

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

‘The Asia-Pacific Regional Workshop on Intangible Cultural Heritage and Natural Disasters’ was convened from 7–9 December 2018 in Sendai, Miyagi Prefecture, Japan. Workshop sessions were held on DAY 1 and DAY 3 at the Sendai International Centre, while DAY 2 had an excursion scheduled to visit the coastal town of Onagawa (Miyagi Prefecture) (see Annex 2 for the detailed programme of the workshop). The workshop was organised by IRCI in cooperation with Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties (as co-organiser) and the Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University (as cooperating body).

Participants were invited by IRCI from various countries in the Asia-Pacific region including Australia, Bangladesh, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nepal, the Philippines, Vanuatu, and Vietnam. The workshop also welcomed the representative of UNESCO and the UNESCO Category 2 Centres in the Asia-Pacific region, namely CRIHAP (China) and ICHCAP (the Republic of Korea). Another UNESCO Category 2 Centre in Latin America (CRESPIAL) also contributed to the workshop. The workshop was not open to the public; however, a certain number of observers were accepted through pre-registration. Accordingly, a total of 45 researchers and specialists in the fields of culture, heritage, and DRM attended the workshop (Figure 1) (see Annex 3 for the list of participants). The discussions over the three days concluded with the adoption of ‘Statements and Recommendations for Safeguarding ICH in Disasters and Mobilising ICH for Disaster Risk Reduction’ (Annex 1).

A summary of the three days of the workshop is presented below. Details of presentations and reports by participants are included in this volume¹.

DAY 1

7 December 2018
Meeting Room 8, 3rd floor, Conference Bldg., Sendai International Center

Opening remarks

The workshop started with opening remarks by Wataru Iwamoto, Director-General of IRCI, who welcomed the participants and expressed his expectations that the workshop would become a valuable opportunity to exchange various case studies and ideas among researchers, contributing to the enhancement of further research for safeguarding ICH in the context of natural hazards and disasters. He also noted the significance of holding the workshop in Sendai, which was devastated by the Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami in 2011, and where the ongoing international

1 All papers were submitted by participants based on presentations made at the workshop. The title of the paper may be different from the presentation title on the workshop programme (Annex 2). The editors of this volume engaged in minimum editing of these papers, and each author is responsible for the contents of his/her paper.

framework for DRR, ‘Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030’ has been adopted.

Then, Emiko Yamanashi, Acting Director-General of Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, which co-organised the workshop, took her turn to deliver her opening remarks. Referring to the Institute’s commitment to the heritage rescue and heritage doctor programmes that commenced about a month after the 2011 earthquake and tsunami disaster, which were largely focused on tangible cultural heritage, she noted that there were also many intangible elements such as rituals and festivals that were affected by the disaster and that the revitalisation of such intangibles actually encouraged the recovery of the affected people and communities. She stated that she hoped that the workshop would enhance our understanding of the importance of ICH in DRR.

Finally, on behalf of UNESCO, Himalchuli Gurung (Programme Specialist for Culture, UNESCO Office in Beijing) explained UNESCO’s perspectives on the theme of ICH in emergency situations with reference to the sustainable development goals (SDGs) and the Sendai Framework. Using the term ‘living heritage’ to enable a better understanding of the nature of ICH, she explained the importance of ICH in crisis management: while ICH is subjected to protection by the DRR framework, the richness and diversity of living heritage provide community-based, culturally sensitive, and sustainable resources for preventive, preparedness, and response measures. Being in the process of conceptualising and transforming the knowledge and experiences acquired into methodological guidance for the state parties, she expressed that UNESCO welcomes efforts of the international communities such as this workshop to explore and understand creative ways of maintaining ICH through dialogues, and that the outcome of the workshop would provide valuable insights.



Figure 1 Workshop participants.

Introduction to the workshop

Before the workshop sessions began, Yoko Nojima (IRCI) briefly explained the project background and objectives (as summarised in the introductory paper in this volume), and programmes scheduled over the three days (Annex 2). She also introduced the definitions of key terms that would be frequently used during the workshop: ‘intangible cultural heritage (ICH)’, ‘local (or indigenous) knowledge’, and ‘(natural) disaster’. While referring to the definitions by UNESCO and UNISDR as examples, she stated that these concepts are considered as broadly and flexibly as possible in the workshop to accommodate various viewpoints and opinions.

