Towards an Integrative Understanding of 'authenticity' of cultural heritage: An analysis of World Heritage Site designations in the Asian Context

Julie Williams Lawless, PhD
Lawless Planning & Design Research

Kapila D. Silva, PhD
University of Kansas

Abstract

In the World Heritage Sites (WHS) designation, it is required to define the conditions that 'authenticate' the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of heritage sites. Initially, the notion of authenticity had been understood as an objective and measurable attribute inherent in the material fabric of sites. This perspective overlooked the fact that authenticity of a place is culturally constructed, contextually variable, and observer dependent. In 1994, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) introduced a set of attributes that facilitate a holistic understanding of authenticity of heritage sites which considers both tangible and intangible aspects of heritage together. To find out the extent to which this holistic understanding of authenticity is currently applied in the WHS designations, we analysed nomination dossiers of 31 sites from the Asian context that were designated as World Heritage between 2005 and 2014. The findings point towards the continuing need to apply systematic, holistic and integrative perspectives of authenticity standards to heritage sites.

Keywords

Authenticity, Asia, intangible heritage, integrity, tangible heritage, World Heritage

Introduction

Since its inception in 1972, designation of World Heritage Sites (WHS) under The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) requires the nominating State Party to define a site's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and the conditions that 'authenticate' such value. This search for 'originality' in cultural heritage properties had led to defining the notion of authenticity as an objective and measurable attribute inherent in the material fabric of historic environments. Accordingly, the initial criteria used in the World Heritage designation during its first three decades to test for authenticity included the physical dimensions of the cultural property, that is, design, materiality, artisanship and setting, which had been understood as universally applicable (Labadi, 2010). As a result of the evolution of contemporary heritage conservation thought over the last five decades, since the ratification of *The Venice Charter* of 1964, a greater emphasis is now placed upon the holistic understanding of heritage sites that involves the

integrated relationship between both the tangible and intangible attributes of cultural heritage (Silva, 2015a). The set of attributes now widely employed to define the conditions of authenticity of cultural and/or global significance of heritage sites reflect this gradual evolution. For WHS, these attributes include: form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions, techniques and management systems; location and setting; language and other forms of intangible heritage; spirit and feeling; and other internal and external factors (UNESCO, 2015, p.17). This comprehensive set of criteria for the test of authenticity was first introduced in the *Nara Document on Authenticity* in 1994 (UNESCO, 1994). However, they did not appear in the *Operational Guidelines* for WHS until 2005 (UNESCO, 2005). In this study, we examine how this holistic understanding of authenticity of heritage sites is understood and utilized in WHS designations in the Asian context.

This expanded framework of heritage authenticity criteria was a result of the debates on the limited applicability of authenticity criteria used in the beginning decades of WHS programme. In an analysis of 106 World Heritage nomination dossiers for sites located in 18 European and non-European countries submitted to UNESCO between 1977 to 2002, Labadi (2007, 2010, 2013) found that the State Parties predominantly used the four original authenticity criteria – design, materiality, artisanship and setting - related to the physicality of heritage sites to represent the authenticity of those sites and tended to claim that the sites had remained in their original condition since they were first built. This materialist representation of authenticity led to perceiving heritage sites as original, static, and timeless (Jones, 2010). It had overlooked the processes of change in heritage sites over time and also disregarded the debates over the meaning and universality of these criteria ensued from the early 1980s, and the importance of the cultural context and of defining multiple measures of authenticity.

The cultural constructivist and relativist argument was that authenticity of a place is culturally constructed, contextually variable, and observer dependent, and thus the original criteria were extremely restricted in use. Furthermore, application of the four original parameters of authenticity into more complex, dynamic, and large-scale heritage sites were limited since the criteria were principally developed for self-contained historic sites and based on object-centric logic that focused on the physicality of buildings (Pendlebury, Short & While, 2009). They were also not useful for historic places where spiritual and symbolic associations and the experiential/existential aspects of heritage played a vital role in determining those sites' cultural significance (Byrne, 2004, 2012; Chapagain, 2013; Munjeri, 2004, Reisinger and Steiner, 2006, Steiner and Reisinger, 2006). Nevertheless, this constructivist perspective at its extreme interpretation could be quite unproductive as it negates the importance of the possible exceptionality of the design, setting, artisanship and materiality of heritage places and disregards their experiential value of authenticity in people's social lives (Jokilehto, 2006; Jones, 2010; Jones and Yarrow, 2013).

