible evidence of significance, and that the values and intangible attributes can be retained via interpretation. What do you think?
• What are the requirements in relation to cultural sensitivities? For example, consultation and involvement of relevant groups, respect for traditional law/lore, secret knowledge, confidentiality, access issues, continuity of practice and ceremony, conflicts between different associated groups, privacy of owners.

Report back:
Discussion began with need to respect and listen to the disadvantaged in the community – the aboriginal community, mentally ill, children. Susan has been working on the Ballarat Orphanage and the stories of the stolen generation. Peter has been working on the aboriginal massacre sites in SW Victoria.

The need to focus on intangible heritage related to PLACE was queried – can it be separated into fabric based intangible? e.g. Country towns encompassing intangible heritage in the way they are governed by economic booms and busts, with people who can, moving out in bad times, and the people who can’t, remaining. Is this an example of intangible heritage related to place?

Soldier settler communities.

Peter was interested in how ICOMOS and intangible heritage can lead to places becoming transformative. How can it improve people’s lives?

Juliet talked about how Art programs have transformed marginal community groups.

Anne talked about Thirdspace – studied in her thesis. This is a theory proposed by geographer/philosopher Edward Soja. Firstspace is described as the way places can be mapped, defined and written about as historical time-lines – boundaried space. Secondspace includes the contestible spaces such as private/public; civic/everyday; yours/mine etc. Thirdspace is the space that people create themselves, that is completely different to the boundaried Firstspace and Secondspace. The way Aboriginal communities look at space is often Thirdspace – not including European concepts of boundaried space.
Can intangible heritage be defined? Perhaps it is better left undefined? As soon as boundaries are placed around it, it becomes limited. At this stage, intangible heritage may need to be left vague, allowing for wider definitions to emerge.

Peter noted that a purpose of this work is assisting people to move into a space or strengthen their space and that sustainability was having all people participating. Susan added that involving people in interpretation was important in the Ballarat project. Peter further noted that significance related to the degree to which a place can change but retain core values. Establishing a sense of identity for people was important but identity was internal. We need to provide a receptive environment, a culturally safe zone but not compromise the story.

Notes by Anne Warr. People in the discussion: Peter Lake (Director Health Services in South Western Victoria), Susan Fayad (Co-ordinator Heritage Strategy City of Ballarat), Juliette Ramsay, Liz Vines (part time), Richard Morrison (part time), Anne Warr.

Questions/discussion from the floor
Steve – Connecting human rights to heritage is relevant to the Millers Point example – and is an important theme in heritage today.

Sandy – Value of collaborating with other disciplines and exploring other approaches.

Anne Warr – great way to move forward in heritage in different ways – more nuanced, more crafted – new ways of thinking.
Attachment 1: Detailed notes on Issue 3 - Assessing significance

**TOPIC 1 - HERCON criteria.**
- Kirsty. Generally uses all the criteria when assessing ICH. Most frequently Criteria A (history), E (aesthetic), and G (social); perhaps H (association); and least frequently B (rarity) and C (research potential).
- Criterion D is difficult because ‘classes’ required the establishment of a typology, which may not be a good way to go with ICH.
- Aboriginal heritage in the 1970s-1990s often emphasised archaeological heritage and was assessed against criteria developed in the 1980s – by Sandra Bowdler and Sharon Sullivan (research potential and representativeness).
- **Case example 1.** Assessment of Adelaide City and Parklands in which the Indigenous cultural values, largely ICH, ‘fell out’ because they were deemed not to have reached a (unspecified) threshold.

**Principle 1.** All HERCON criteria (i.e., A-H) may be used to assess ICH attributes.

**TOPIC 2 - Social-scale of ICH.**
- Criterion G preferences community and cultural group (i.e., official heritage) over personal or family heritage (unofficial heritage). Privileges a ‘higher’ level of social grouping.
- Criterion H – ‘works of a person’. Usually associated with nationally recognised person in, for example, politics or art. Seldom is it applied to works of a locally important person?
- The Japanese ‘National Living Treasure’ approach, in which the national government recognises and designates the ‘traditional’ knowledge and skills of single individuals or small groups. E.g., wood crafting, dance. In this process, a community of practitioners (and consumers?) recognises the ‘expert’ skills and knowledge held by ‘living experts’ or exponents. The government’s role is to give official recognition to that/those person(s) and provide resourcing to support learning and sharing of skills and knowledge. It is the expert group itself that often has to find the person/group that the skills be passed on to.