She noted criticism concerning the term ‘natural disaster’ especially in the field of DRR, stating that a disaster occurs when a natural hazard disrupts people in some ways and that there are always human factors in disasters. She remarked that although the term is still commonly used internationally and was also used in the title of the workshop, it refers to ‘a disaster caused by natural hazards’. Similar statements regarding avoiding the term ‘natural disaster’ were also made in the course of the workshop by other participants such as Fadjar I. Thufail (Research Center for Regional Resources, Indonesian Institute of Sciences) and JC Gaillard (The University of Auckland), and this was also noted by Meredith Wilson (Stepwise Heritage and Tourism Pty Ltd) (this volume).

She also distributed the first draft of the recommendation to the participants to seek their input. This draft was revised by organisers after DAY 2 to reflect findings of the workshop, and was again distributed to the participants on the morning of DAY 3 to be used in the final discussion.

Session 1: Natural hazards/disasters and the transmission of ICH

In the first session facilitated by Hiroki Takakura (Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University), three papers were presented by anthropologists from Myanmar, Vietnam, and the Philippines.

Mya Mya Khin (University of Yangon) introduced three case studies she had conducted in Myanmar: agricultural practices of Anaul Phwa Saw near Bagan; pottery traditions in Twentay (southwest Yangon); and ICH, including religious beliefs in Thidar village in the Ayeyarwady region. While reporting on the impact of climate change on soil productivity and agricultural practices near Bagan, investments in the area led the villages to abandon their agricultural land. Similarly, Khin pointed out the high impact of ‘manmade’ factors on the transmission of ICH, such as the construction of Twantay canal that blocked the potters’ access to clay sources, as well as theft, violence, and corruption by the government.

Introducing current ICH policies in Vietnam, Phan Phuong Anh (Vietnam National University) pointed out limitations of existing ICH management as a top-down, product-oriented approach without sufficient consideration of the drivers of viability, sustainability, or the decline of ICH, as well as the tendency to capture ICH as a fixed object regardless of its changing socio-cultural and environmental contexts, drawing on the case of *Bá Trạo*, a ritual opera that is essentially a part of whale worship. She

also pointed out the limited linkages between ICH and DRM in Vietnam, such as a lack of capacity and interest from the culture sector in DRM, and a lack of recognition among the DRM sector of the role of ICH, and called for the development of new tools and frameworks to support the integration of ICH in DRR policies and practices and vice versa.

Soledad N. Dalisay (University of the Philippines-Diliman) approached the transmission of ICH from a different angle: ‘remembering disasters’. Introducing a series of practices in response to disastrous typhoons in the Philippines such as Yolanda (Haiyan) in 2013 and Reming (Durian) in 2006, she demonstrated the vital role of both material culture and certain domains of ICH as tools for remembering and commemorating. She noted that disaster events sometimes add new narratives to old legends (i.e. the stories of Sam Ryan in Guiuan), or even create new heritage conveying the memory of disaster, such as the crosses in Albay, the astrodome and beached ship in Tacloban, and community-wide commemorative events like the candle-lighting ritual.

Discussion:

Several points were discussed during the session.

Concerning the story introduced by Phan that related that more than 100 villagers survived a landslide that buried the village because one man who identified a crack in the surroundings urged the villagers to evacuate, Wilson questioned whether this story had been formalised in some way for disaster knowledge, or whether it could be considered ICH, as it reflects that person’s understanding of that particular place. Phan responded that this could be considered a new form of ICH – knowledge of a disaster and memory of a disaster – but more research is required to confirm this point. Vu Canh Toan (ISET-International) expressed his view that knowledge and experiences of disasters are very important, as they can contribute to resilience; however, he cautioned that relying on past experience could become problematic in the context of changing climate as well as changing socio-economic conditions and urbanisation, which change the nature of disasters. Dalisay added the point the culture is adaptive and cultural knowledge and practices are also changing as presented in her case study; therefore, it is necessary to document changes in both landscape and culture.