As a result of these debates on authenticity, the *Nara Document on Authenticity* was formulated in 1994, which recognized the implications of cultural context and intangible heritage in the definition of what is authentic for a particular historic site (Larsen, 1994; UNESCO, 1994). The discussions of the restrictive nature of original authenticity criteria and what constitute cultural

heritage were also framed within the non-Western cultural contexts and the geo-cultural imbalance of the World Heritage List in its first three decades since 1972 (Cleere, 1996; Stovel, 2008). It was argued that the original authenticity criteria were materialistic - focusing on design, artisanship, materiality and setting – and thus lack the recognition of non-materialistic, intangible, and spiritual processes employed in various non-Western cultural contexts in the creation and protection of their cultural heritage (Silva, 2015a). The introduction of the expanded criteria for heritage authenticity first in 1994 and then more explicitly in the *Operational Guidelines* in 2005 was intended toward the rectification of the issue and with the expectation that nominations of WHS in non-Western contexts such as Asia would adopt the new criteria to successfully frame the holistic nature of cultural significance of their heritage sites and means of safeguarding that heritage. The introduction of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage* in 2003 (UNESCO, 2003) could also be considered an important step in this connection as it provides recognition to and clear articulation of intangible cultural heritage, and in turn facilitates establishing how intangible heritage contributes to the authenticity of historic sites. Consequently, the revised framework on heritage authenticity should have marked the turning point of how we understand the notions of authenticity and integrity in heritage conservation in general and in non-Western contexts in particular. Nevertheless, there are no specific or clear definitions given to some of these constructs; State Parties and their heritage experts have the liberty in how to articulate these attributes as applicable to heritage sites and based on available evidence of sites' historical and cultural context.

The Research Question and the Methods

In order to fully understand the extent to which the changes in authenticity criteria in UNESCO's *Operational Guidelines* facilitate a holistic understanding of authenticity of heritage sites as currently applied in WHS designations from non-Western contexts, we examined 31 sites from the Asian context that were designated as World Heritage Sites from 2005 to 2014. Sites from Asia were specifically selected because heritage experts from Asia played a significant role in bringing about this broader understanding of the notion of authenticity. In heritage conservation, it is generally considered that, in an Asian context, cultural heritage is perceived both in terms of its material and symbolic attributes (Silva & Chapagain, 2013). Therefore, it was our expectation that of any sites designated as WHS after the revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*, the WHS nominations from the Asian realms had the best chance of fully realizing the expanded authenticity criteria and specifically using intangible attributes as a means of qualifying the OUV of those sites. Our decision to examine WHS designations after 2005 was based on the fact that even though the revised criteria was developed in 1994, they did not appear in the *Operational Guidelines* until 2005; we assumed that the application of the revised authenticity framework in WHS designation could then be reasonably expected after 2005.

The study involved a qualitative textual analysis of WHS nomination dossiers of those 31 sites. We focused primarily on the ways OUV is defined, the type of authenticity criteria employed, how the complexity and dynamic nature of sites' histories are taken into account and how the intangible attributes that contributed to sites' cultural significance and authenticity are articulated. From the onset, there were three primary goals to this research: (a) to understand the extent to which a holistic understanding of authenticity of heritage sites (the post-2005 framework) is currently

applied in the WHS designations in the Asian context; (b) the extent to which a relationship between tangible attributes and intangible aspects of cultural heritage are discussed or employed in the nomination to go beyond the mere physicality of a heritage site; and, (c) to understand what types of evidence may be used to establish heritage authenticity.

