



Maritime Silk Routes: Report on UNESCO Expert Meeting, London, 30-31st May, 2017

Tim Williams, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
with editorial input from the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO

June 2018



Group photo of the London UNESCO Expert Meeting participants.

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Participants	3
Aims of the meeting	3
Programme.....	3
Discussions	4
Introduction	4
Summary of issues discussed	6
Protection	6
Terminology/naming	7
Geographic scope.....	7
Chronology	7
Maritime landscapes	8
Port cities.....	8
Coastal hinterlands and connecting overland routes.....	8
Wrecks, cargoes and museum collections.....	8
Intangible heritage	9
World Systems Theory	9
Other points raised.....	9
Nomination strategy	9
Next steps.....	10
Research issues	11
Practice.....	11
Annex 1 Breakout sessions: regional discussion groups	12
I. East Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia Group (notes by Phacharaporn PHANOMVAN and Bérénice BELLINA-PRYCE)	12
Participants.....	12
Chronology	12
Name	12
Shipwrecks and material from shipwreck.....	12
Inter and Intra-Connections: Overlapping territories: materials aspect.....	13
What type of sites do we have?.....	13
How SEA defines maritime landscape and ship: unique characteristics.....	13
II. Western Indian Ocean group (notes by Eric STAPLES).....	14
Participants.....	14
The question of boundaries: the Mediterranean.....	14
The question of organizational units: the monsoonal trade route zones.....	14
The question of periodization.....	14
Pearling.....	15
III. East Asian Regional Group (notes by Jun KIMURA)	15
Participants.....	15
Aim	15
Discussion topics	15
Suggestions.....	16
Annex 2 Breakout sessions: thematic discussion groups	17
A. Thematic group on Shipwrecks as part of a possible Maritime Silk Route World Heritage property (notes by Gay LACSINA).....	17
Participants.....	17
Notes.....	17
B. Thematic group on selecting three case studies for Maritime Silk Routes (notes by Tim WINTER)	18
Participants.....	18
Notes.....	18

Annex 3 Participants.....	20
UNESCO-ICOMOS-UCL Core team/co-organisers.....	20
International attendees.....	21
Japan	21
Republic of Korea	21
China.....	21
South-Eastern Asia	22
Philippines.....	23
Indonesia.....	23
Singapore.....	24
India.....	24
Sri Lanka.....	24
Abu Dhabi Emirate.....	25
Oman	25
Turkey.....	25
East Africa	26
International scholars	26
UCL organisation team/helpers and UK attendees	27
Student helpers/observers	30
Annex 4 Discussion paper (attached as a separate document)	31

Introduction

The UNESCO Expert Meeting on Maritime Silk Routes took place on the 30 and 31 May 2017 at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London, UK. This UNESCO Expert Meeting was made possible thanks to financial contributions from the Chinese Government's voluntary contribution to World Heritage Fund to support the Silk Roads nomination process, and organizational specificities were undertaken by the Institute of Archaeology, University College of London.

Participants

For a full list of participants, and their backgrounds, see Annex 3.

Aims of the meeting

- 1) Consider the chronological and geographic scope of the Maritime Silk Routes (MSR)
- 2) Explore the range of archaeological evidence for the MSR, considering how these might comprise 'attributes' and values of the MSR
- 3) To explore potential for serial nominations of the MSR, including trans-national working, coordination mechanism, and data exchange.

Programme

Tuesday 30 th May, 2017	
9.30 am to 10.00 am	Registration Room 609 (6 th floor), Institute of Archaeology
10.00 am to 10.15 am	Welcome Feng JING, Chief, Asia/Pacific Unit, UNESCO World Heritage Centre Tim WILLIAMS, Reader in Silk Roads Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
10.15 am to 11.00am	Introduction: General background, objectives and expected output of the Maritime Silk Routes meeting 10.15-10.40 Roland LIN Chih-Hung, Project Officer, Asia/Pacific Unit, UNESCO World Heritage Centre. <i>General background of the UNESCO Silk Roads World Heritage nomination process: objectives and expected output of the meeting.</i> 10.40-10.55 Tim WILLIAMS, Institute of Archaeology, UCL. <i>The structure and aims of the meeting.</i> 10.55-11.00 Susan DENYER, Advisor, ICOMOS UK & ICOMOS International. <i>Technical advice of ICOMOS.</i>
11.00 am to 11.30am	Group photograph and Coffee Break
11.30 am to 1.00 pm	Discussion session: chronological and geographic scope the MSR, and the changing nature of routes & impacts. The whole and the parts
1.00 pm to 2.00 pm	Lunch (provided)
2.00 pm to 3.30 pm	Discussion session: The surviving range of archaeological and built heritage, the complexity of port cities, and approaches to wrecks, cargoes

	and museum collections. The role of land routes: ports, their hinterlands and production sites
3.30 pm to 4.00 pm	Break
4.00 pm to 5.30 pm	Breakout sessions (see below): regional issues and priorities
5.30 pm to 6.30 pm	Reporting session from breakout groups & discussion
6.30 pm to 7.30 pm	Reception at the Institute of Archaeology
8.00pm	Conference dinner

Wednesday 31st May, 2017

9.00 am to 9.30 am	Arrival: Room 609 (6 th floor), Institute of Archaeology
9.30 am to 11.00 am	Discussions of issues arising from Day 1
11.00 am to 11.30am	Break
11.30 am to 1.00 pm	Ways forward: concept/strategy & conclusions
1.00 pm to 2.00 pm	Lunch
Afternoon/Evening (optional)	Visit to Cutty Sark, Greenwich; Dinner at a traditional English pub in Greenwich; Boat journey from Greenwich back to central London

Discussions

Introduction

A draft discussion paper (see Annex 4) was circulated to all the participants in advance and served as basis for discussions.