Takakura asked Khin and Phan the role of communities in ICH safeguarding in Myanmar and Vietnam, as their presentations emphasised the role of the government. In the same vein, he asked Dalisay, who discussed the role of communities, the role of the government and international agencies. Khin answered that in Myanmar, where the military government dominates, the abilities of local communities are limited. Phan noted that there are some good practices, but in principle, ICH safeguarding in Vietnam takes place in a top-down manner, and the elements that have been inscribed in UNESCO lists become state assets and properties, often without communities being aware of these consequences. Dalisay said that many programmes are implemented by international organisations, especially in relation to SDGs. Wilson expressed her viewpoint that ICH safeguarding plans are essentially meant to be defined in association with the community; we as researchers

may be able to play a role in getting people to think about disasters and their impacts, but ultimately, the plan needs to protect the integrity and viability of ICH according to the community.

From the DRR point of view, Gaillard questioned how we manage to incorporate culture and ICH, which are so fluid and flexible, into DRR frameworks that are more rigid. This was a question that could be further explored in Session 3. Phan and Dalisay both emphasised the importance of cooperation and multidisciplinary dialogue, saying that all, not just those in natural sciences and technology, should come together to draft DRR plans. Dalisay further asserted that a good plan should have flexibility to incorporate local perspectives and other elements that occur in the process of implementation. Phan added that ICH safeguarding also has problems with many frameworks and policies, but it is a part of management and is thus operational. Referring to the flood managing system in Bangladesh, Amanullah Bin Mahmood (former staff of FAO Office in Dhaka) added that there are some cases in which local traditional knowledge and engineering is very effective and that this should be considered as an option.

Session 2: Challenges and lessons learnt from disaster experiences, and the potentials of local knowledge

In session 2 facilitated by Tomo Ishimura (Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties), participants from Nepal, Vanuatu, Fiji, and Indonesia presented papers, drawing on certain disaster events and experiences in their respective countries, some of them highlighting the recent re-evaluation of traditional, local knowledge.

Yamuna Maharjan (National Museum of Nepal) reported the impact of the Gorkha Earthquake in 2015. While the earthquake destroyed or damaged a wide range of tangible heritage properties such as temples, stupas, monasteries, and historical buildings, she noted that intangible elements such as religious practices and cultural festivals were thriving in the post-disaster context. However, it should be noted that the earthquake brought about drastic changes in tangible and intangible cultures in Barpak, a tiny settlement near the epicentre of the earthquake, such as the loss of traditional architecture and building materials, which also reflects changing lifestyles and cultural consciousnesses.

Richard Shing (Vanuatu Cultural Centre) emphasised the importance of traditional knowledge in the Vanuatu context and introduced the recent efforts of the Vanuatu Cultural Centre to promote ICH knowledge and practices in the country, which focused on traditional architecture, subsistence systems, and food preservation. Lastly, he reported the ongoing volcanic eruption on Ambae, which relocated the island's entire population to the neighbouring islands of Santo and Maewo, noting that the Vanuatu Cultural Centre has just conducted an assessment of their ICH, and that there is a strong will among the evacuated people to return to the island, which includes the expectation that the ash fall will contribute to increasing the fertility of the soil.

Melaia Tikoitoga (iTaukei Institute of Language and Culture, Fiji) presented ways in

which iTaukei (=indigenous people in Fiji) knowledge and practices could assist and contribute to existing DRR in Fiji. Pointing out the limitations of current DRR systems, such as the dissemination of warnings and the distribution of food supplies to remote areas, she highlighted the role of the traditional chiefly system of governance, traditional architecture, and traditional system of early warning, with particular attention to the impact of tropical cyclones. She concluded that these ideas should be re-examined in the context of DRR, and those that are beneficial in the contemporary context should be promoted.

Fadjar I. Thufail focused his presentation on the story of Mbah Maridjan, who was the local leader and a 'caretaker' of Mt Merapi, and whose death in the 2010 eruption provoked a controversy between the scientists and the local people, and gave rise to the discussion on how the early warning system was shaped in Javanese cosmology. He emphasised that the recognition of ICH should take into account the human-nonhuman relationship, such as the ability to talk to the mountain, and that certain spaces should be guaranteed for local people to continue this communication when there is an intervention by scientists or the government.

Discussion:

Questions were raised concerning the specific situations in each presentation.

Concerning Nepal, Gaillard asked whether wildlife is considered a part of heritage and hazards, recognising that DRR is currently trying to incorporate wildlife. Maharjan responded that in Nepal, wildlife is important in rituals as sacrifices to the gods, while at the same time they are considered vehicles of gods. Takakura asked if the country had any legal policy to safeguard traditional practices before ratifying the 2003 Convention for ICH, given that the term 'folklore' had been used. Maharjan commented that there was no national policy, but there were community-level systems to safeguard ICH practices.