As with any qualitative study, the data collection required a set of parameters to determine the heritage sites and the specific geography that would be most pertinent to our goals. We employed a critical review of WHS designations submitted for review (making the Tentative List) and listed between 2005 and 2014, paying attention to sites that would fulfil the requirements of our study using the adoption of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* and *2005 Operational Guidelines* as our start date. We defined the geography of our study to include 11 countries within the contemporary Asian realms (South Asia, East Asia, and Southeast Asia), as this geography culturally defines the standard practices encouraged by both the *Nara Document on Authenticity* recommendations and the *Hoi An Protocols* (Taylor, 2004; UNESCO 2009). Site type was also critical as only cultural heritage sites use the revised criteria for authenticity. Our last parameter involved a matter of language. UNESCO requires all nomination dossiers to be submitted in either English or French. We chose to use only those prepared in English in order to clarify issues of translation errors, specifically because we employed analytic measures that examine the descriptions and terms used in the dossiers. That is, we needed some research control over how language was used to apply meaning in the documents. Using these limits, we found 31 World Heritage Sites for our study: 21 classified as archaeological sites, five classified as inhabited sites and another five classified as cultural landscapes (See Table 1).

For each of the 31 sites, we reviewed the nomination dossiers to examine meaning in the language used to define:

> 1. Justification of the OUV of the site;
> 2. Type of authenticity criteria employed;
> 3. The complexity and dynamic nature of the site history;
> 4. Articulation of intangible attributes that contributed to site's cultural significance; and
> 5. The site's proposed conservation and monitoring plan, specifically to review plans to preserve each of the above qualities.

To construct a study of the dossiers, we undertook an initial analysis of the entirety of the data using content analysis to determine if there were ideal descriptors or plans to measure and manage heritage authenticity not only for the nomination, but also for future management of the site. At the conclusion of the initial review of the documentation using content analysis, three categorical themes emerged, each evolving a set of guiding questions for further in-depth review of documents using discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2003; Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002).

The first category of information involved the way the OUV of a site is articulated. The intention of this analysis was to find out how the opportunity afforded by the *Nara Document on Authenticity* to develop culturally-relative conceptions of heritage was utilized and whether heritage sites are

presented as immutable, ignoring their probable change over time and the impact such change may have on their authenticity. The questions asked included:

- Under what heritage category (monument, ensemble, or site) has the site been listed?
- Could it have been listed as a cultural landscape, a mixed natural-cultural site, or other heritage category as conceived within the respective cultural context?
- What seems to be the reason for not listing it as cultural landscape or other category?
- Is there a strict adherence to the WH Guidelines or flexible use thereof?
- Is heritage presented as static or immutable entity?

The second category involved the way the heritage authenticity is presented. The intention here is to examine the extent to which the revised framework of authenticity is employed and whether culturally-relevant authenticity measures are developed, presented and justified. Specific questions that guided the analysis included:

- What type of authenticity criteria are mentioned?
- Is it mostly about the materiality of heritage?
- What aspects of authenticity are most or least mentioned?
- What are the most mentioned intangible attributes that may contribute to the authenticity of heritage site?
- What are the least mentioned intangible attributes?
- Are the authenticity attributes listed in the official WHS guidelines strictly adhered to or flexibly interpreted?
- Have any new authenticity attributes, unique to the site, been identified or discussed?
- What is the nature of evidences presented to establish the authenticity of heritage site?

The third category involved the way the associations between the tangible heritage and intangible heritage of a site is discussed. We looked into the following questions, in order to find out how such associations are presented as critical part of authenticity of a heritage site and how the authenticity discussion given goes beyond a mere material aspects of a site to include non-physical or intangible aspects of authenticity such as traditional heritage management practices, oral history, stories and myths, other forms of intangible heritage and notions such as sprit and feeling.

- Is intangible heritage associated with a site merely mentioned or thoroughly discussed?
- Is it as important as the tangible heritage?
- What types of intangible heritage are usually presented?
- Are there innovative articulations of intangible heritage presented that go beyond the categories/definitions given in the *Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage,* 2003?
- Have safeguards for the protection of intangible heritage been discussed?

These three sets of questions were used to define and guide further categorization of data in the discourse analysis. Our goal in this analysis was to look for meaning in the patterns which emerge from the language used within each area of the nomination documentation (OUV, descriptions of

authenticity and integrity, the monitoring plans, etc.) In this approach, we examined both the areas of intersectionality (commonality) and divergence (difference). Based on the outcomes of this review, we established three primary categories for further review:

1. The Null Case: in this category, the nomination dossier defines a site's OUV and authenticity only in tangible and material dimensions. It lacks any discussion of other expanded authenticity attributes, including the contribution of a site's intangible attributes to its authenticity. This may occur where the type of site is immutably based in the material significance such as a specific example of engineering or architecture. In addition, site nominations that effectively pre-dated the application of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* were weighted in this category.