**Principle 2.** ICH is often most powerfully held at local and personal levels in its form, depth of association, and expression.

**TOPIC 3 - ICH and ‘place’.**
- Does ISC have to be linked to place? When is ICH not linked to place?
- In Burra Charter terms, the focus is place. Is place an anchor to all ICH traditions and practices.
- **Case example 2.** A long-time member of the CWA has an award-willing recipe for a sponge cake. She has won many prizes at local agricultural shows, has baked the cake for many CWA meetings and fund-raising afternoon teas, and is recognised amongst her local community for her knowledge (the recipe) and skill in making the cake. What are the place associations: (1) the kitchen and wood-fired oven in which the cake is produced; (2) the various exhibition halls at rural agricultural showgrounds at which the cake has won prizes; and (3) the local halls and homes in which CWA meetings have taken place.
- In this example, the ICH is associated with a series or network of places (‘sphere of reference’) that together express practice and knowledge.
- So while heritage practitioners may use place as a starting point to identify and then assess ICH, the reverse approach is also appropriate – i.e., start with ICH and identify associated places.

**Principle 3.** Identifying ICH can be undertaken by documenting the tradition or practice and then identifying the network of associated or linked places.
- ICH might also be explored through the application of an historic themes framework.
**TOPIC 4 - Ethnically diverse heritage and ICH.**

- Australia is an ethnically diverse nation. It comprises ethnic groups and nationalities from most parts of the globe.
- What ICH do migrants bring to Australia and how are these traditions and practices adapted, or how do they evolve, in Australia to have a distinctive local expression?
- **Case example 3.** The corrugated iron mosque in the cemetery at Broken Hill. It is listed on the local heritage register. This mosque reflects an adaptation to local conditions in its placement (in a cemetery), function, and fabric (corrugated iron).
- **Case example 4.** William Yang, the Australian photographer, has a passion for photographing food at rural pubs. He has a special interest in local expressions of classical dishes – e.g., sweet and sour pork. How is this dish changed from a Cantonese ‘original’ (acknowledging diversity in the original) to suit Australian tastes? Yang uses the term ‘Chinglish’ for forms of adaptation from the Chinese original to local re-interpretation.

**Principle 4.** ICH will have a distinctive Australian expression when ethnically diverse migrant individuals and groups locally adapt ‘homeland’ traditions and practices.

**TOPIC 5 - Place and landscape.**

- There is a tendency in Australian heritage practice to use place in a broad sense. This can include place as encompassing large landscapes. Is this useful?
- **Case example 5.** Indigenous mythological and/or Dreaming tracks. Such places can be identified and assessed as either a series of connected sites or places (i.e., each place is registered/listed separately and the interconnections noted) or as a landscape or route (i.e., one large landscape or route is identified and listed). An example is the Seven Sisters storyline and pathway.
- Principle 3 (above), identifying ICH and then the associated interconnected places is relevant here.
- Water courses are a complex form of landscape unit. Is a river (Swan River, River Torrens) or creek a place?
- Some discussion of spatial scale – from large landscapes and cultural routes, to confined places. Can an individual object (tractor, crane) be a place?
- Some discussion of the ICH associated with wood stoves – the kind of wood used, the skills required to maintain desired temperatures, etc.

**Principle 5.** Almost all ICH can be linked to one or more places, but equally may be expressed through large landscapes or cultural routes. It may be complex, perhaps unnecessary, to establish fixed boundaries.

**TOPIC 6 - Should an assessment be replicable?**

- If an assessment of ICH is undertaken by a heritage practitioner (or anyone), must that assessment be replicable? Does it need to be?
- Where does adaptation sit in processes of assessment?
- **Case example 6.** Tasmanian and central Australian Aboriginal women’s fibre working skills. (Also Alice Springs beanie makers, Tasmanian Aboriginal women’s kelp working; lower Murray River feather flowers, etc.). In Tasmania in the period 2006-2009, 35 Tasmanian Aboriginal women participated in a project to re-invigorate basket-making knowledge, techniques, and practices. In the process of re-learning these skills, they also experimented with new forms and methods, sometimes using non-traditional fibres in their work. Something similar can be seen in the large fibre sculptures produced in central Australia – e.g., a life-size Toyota Landcruiser, an airplane, etc. What do these examples say about the transmission of ICH knowledge, skills, and practice? What do re-learning practices do? What is ICH when an original ICH practice is adapted to new methods, materials, and end-products?
What is important is not just continuity or ‘unbroken tradition’ (in Native Title terms) but the dynamic between continuity and adaptation.