For Vanuatu, ongoing volcanic eruption events on Ambae was highlighted. After being requested by Wilson, Shing explained the process of relocation, stating that the government designated the island of Maewo as the major destination given the strong connections between the two islands; however, many locals preferred to go to Santo, the second-biggest urban centre in Vanuatu, as they had relatives or family members there.

Responding to Ishimura's comment that Vanuatu showcases the resilience of local communities, Shing emphasised that all casualties at the time of Cyclone Pam were due to imported, non-traditional materials such as corrugated iron, which is commonly and improperly used for roofing. He also added some information about the earthquake that occurred near Vanuatu just a few days before the workshop, saying that the island of Aneityum was hit by a 4–5 m tsunami but there were no casualties, as everyone had been evacuated, although houses and properties were damaged.

Yu Fukuda (Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University) asked about

programmes for passing down ICH other than school education. Shing responded that traditional methods for learning ICH are through spending time with elders in local communities via conversations, actions, and practices. However, children are becoming dissociated from local culture as they attend schools around provincial centres; thus, the Cultural Centre has been attempting to maintain their interest.

Concerning the traditional indicators for early warning systems in Fiji, Abner O. Lawangen (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office of Tublay, Philippines) asked if there are indicators with specific yearly patterns that have changed or are no longer applicable in the context of changing climate patterns in recent years. Tikoitoga responded that they remain accurate in Fiji at the moment especially in rural areas. She also noted that certain indicators such as particular varieties of bananas or breadfruit are no longer available in urbanised areas.

Finally, Iwamoto questioned about the value of local knowledge, how it could be differentiated from superstition, and if there is any evidence to confirm its value. Thurail, referring to his study on the story of Mbah Maridjan, responded that for scientists, it would be considered a superstition without any evidence, but emphasised that the important part is not the evidence but the actors who take part in this process, and to understand the local context.

Session 3: Enhancing dialogue between ICH and disaster risk management

Session 3, facilitated by Yoko Nojima, consisted of three presentations by researchers in the field of DRM and environmental science in Bangladesh, Vietnam, and the Philippines, to understand their viewpoints on ICH for enhancing positive dialogue and future cooperation.

Amanullah Bin Mahmood reported the recent DRM policy development in Bangladesh. It is noteworthy that new policies and programmes started to address the safeguarding of ICH more directly, including the new National Disaster Management Policy (2015) and the 7th Five Year Plan (2016-2020). However, he pointed out that there are no policies or strategies that are dedicated to safeguarding ICH from disaster risks, and thus more effort in the field of ICH is required, including inventories, educational programmes, and campaigns for raising awareness.

Outlining the current DRR policies and organisational structures in Vietnam, Vu Canh Toan explained challenges in mainstreaming ICH into DRR practices and policies in Vietnam. He pointed out that DRR in Vietnam is still dominated by top-down and technocratic approaches, which limits the involvement of communities and ICH holders in decision-making, and sometimes results in adding risks and disasters instead of reducing risks. Also noting different perceptions of risk – typically, floods are beneficial and are a source of livelihood for the people in the Mekong Delta rather than a hazard – he stressed the need of DRR that is socially and culturally constructed and accepts different forms of knowledge.

Abner O. Lawangen introduced a community project integrating indigenous resiliency culture into the community's DRR through 'participatory three dimensional mapping

(P3DM)', which was implemented in the municipality of Tublay in Benguet, Northern Philippines. He demonstrated that P3DM is an interactive and inclusive tool that encourages the participation of various stakeholders. Interestingly, the mapping included cultural landmarks and places, which enabled the local people to discuss their risks and capacities, including local knowledge and ICH, and to integrate these aspects in resiliency efforts.

Discussion:

A major discussion centred on metrics – how we measure ICH or local knowledge, or whether we should measure it. Noting that the Sendai Framework acknowledges local culture and local knowledge and that governments need to submit reports, Gaillard first questioned how we could include culture and ICH, for instance, to the loss database. Vu suggested the possibility of breaking down the concept of ICH into knowledge, people, and space/location, and then examining each component. Mahmood noted that some elements could be valued in terms of economic activities or ecosystems. Lawangen stressed the importance of defining specific values to allow people to regard ICH as something valuable for them and stated that we would need some methodology or tool to do this; however, he added that considering the 'living' nature of ICH, deeper analysis would be required. Agreeing with this point, Vu also called for the need for organisations that could play a facilitator/knowledge-broker role between culture and DRM sectors between local people and at the higher level, referring to the limited effectiveness of international programmes in Vietnam that are generally implemented with limited knowledge of local contexts.