2. The Possible Case: in this category, there were elements of expanded authenticity framework apparent; however, the discussion was found lacking in detail. There were perhaps lapses in how authenticity attributes were described or minimal understanding of how these attributes contribute to the overall significance of the site. In some cases, the monitoring plan had little to no articulation of how these attributes could be preserved.

3. The Actual Case: in this category, there were clearly articulated application of an expanded authenticity framework with meaningful discussion. The test of authenticity for a site is established within the cultural context and relevant sources of evidence are convincingly presented. Descriptions of how intangible qualities of the site exemplified its universal value and authenticity were engrossing and complete. The monitoring plans clearly delineated the care and preservation not only of the materiality of a site but also of non-material attributes that contribute to the site's authenticity, particularly elements like the spirit of place.

Once established and defined, we re-examined each dossier for inclusion in one of these categories. However, we would find this no easy task, as it became clearer in the review that the middle category required further refinement. The Possible Cases were then subdivided; whereby instead of discreet categories, the case studies more likely fell into a spectrum of meaning with a sliding range from Null to Actual (See Table 1).

Findings and Discussion: The Evolution of a Holistic Viewpoint of Authenticity

A spectrum of cases

Findings reveal that there is a gradual but slow evolution of the use of complete set of authenticity criteria in site nominations and the articulation of intangible cultural heritage in the definition of sites' cultural and universal significance and heritage authenticity. On the spectrum of cases, we used a careful evaluation of the original and additional criteria given in the *World Heritage Operational Guidelines* before and after 2005 to understand the way in which nominations position the importance of a broader set of authenticity criteria. Based on the way they discuss the contribution of multiple material and intangible authenticity attributes in determining sites' heritage values, 61 per cent of nominations could be considered to be in the range of Possible-to-Actual Cases. We found that 5 of the 31 sites that go beyond mere material aspects of authenticity to clearly articulate the significance and safeguard mechanisms of intangible heritage attributes

that contribute to the authenticity of sites. The dossiers of those sites also define sites' authenticity through their culturally understood manner, supported by culturally relevant evidences to justify their test of authenticity. They are thus considered Actual Cases.

An additional eight sites, termed Actual-Possible Cases here, present adequate identification of a broader set of authenticity dimensions, including intangible attributes, but slightly lacking in a full discussion. Six sites utilize the basis of material form or design for the purpose of nomination, but still also recognize significant value of and so include intangible attributes that contribute to sites' authenticity in their monitoring plans. Four sites seem to bear some aspects of intangible cultural heritage, as given in the description of the sites, but no discussion of these in the definition of sites' heritage authenticity is provided, making them to be included in Possible-Null Case category. Based on multiple criteria, including intangible heritage attributes, 8 of the 31 sites present no evidence for an application of a comprehensive framework for test of authenticity; hence, we called them Null Cases. It should be noted that three of these eight sites began the listing process prior to the adoption of the additional criteria under the recommendations of the *2005 Operational Guidelines*, but could have followed the *Nara Document on Authenticity* of 1994 in their discussion of heritage authenticity. Two sites that we include in the spectrum of Possible Cases – Kaesong Monuments of North Korea and Pyu Ancient Cites of Myanmar - were also in the Tentative List prior to 2005; they were re-nominated with very brief statements of the authenticity criterion 'spirit and feeling'. Some of the Null and Possible-Null Cases were listed in as recently as 2014, indicating that application of a comprehensive framework of authenticity attributes is still not given much attention in the nomination process.

From these findings, it is apparent that the use of a broader test of authenticity and the inclusion of intangible attributes of authenticity for the purposes of listing as a WHS are gradually gaining acceptance in the Asian context. It may require more clarity and emphasis in the holistic use of authenticity criteria in the nomination guidelines, nevertheless.