**Case example 7.** Lake Condah basket weaving practice (Chris Johnston). The basket making tradition as it exists today came through one community member who remembered seeing the practice as a child, though was not allowed to learn the skill as a young person. She taught herself in later life. When she showed her mother her attempts, the mother said the weave or stitches were too loose – the mother had never learned to weave, but had seen it done also as a child and could remember the ‘look’. An example of ‘residual’ community knowledge of a practice and how it is elicited. This was a ‘narrow funnel’ through which the practice came through.

**Case example 8.** Jane Harrington speaks of Murray Island, Queensland, where complex of new homes was constructed and local people moved into them. One traditional house survived. A current heritage practice is to protect and conserve that structure. Why are we not conserving the practice that would allow another such structure to be built? It is the notion of practice which is the issue: i.e., not just how to maintain and conserve special objects, buildings, and places, but understanding how trade skills are heritage and a significant component of heritage. Furthermore, Murray Island Elders want their children to be educated and aspire to an economically sustainable future. Is spending time learning to build a traditional house important to local people in this context? How do heritage practitioners insert themselves into such a situation?

- Recording of the traditional house is one way to maintain a certain level of knowledge. This structure could be then re-drawn on it in the future.
- Can and should ICH be ‘assessed’ as heritage when it is typically fluid, dynamic and creative?

**Principle 6.** ICH is dynamic and may be characterised by continuity as well as re-learning or renewal in new contexts with rapid change in methods, materials and creative/imaginative practice.

**TOPIC 7 - ICH and Burra Charter values**

- Is ICH associated with all of the five Burra Charter values? Or is it primarily a ‘social or spiritual’ value?
- Scientific values/technical achievement will have ICH associations, for example.
- Should we think about the five values as ‘equal’? Or, as for example Byrne, Ireland and Brayshaw (2001) argue, that four of the values are a sub-set of social value?

**Principle 7.** Each of the five Burra Charter values may be used to assess ICH attributes.

**Principle 8.** Australia ICOMOS has a concern for personal heritage as well as the heritage of a cultural group or community when recognising ICH.

- Does dealing with personal ICH and cultural group ICH require different tool kits?
- This might be considered in the Practice Note?

**TOPIC 8 - ICH and threshold.**

- Is there a threshold boundary between ICH associated with the individual/primary family group and a cultural group/community/nation?
- Is ‘strength of association’ a measure of threshold? Can and should strength be measured by the number or people or size of cultural group?
- This discussion is linked to Topic 2 (see above).
- Is the notion of threshold useful in assessing ICH?
- Is comparative assessment a useful way in which to assess ICH? Or does this perpetuate ideas of the best, typical (representative), or rare?
- Should we be giving focus to the ‘I’ in ICH more than the ‘H’?
- What does meeting a threshold mean? Does it imply the relevant ICH knowledge, skill, or practice should be ‘conserved’ and transmission ensured? This is the idea behind Japan’s Living National Treasures’ program.
Some skills (e.g., dance forms) in Japan require learning from a very young age because the movements required can only be learnt by starting in childhood.

**Case Study 9.** Aboriginal scarred trees – place and practice. Victorian Aboriginal heritage legislation is designed to protect surviving examples of ‘traditional’ scarred trees. We don’t know the person(s) who made each of these scars. Should modern examples of scarred trees be identified, assessed and, if deemed significant, managed and protected? What about the skills, knowledge, and continuing practice required to produce scars? Should the skills associated with using stone wedges and hammerstones be documented and protected? What about the creation of scars using modern tools – such as an axe or chainsaw? Should contemporary manifestations of tree scarring (e.g., the trees themselves and the practitioners) be protected?

- Can and should the knowledge, skill, and practice be listed? What is the threshold?

**Principle 9.** In identifying and documenting ICH, there may be no requirement to assess if it is not intended that it should be the subject of a legislative or regulatory protection and management regime.

**TOPIC 9 - Why separate ICH and tangible heritage/places?**

- How does the Burra Charter process accommodate place and practice? Does it?
- At a different level, we have a World Heritage Convention and a Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage: why a need for separation?