Citing the case of the Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu that killed only a few people, Wilson questioned how we could measure the extent to which local knowledge prevented the loss of life, and wondered whether metrics are required for that or whether we need increased collaboration and understanding on both sides. Responding to her question, Vu stated that having some sort of documentation demonstrating the contribution and role of local knowledge and ICH for reducing risks would be beneficial for convincing people in the DRM sector. Gaillard stated that metrics can be used to get attention, after which we can move to emphasise intangibles over figures and numbers.

In relation to community-based disaster risk reduction, Wilson raised a question about community consultation – who you would need to speak to in order to talk about DRR in communities, while in ICH we need to identify the right practitioners. Vu responded that they would speak first with local leaders who are influential to gain a better understanding of other community members. Gaillard commented that this issue is related to power relations at the local level and that would be applied for ICH, as ICH holders may not be willing to disclose everything.

Concerning the P3DM presented by Lawangen, Shing noted its visual effectiveness in helping local people to understand and exchange information about disasters, reflecting on his observations of a similar model in Vanuatu. Lawangen further explained its purpose, emphasising that it was meant to be an interactive, living tool for the community that would be constantly updated by the community. Wilson asked if there is any way to include historical dimensions in the map. Lawangen agreed that

a history of disasters would be a good component of P3DM, as it is necessary for capturing resilience.

DAY 2

8 December 2018
Onagawa Town Government Building, and Takenoura Community Center

On DAY 2, an excursion, ‘Revitalisation of *shishifuri* folk performance in Takenoura Community, Onagawa Town (Miyagi Prefecture)’, was programmed, and participants took a trip to Onagawa. The excursion was divided into two major programmes: 1) introductory lectures at the Onagawa Town Government Building (in the morning), and 2) the visit to the Takenoura community to learn about local people’s efforts to revitalise their *shishifuri* performance.

Upon arrival at the Onagawa Town Government Building, participants observed the town centre of Onagawa that was still under reconstruction and heard stories about the destruction of the entire town by the massive tsunami triggered by the Great East



Figure 2 Participants walk up the slope to the shrine in Takenoura. The signboard on the wall indicates the height the tsunami reached on 11 March 2011. (Source: IRCI)



Figure 3 The precinct of the shrine, where people were evacuated during the tsunami. (Source: IRCI)



Figure 4 Scenes from the *shishifuri* experience at the Takenoura Community Center. On the right, Shigeo Suzuki shows a lion head that was made with a cushion and slippers just a few months after the disaster while evacuation was still in place. (Source: IRCI)

Japan Earthquake on 11 March 2011.

In the lecture room, Hiromichi Kubota (Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties) first explained the background of *shishifuri/shishimai*, or lion dance performances in the region, including their history and variations, noting that similar performances are widespread and can be found in other countries in Asia.

Subsequently, Eiichi Hiratsuka (Secretariat of the Onagawa Town Committee for the Reconstruction of *shishifuri* Performance) talked about the revitalisation of *shishifuri* performances in the communities in Onagawa after the 2011 earthquake and tsunami disaster, including the damage caused by the tsunami, how the community received support to restore necessary tools, and the footage of the recovery. He emphasised that *shishifuri* performances that were upheld in each community in Onagawa have an important role in forming strong solidarity among the community members, and thus, the recovery of the performance is closely linked to the recovery of the community.

In the afternoon, participants moved to Takenoura, which is located approximately 5.5 km east of the town centre, to observe its *shishifuri* performance. Led by Shigeo Suzuki (Leader of the Takenoura community) and Tadashi Abe (member of the community and leader of the Takenoura Committee for the Preservation of *shishifuri* performance), participants had an opportunity to walk to the local shrine where the majority of the community members found refuge when the tsunami hit (Figures 2 & 3). Photographs taken by Abe at the time of the disaster were posted at the site, which visually recounted the devastation at that time.