Issues of articulating heritage authenticity

Despite evidence of increasing effort at the promotion of an integrative articulation heritage authenticity in the nomination process, there remains heavy emphasis of the use of materiality for authentication. Two-thirds of the sites reviewed in this study used the original four criteria – design, materiality, setting and artisanship - as the predominant means of proving heritage authenticity. This dominance creates an issue in some sites where tradition may dictate that in order to preserve the essence of the site, structures will be routinely rebuilt. A close look at the manner in which authenticity is addressed within the dossiers tells as to why other non-material attributes and cultural practices of managing heritage remain secondary evidence. In the majority of cases, the key non-material authenticity criterion employed to point towards a site's heritage is 'sprit and feeling'. It is the most frequently cited (43 per cent) and/or the only reference given (23 per cent). Even in these cases, it is described in very brief statements, without in-depth discussion or empirical evidence to support how the spirit of place is defined, its contribution to site's cultural significance and heritage authenticity, and its safeguard mechanism.

A few dossiers are innovative in their approach to the way sites' authenticity is established. They broaden how the evidence is presented by including community experience in the daily use or maintenance of the site, thereby intertwining the materiality with the visceral nature of personal experience and spirit of place. For example, the case of Bali cultural landscape of Indonesia clearly articulates how authenticity is based on values and perceptions of its local cultural community, utilising the opportunity provided by the *Nara Document on Authenticity* and *2005 WH Operational Guidelines* to place heritage authenticity within a given cultural context. In discussing the site's authenticity, the nomination dossier simply disregards the usual prescribed authenticity criteria, and asks two critical questions that clearly emphasise the criticality of how the local community understands the cultural significance of the landscape and the religious structures. The first query is about whether the farmers in the Bali cultural landscape regard the Supreme Water Temple as an authentic manifestation of their spiritual beliefs, and the second questions whether the building has a well-documented history. The everyday engagement of 250 *subak* farming communities in the temple activities, their belief in the importance of the temple in the cultural and economic lives of communities, and the native and colonial historical documents and oral histories are cited as evidence for the vital intangible aspects of authenticity of the temple. The relationship between the temple, people and their agricultural landscape is established as the primary contours that define cultural heritage of the *subak* landscape, and not any specific material dimensions of the place and its physical structures. In the case of establishing the integrity of the temple, the dossier clearly argues for disregarding the emphasis of the temple's material authenticity and integrity, since the cyclical renewal of the temple has been the culturally accepted way of conserving the temple's critical cultural significance, supported by historical documents. In the case of Villages of Hahoe and Yangdong in South Korea, the official set of authenticity criteria given the WHS *Operational Guidelines* is clearly followed, but they are discussed under new set of themes – conservation of buildings, community organization and daily maintenance, and historical records and evidences – to demonstrate that the buildings' and settlements' cultural authenticity is intact due to the adherence of traditional practices for maintaining the buildings. How the intangible cultural heritage of the villages has been an integral part of the place and its physical and social fabric is discussed in-depth throughout the nomination dossier. These two instances demonstrate the ample use of the authenticity framework presented by the *Nara Document* and how parochial materially driven criteria are transcended in establishing the primacy of intangible aspects in determining heritage authenticity.

These innovative ways of discussing heritage authenticity are rare in the documentation we studied. For the most part, there is still an inadequate discussion of how evidence of non-physical aspects of heritage may be used to corroborate and establish a site's authenticity alone. This lack of discussion routes back to inadequate resources for applying the *Operational Guidelines* insofar as they relate to the documentation and nomination of intangible heritage associated with a historic site. We most commonly find the mention of relationships between the intangible and tangible nature of a site in the section of the dossier where the description of the site and justification of its OUV is presented. For the most part, it is quite common to read the non-physical nature of a site (i.e., multiple aspects of intangible heritage, including the spirit or feeling) in the first pages of a nomination wherein the State Party establishes the significance of a place as a WHS. These pages