At the Takenoura Community Center, participants were welcomed with a performance of *shishifuri* by community members including the elderly, youth, and children. The day in fact coincided with the occasion on which the community members and the children practised their performances, and they took turns practising on drums and flutes (Figure 4). Participants also joined the performance and had the precious opportunity to communicate with community members. Suzuki explained that Takenoura's *shishifuri* had been open to girls even before the 2011 tsunami disaster and children have been practising it every month, demonstrating the viability of the practice in this community. 'No festival, no reconstruction', said the members of the community.

Cited below are some reflections made by the participants:

- *Shishifuri* ICH played a vital role in revitalising Onagawa and uniting people after the disaster. There is a symbolic dimension of ICH restoration: the revitalisation of ICH reflects the actual rehabilitation of life in a post-disaster context.
- The restoration of ICH itself gathers the community on a common journey, including fundraising, performance, and training activities.
- In Onagawa and Takenoura, community members did not wait for others to help; the revitalisation of ICH was started proactively by the community. ICH restoration needs to come from the community, as they know what is best for

them.

- As a researcher, I asked myself how I could introduce community members' necessities to local/state governments to protect their ICH.
- ICH need to be safeguarded for people, not for itself.
- This is a good example of how ICH contributes to increasing social capital, which is important for DRR. This can be a good lesson for other communities in responding to DRR and in preserving and revitalising their ICH.
- Rehabilitation has always been portrayed as physical, but it is important to consider the mental stability of the victims.

DAY 3

9 December 2018

Conference Room 'Shirakashi' 1, 3rd floor, Conference Bldg., Sendai International Center

Special session: Efforts of post-disaster revitalisation of ICH in Japan

This session was composed of a series of papers on case studies by Japanese researchers who have been committed to research on ICH in the Tohoku region. The majority of presentations focused on cases of folk performing arts after the Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami in 2011 (Figure 5). The session was facilitated by Hiromichi Kubota, who also presented a paper.

As the first presenter in the session, Kubota referred to the case of the *shishifuri* performances in Onagawa that were observed in the excursion on DAY 2 and pointed out that the revival of the performance provided emotional support and also contributed significantly to community cohesion. In this respect, safeguarding ICH, especially those maintained by the community, is analogous with safeguarding the community for sustainable development. He also proposed a framework for categorising ICH in terms of contributing to post-disaster restoration, in which he hypothesised the following three categories: 1) those maintained by the community (often related to religion/spirituality); 2) those requiring specialised skills or techniques performed by certain individuals or dedicated associations (often related to occupation and livelihood); and 3) those upheld unconsciously as part of everyday life, including local knowledge.

Drawing on the case of *Ogatsu-hoin-kagura* in the Ogatsu area of Ishinomaki (Miyagi Prefecture) that has been designated as a national intangible folk cultural property, Ryusuke Kodani (Tohoku History Museum) advocated the 'heritagisation of local culture', through which certain ICH elements are disconnected from the local cultural context while the heritage recognition/designation gives greater opportunities for preservation and protection. He also cited cases in which tiny shrines for *Myojin-sama* (the god that protects homes) were rebuilt on the destroyed house compounds in tsunami-affected areas. Such local traditions and beliefs are considered trivial, but have been an essential part of the lives of the people there; therefore, it is important to look into and recover such modest local cultural elements along with heritagised elements, as they are also part of local communities and are indispensable for the transmission of ICH into the future.

Tomoko Ichiyanagi (Koriyama Women's College) presented two cases of *Taeodori* performances in the areas of Hamadori (Fukushima Prefecture): the Murakami *Taeodori* Society and the Murohara Folk Performing-Arts Society, noting the psychological effect of performing arts that evoke the desire to come together. Parts of Hamadori were severely affected by the nuclear accident that followed the tsunami in 2011 in addition to the damage caused by the tsunami itself. In these cases, post-disaster recovery is still an ongoing process and people are unable to return; therefore, the continuation and transmission of *Taeodori* remains a challenge. Interestingly, the society in Murakami loosened its membership requirements to continue its performance; whereas the Murohara society has held its performance every seven years without accepting any outsiders.

Shuichi Kawashima (International Research Institute of Disaster Sciences, Tohoku University) introduced the case of the revival of fishery techniques in Shinchi-machi (Fukushima Prefecture), which was affected by both the 2011 tsunami and the nuclear accident, through the strictly controlled implementation of a 'trial fishing' system by the government to monitor radioactive contamination, while providing opportunities for fishermen to maintain their livelihoods. While the fishermen endure many restrictions, he noted that the traditional system of mutual cooperation among them contributed significantly to restarting fishing operations, and that more attention should be paid to intangible factors such as the customary practices of the fishing communities.