are filled with evocative language meant to inspire and establish the uniqueness of a place. Where we see less mention of these attributes is in the section whereby the State Party is asked to *prove* the site's authenticity and integrity. In most cases, a brief statement on some aspects of intangible heritage would be given, as if there were a need to simply tick off the checklist of authenticity criteria given in the WHS *Operational Guidelines* as a bureaucratic necessity, without establishing the relationship between such attributes with the physical authenticity of sites and their cultural significance. Stovel (2008) places such superficial discussions of authenticity in nomination documents upon the inadequate understanding of authenticity concept and criteria by heritage managers, insufficient analysis of criteria relative to the sites nominated and perhaps the use of outmoded *Operational Guidelines* or of overlooking the cues given in the guidelines. Our findings point out that a related issue seems to arise from the official categorization of heritage into cultural versus natural and tangible versus intangible: It was evident in the nomination dossiers, at least in the initial years after 2005, that such strict heritage categories had been accepted as mutually exclusive, leading to inadvertent separation and isolation of plurality of aspects that collectively define heritage. Understanding cultural heritage as an intersection of various tangible, intangible, cultural as well as natural attributes is critically required for a holistic definition of heritage authenticity and management (Chapagain, 2017).

Part of the issue could be about the difficulty in sufficiently articulating such intangible attributes that contribute to heritage authenticity. For example, how does one capture the 'spirit and feeling' of a place without proof? Our reading of nomination documents indicates that it is highly likely that heritage experts who prepared the dossiers simply write down some descriptions on such intangible qualitative attributes without specific studies done to identify such attributes of sites or without locating any other oral or written evidence. In the case of 'spirit and feeling' of heritage sites, there are empirical studies that have developed methods to define such place attributes, their contribution to place's heritage and ways of managing such attributes (Silva, 2015b; Wells, 2014). Adopting the theoretical and methodological approaches of these studies would be helpful in the preparation of nomination dossiers in the future.

Prominence of local community in establishing nexus between intangible heritage and authenticity of historic sites

Those dossiers depicting a clear connection of intangible heritage to sites' authenticity are overrepresented by cultural landscapes and inhabited spaces, indicating that a primary aspect of understanding and recording intangible heritage may require a certain amount of experiential research. That is, the documentation of first-hand experiences and feelings in harmony with historical records and knowledge should be emphasized as proof of authenticity and integrity. This may require greater employment of local communities and lay people, more than heritage experts, in the preparation of official documentation. An exemplar of such approach is the cultural landscape of Bali, where local communities were upfront and present in the preparation of not only the documentation but the monitoring plans as well. Significant contributions by locals are evident in the primary descriptions of craft, tradition, and ritual in the authentication of the site. Even in exemplars from the Possible Cases, such as the site of Fuji-san in Japan, evidence of first-hand

experience more clearly articulates the importance of the spirit of place, even when the site is authenticated based on its natural or constructed form. This makes the argument to encourage the development of qualitative and behavioural research methods as a means of documenting heritage sites.

Evolving nature of nomination dossiers

There were several noticeable patterns in the dossiers on how they were prepared. Over time, there appears to be improvement in how State Parties address the expanded criteria for authenticity. In the first years after the adoption of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* guidelines, many sites already on the Tentative List chose to amend their dossiers to address the additional criteria that may have improved the listing documentation. It is evident in these early dossiers that there was no clear referencing or mechanism employed to address the treatment of intangible heritage that may be critical to a site's authenticity neither in the documentation nor in the monitoring plan. In most cases, little mention of the safeguard of such significant intangible heritage is made in these early plans. This initial difficulty in treating the new authenticity categories of nomination remains somewhat evident in a continued lack of interconnectivity between nominating criteria. Many dossiers continue to use discreet descriptions, failing to show how the revised criteria, which include both physical and intangible attributes, may be utilized in a holistic fashion. For example, religious/ spiritual traditions may be discussed in isolation of the craft used to construct temples; the site is significant for its tradition and its architecture, but not recognizing that they may mutually influence each other.

Certain State Parties seemed to develop their own ways of preparing nomination dossiers. Nominations from South Korea demonstrate a much developed mechanism on articulating the interdependent relationship between tangible and intangible dimensions in determining authenticity of heritage sites. After 2008, China began to standardize their dossiers, normalizing the discussion of integrity and authenticity on site factors across each nomination. The monitoring plans also became rather formulaic in approach and mechanism, based on a top-down approach of protection and enforcement of both tangible and intangible culture. Standard behaviour plans were included at inhabited sites to create specific cultural environments respective of the intangible spirit effused in the site's nomination. Likewise, sites with multiple jurisdictions (two or more State Parties) were less focused on discussion of specifics of cultural associations and themes and were more streamlined to focus on proper documentation and division of protection responsibilities. While there were language and translation limitations imposed on the study, there was a common pattern amongst the Actual Case dossiers; the use of infographics and images enhanced the meaningful descriptions in all areas of the nomination.

Conclusion

In 2005, the introduction of additional guidelines on heritage authenticity and nomination criteria for WHS allowed for the designation of historic places based upon a variety of culturally pertinent physical and intangible attributes. This change should have marked the turning point to how we understand the notions of authenticity and integrity in heritage conservation. However, as we

examine current contexts and debate on how the idea of authenticity was used in designation prior to this change with the way the new criteria are used in Asia after 2005, few true uses of a broader authenticity framework are evident. This leads to a conclusion that the additional guidelines are not fully understood and utilized as originally intended, begging the question that the guidelines themselves need to be revisited for an all-inclusive approach on how we place value on the meaning of authenticity and integrity in heritage conservation worldwide. In addition, guidance on further development of monitoring plans should include specific mechanisms contextually relevant for the safeguard of intangible heritage that contribute to a site's authenticity; otherwise, despite now having the ability to list these sites for the rare and unique qualities they possess, we may still continue to see a significant loss in the holistic treatment of their authentic nature.

The review of these 31 dossiers brings up several emerging themes relevant to the study of heritage authenticity and, to some extent, intangible cultural heritage. Most readily, there is a continued need to apply systematic, holistic, and integrative perspectives of authenticity standards to heritage sites. *Operational Guidelines* may need to be amended to encourage the multiplicity of research methods that would employ a greater diversity of information while creating a more adaptable approach to documenting intangible authenticity attributes. As the notion of heritage is constructed through cultural processes and as it is not immutable (Smith, 2006), the mechanisms to study and conserve it need to adapt and survive the need for holistic view of heritage authentication. Appropriate research methodologies can be employed to understand the meaningful experiences of people of the past and present at these sites. As Jones (2010) contends, the meanings of authenticity emerge through how cultural heritage is experienced and negotiated in the interactions between people, places, and artefacts; those meanings are not simply embedded in the materiality or culturally constructed values without such networks of interaction. It is rather imperative that we learn to accommodate the negotiated experience of culture as part of the authenticity of a site.

Clearly, further research must be carried out. Continued review of nomination documents and monitoring reports will only seek to further refine our use of these documents in the conservation of WHS. The establishment of best practices for site type and application of integrative criteria would be useful not only for the nomination process but in the adoption of management and monitoring plans that may be more impactful as time goes on. The further we study the intersectionality between the meanings of authenticity and the attributes of heritage, the better we become at heritage conservation.

Acknowledgements

References

Byrne, D., (2004) Chartering heritage in Asia's postmodern world. *Conservation: The Getty Conservation Institute Newsletter*, 19(2), 16-19.

---------- (2012) Anti-superstition: Campaigns against popular religion and its heritage in Asia. *In*: P. Daly and T. Winter, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*. London: Routledge, 295-310.

Chapagain N.-K. (2013) Chapter 2: Heritage conservation in the Buddhist context, in K. D. Silva and N.-K. Chapagain (eds). *Asian heritage management: Contexts, concerns, and prospects*. London: Routledge, 49 – 64.

---------- (2017) Chapter 2: Blurring boundaries and moving beyond the tangible/intangible and the natural/cultural classifications of heritage: Cases from Nepal, in K. D. Silva and A. Sinha (eds). *Cultural Landscapes of South Asia: Studies in heritage conservation and management*, London: Routledge, 24 - 38.

Cleere, H. (1996) The concept of 'outstanding universal value' in World Heritage Convention, *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 1(4): 227-233.

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analyzing discourse and text: Textual analysis for social research*, London: Routledge.

Jokilehto, J. (2006) Considerations on authenticity and integrity in World Heritage context. *City & Time*, 2(1): 1- 16. [online] Available from: < http://www.ct.ceci-br.org > (Accessed 3 March 2011).

Jones, S. (2010) Negotiating authentic objects and authentic selves: Beyond the deconstruction of authenticity. *Journal of Material Culture*, 15(2), 181-203.

Jones, S. and Yarrow. T. (2013) Crafting authenticity: An ethnography of conservation practice. *Journal of Material Culture*, 18(1), 3-26.