The final presenter, Hiroki Takakura, questioned why disaster-affected people perform rituals in the post-disaster context and examined the role of ritual-related ICH in post-disaster contexts using the cases of *shishimai* of Shimoniida village (Iwaki city) and Nagareyama dance in Futaba town in Fukushima Prefecture, introducing Evans-Pritchard's concepts of 'ecological time' and 'structural time'. Agreeing with other studies that point out ritual performances' role of evoking a sense of daily life and for social integration, he added that the historical-geographical depth of rituals contributes to the renewal of social relations.

Discussion:

Dalisay questioned whether there has been any case of revitalisation or resurgence of ICH in resettlement areas, as diaspora studies note many instances in which cultural activities are programmed among immigrant communities. Kubota responded that there are many such instances and noted that young people who have moved to a larger city return to their hometowns to participate in ICH performances. Kodani added the case of *toramai* being practised among the immigrants from Miyagi prefecture in Mexico, which is also a case of 'heritagisaion', in which *toramai* has been transmitted in a new context.

Issues concerning the use of the term 'cultural properties' were raised by Thufail, who stated that its standardised use is generally associated with the state, and that the concept should be decentralised to acknowledge communities. Explaining the background that the concept has been used in the Japanese government's cultural policy for many decades, Kodani noted that owing to the introduction of the concept



Figure 5
Session on DAY 3.
(Source: IRCI)

of ICH, the notion of ‘cultural properties’ has been shifting to include the community-centred view, and in this new context they have been able to conduct emergency research of intangible folk cultural properties in the tsunami-affected communities in Tohoku.

Takakura noted that the categorisation of ICH as posed by Kubota is a very important point and further argued. Unfortunately, the time was too short to discuss this issue; however, recognising its importance, this point was included in the Recommendations (see 4.1 of Annex 1).

While our discussions on DAY 1 centred on ICH for disaster prevention and risk reduction, this session was more on the role of ICH in recovery. Reiterating this point, Kubota expressed his hope that these cases in Japan could add another angle to further discussions.

Report on ICH Safeguarding and Disasters in Latin America and the Caribbean

The workshop welcomed two participants from the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Latin America (CRESPIAL), Adriana Molano and Lucas Roque Dos Santos, who shared the situation of ICH safeguarding and disasters in Latin America and the Caribbean, noting that this was the first approach by CRESPIAL to understand the ICH-disaster situations in the region. Reviewing the ICH-disaster situations for Ecuador, in which PDNA was applied for ICH after the earthquake in 2016; Peru, in which the influence of El Niño is pronounced; the Uru people and water management in Bolivia; the initiatives in the Caribbean region that take ICH into account in disasters; and identifying major challenges, CRESPIAL proposed to develop a consultancy in Latin America to diagnose ICH in disasters and multinational projects on this subject.

Final Discussion

The final discussion was divided into two parts: (1) a summary of the workshop by the rapporteur and general comments by the resource person, and (2) a discussion based

on the draft recommendation to be adopted at the end of the workshop.

(1) Workshop summary and general comments

First, as the resource person and rapporteur of the workshop, Meredith Wilson summarised a wide range of ideas and viewpoints presented at the workshop while referring to the findings from her desk study prepared for UNESCO ICH Headquarters in 2017 as well as her collaboration with IRCI since 2016. She summarised major issues limiting our ability to embed ICH in a DRR context, such as the greater emphasis given on tangible heritage; ICH being defined and understood in terms of DRR, disregarding its local context; and the absence of national DRR policy relating to community-led DRR and ICH. She also mentioned the heritagisation of culture, the point raised by Kodani, stating that we need to be mindful about what we privilege, and respect living culture. Re-presenting the model of 'People, Place, and Story (PPS)', she lastly proposed a framework through which ICH and DRR fields may work together.

Subsequently, JC Gaillard as resource person provided comments from the perspective of disaster studies. First, he noted the importance of local researchers and practitioners talking about their own localities and experiences in the workshop, contrasting disaster studies and DRR fields that are dominated and biased by Western researchers and epistemologies. He then specified current challenges in the field of disaster studies, which are also challenges in the ICH field, as well as challenges for bringing both fields together. These include the issues surrounding listing or labelling things and people, and the tension between moral imperative and respecting local culture that might further marginalise certain people. He also noted that to incorporate ICH in DRR, we need to look at ICH as a form of capacities and ground this in the regular social fabric to strengthen people's livelihood.