Jorgensen, M. and Phillips, L. J. (2002) *Discourse analysis as theory and method*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Labadi, S. (2007) Representation of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage. *Journal of Socio Archaeology*, 7(2): 147-170.

-------------- (2010) Chapter 3: World Heritage, authenticity and post-authenticity: International and national perspectives. *In*: S. Labadi and C. Long, ed. *Heritage and Globalisation*. London: Routledge, 66-84.

------------- (2013) *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based analysis of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. Lanham, Maryland: AltaMira Press.

Larsen, K. E. (ed.) (1994) *Nara Conference on authenticity in relation to World Heritage Convention*, Paris and Rome: ICCROM, ICOMOS, and UNESCO.

Munjeri, D. (2004) Tangible and intangible heritage: From difference to convergence. *Museum International*, 56(1-2): 12-20.

Pendlebury, J., Short, M., and While, A. (2009) Urban World Heritage Sites and the problem of authenticity. *Cities*, 26: 349-358.

Reisinger, Y., and Steiner, C. J. (2006) Reconceptualising object authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1): 65-85.

Silva, K. D. (2015a) Paradigm Shifts in Global Heritage Discourse, *Journal of Space and Communication*. 1(1): 1-15.

Silva, K. D. (2015b) The Spirit of Place of Bhaktapur, Nepal, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 21(8): 820-841.

Silva, K. D. and Chapagain, N.-K. (ed.) (2013) *Asian heritage management: Contexts, concerns, and prospects*. London: Routledge.

Smith, L. (2006) *The uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.

Steiner, C. J., and Reisinger, Y. (2006) Understanding existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2): 299-318.

Stovel, H. (2008) Origins and influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity, *APT Bulletin*, 39(2/3): 9-17.

Taylor, K. (2004) Cultural heritage management: A possible role for charters and principles in Asia. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10 (2), 417-433.

UNESCO (1994) *The Nara Document on Authenticity*. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Available from < http://whc.unesco.org/archive/nara94.htm > (Accessed 17 July 2013).

------------ (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

------------ (2005) *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

----------- (2009) *Hoi An Protocols for best conservation practice in Asia*, Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok Office.

------------ (2015) *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

Wells, J. C. (2014) A methodological framework for assessing the 'Spirit and feeling' of world Heritage Properties', in T. Gensheimer and C. L. Guichard (eds.) *World Heritage and national registers; Stewardship in practice*, New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Publishers, 19 -32.

Table 1: Analysis of World Heritage Nomination Dossiers from Asian Countries from 2005 – 2014				
A Spectrum of Cases on an Integrative Articulation of Authenticity Criteria				
Null Cases	Possible-Null Cases	Possible Cases	Actual-Possible Cases	Actual Cases
Silk Roads, China (2014) Tomioka Silk Mill and Related Sites, Japan (2014) Grand Canal, China (2014) Lenggong Valley, Malaysia (2012) Preah Vihar, Cambodia (2008) Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape, Japan (2007) Yin Xu, China (2006) Historic Center of Macao, China (2005)	Kaesong Monuments, N. Korea (2013) Monuments of Dengfeng in 'the Center of Heaven and Earth', China (2010) Fujian *Tulou*, China (2008) Kaiping Diaolou and Villages, China (2007)	Rajasthan Hill Forts, India (2013) Fuji-san, Japan (2013) Hiraizumi Temples, Gardens and Archaeological Sites, Japan (2011) Petroglyph Arts, Mongolia (2011) West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou, China (2011) Mount Wutai, China (2009)	Pyu Ancient Cities, Myanmar (2014) Rani-ki-Vav, India (2014) Site of Xanadu, China (2012) Ho Dynasty Citadel, Vietnam (2011) Janta Mantar, India (2010) Tang Long-Hanoi Imperial City, Vietnam (2010) Melaka/ George Town, Malaysia (2008) Red Fort, India (2007)	Namhansanseong City, S. Korea (2014) Cultural Landscape of Honghe Hani Rice Terraces, China (2013) Bali Cultural Landscape, Indonesia (2012) Hahoe & Yangdong Villages, S. Korea (2010) Royal Tombs of Joseon Dynasty, S. Korea (2009)

Source: Authors' own.