Some discussions followed concerning Western bias on DRR. Thufail, acknowledging Gaillard for raising this issue, expressed that we need to move forward beyond the hegemony to reach some sort of practical understanding, saying that local knowledge is also problematic in some ways. He agreed regarding the issue of listing, and requested that the participants not take the lists that UNESCO has created for granted, but try to work in between the lists to find alternative lists that address the problems they find on the ground.

Agreeing on the important role of local researchers and understanding the reflective view of Western science, Takakura continued that we should cooperate internationally in implementing DRR, given that the purpose of disaster studies is to contribute to local people's recovery and risk reduction. Gaillard, in response, added that current DRR practices are too often driven by outside researchers without local partners, which in the end limits their contribution and impact, despite their goodwill.

(2) Recommendations for safeguarding ICH in disasters and mobilising ICH for DRM

To encourage active participation in the discussion, all participants, including observers, broke up into four groups to discuss the points listed on the draft recommendations (Figure 6). Group discussions proceeded section by section, taking

10–15 minutes each; each group was provided with a magnified copy of the sections of the draft, blank papers, and a marker. After discussing a section, each group briefly reported some points to be added or deleted, then moved on to discuss the next section.

Beginning with Section 1) understand the nature of disaster impacts on ICH, the group discussion examined Section 2) understand and further explore the active roles of ICH in community-based disaster risk management and post-disaster recovery; Section 3) further promote community-based safeguarding and mobilisation of ICH in disaster context; and Section 4) further enhance ICH-DRM dialogue to ensure that ICH and other cultural factors are incorporated into DRM planning at local and national levels. During the group discussion, Wilson and Nojima examined the revisions made by participants and displayed them on the screen.

After the group discussions were completed and the proposed revisions were displayed as a draft on the screen, Iwamoto, as the Director-General of IRCI, took the floor to ask whether the recommendations discussed above could be adopted as the outcome document of the workshop. Given that there were no substantial changes to the draft, he sought the participants' authorisation to the secretariat in consultation with Wilson and Gaillard to finalise the document after adding cosmetic changes on wording and expressions without changing the substance, and to be sent to the participants within a week. The floor agreed to his proposal, and thus, 'Statements and Recommendations for Safeguarding ICH in Disasters and Mobilising ICH for Disaster Risk Reduction' was adopted (see Annex 1 for the final version of the document).

Takakura then questioned how IRCI would distribute the document. Iwamoto said that



Figure 6 Group discussion examining the recommendations (right).
(Source: IRCI)

it would be made accessible on IRCI's website and also included in the proceedings to be published by the end of March 2019, which will be widely distributed to UNESCO and its member states, national commissions, and related researchers. Gaillard suggested that the document could also be shared through the PreventionWeb by UNISDR, which is the major portal and repository for DRR that are widely accessed by academics, practitioners, and policymakers. Gurung also added that in addition to the IRCI secretariat, each participant is responsible for disseminating the document once they receive it.

Closing

To conclude the workshop, Hiroki Takakura, on behalf of the Center for Northeast Asian Studies of Tohoku University, thanked the participants for their active discussions over the three days of the workshop. As he and his research centre joined this workshop as a cooperating body, he proposed further collaboration and discussions on this theme of ICH and disasters, with extended geographical focuses, including Northeast Asia, the Northern Pacific-rim, and indigenous communities in North America, which should enable us to devise stronger and more universal statements, theories, and policy suggestions.

Finally, Iwamoto took his turn to express his gratitude to all the participants for their active discussions. Citing an episode in *The Legends of Tono (Tono monogatari)* published in 1910 by the Japanese folklorist Kunio Yanagida, in which a man who lost his wife in the 1891 tsunami in the Tohoku region meets her ghost with her former lover, he suggested that, if ICH is a vehicle of memory contributing to the sustainability of communities, it is our task to consider how we can transmit this memory to future generations. Before ending his closing remarks, he extended his gratitude to the Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, the Center for Northeast Asian Studies of Tohoku University, simultaneous interpreters, logistic supporters from the Inter Group Cooperation Sendai Office, and the members of the IRCI secretariat for organising the workshop.