The majority of the meeting, after a short introduction, comprised an extended open discussion, which explored the chronological and geographic scope the MSR, the changing nature of routes & impacts, the issue of whether to consider the whole and the parts, the surviving range of archaeological and built heritage, the complexity of port cities, and approaches to wrecks, cargoes and museum collections, hinterlands and production sites. The discussions tended to be quite broad and often returned to similar issues.

During the two days, a number of breakout group discussions took place (see below), which explored regional and thematic issues in smaller groups. These often touched upon, or explored in depth, issues that were also discussed in the main group sessions.

The final session discussed the issues that had arisen and recommended the development of a concept/strategy for the MSR as desirable.



Figure 1. Discussions in the main group.



Figure 2. Breakout discussion group.

The meeting notes were taken during the discussions and some of the key issues raised are noted below. In addition, some of the rapporteurs for the breakout sessions emailed notes, also included in Annexes 1 & 2.



Figure 3. Informal discussion during the course of the meeting.

Summary of issues discussed

Protection

There was a broad consensus that protection of maritime heritage was a major issue, and that it was of critical importance to raise the profile of the coastal zone.

There needs to be much greater communication regarding the shared challenges.

How fishing discoveries are handled/reported was raised an issue, as were issues of damage through dredging and trawling.

A great deal of discussion focused on marine salvage and excavation/salvage. Considerable debate took place regarding local laws and the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage; and how these issues could be developed through the implementation of the UNESCO 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. A nomination to the World Heritage List could be a tool to help promote this debate and raise awareness.

Wrecks mostly lie in territorial waters and are therefore the responsibility of a State Party to the two above-mentioned UNESCO Conventions, which should be establishing effective standards and protocols for their protection and management.

The World Heritage Convention is about places, and while wrecks inhabit a specific place, issues of access and stability/degradation make their management complex, presenting challenges for their inclusion in any nomination project.

There was a discussion that environmental laws are perceived to be stronger than cultural ones, and that the concepts of nature/culture (human/biospheres) needs to be actively developed to afford greater impact on maritime heritage protection and interpretation.

Protection must not be separated from daily life and contemporary concerns.

Terminology/naming

All agreed that the MSR was not solely, or indeed chiefly, about silk, and not a single route, but a plurality of interactions. As with the land route, it was recognised that the complexity of goods, and the distances these were transported, belies a simplistic equation with silk, and underplays the complexity of the non-silk goods, such as Indian textiles and Chinese ceramics. However, the common usage of the term makes it difficult to use alternatives. As such, silk might be perceived as a symbol, rather than just a product.

The term 'spice routes' was also discussed; again in common usage, but was felt to rather more closely apply to the later trading activities and perhaps thus less useful for this nomination process.

Geographic scope

It was generally agreed that this nomination process should encompass an area from Japan to the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean was generally agreed to be a different sphere of activity from the Red Sea/Indian Ocean (see Western Indian Ocean discussion group, Annex 1).

Turkey might be an important bridge for the overland and Black Sea area.

The role of shipping to the Americas and Spain was raised, and while not central to this project, the wider narrative should be recognised.

Chronology

The chronological starting point was discussed in some detail. It was recognised that, as with the overland Silk Roads (SR), coastal trading/movements began much earlier than the 2nd century BCE - it was raised that there were prehistoric foundations to navigation and the use of monsoons. Some participants (e.g. the East Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia breakout group – see Annex 1) drew attention to developing contacts during the 4th century BCE. Others suggested it was best to follow the 2nd century BCE starting point, as used for the overland nomination process, as the change from coastal trade to transoceanic sail, and the advent of durable shipping, took place in c 2nd century BCE.

It was widely recognised, however, that different regions had different chronologies. **Overall, many participants found a start date difficult to agree upon** (e.g. the West Indian Ocean breakout group – see Annex 1).

The end date, in terms of any nomination strategy, was also discussed. Many suggested that the mid-19th century, with the transition from traditional sail to steam power, might mark a suitable change in the nature of impact and routes, breaking the relationship with seasonal winds and currents. However, other voices explored the changes brought by the western colonial empires, or the continued dhow trade in to the 20th century (e.g. the West Indian Ocean breakout group – see Annex 1). Again, **there was no final consensus, although the mid-19th century CE was perhaps the most popular option.**

Environmental/climatic contexts were emphasised by many, including the cycles of monsoon seasons, and that it was vital to consider this over the *longue durée*.

Maritime landscapes

Westerdahl's concept (1992)¹ of maritime cultural landscapes brings together land and sea interactions, and might be a useful tool for this nomination process.

The East Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia discussion group raised the potential of nominating 'SEAsapes', instead of trade routes, as a way to incorporate tangible heritage (such as rich wreck sites) with non-tangible narratives (such as myths and cultural practices associated with the sea). (See also the Thematic Case Study group in Annex 2.)

Port cities

Extensive discussion took place regarding port cities. The idea of using ports as nodes, in a similar way to the overland strategy, was debated.

The contrast between port cities and inland agrarian cities was made.

Port cities often existed in competition with each other – and often had links with ports further away – and thus the issue of geographic proximity is not the same as on the overland routes.

Many ports are living cities, presenting important challenges and opportunities.

Coastal hinterlands and connecting overland routes

Where should any MSR nomination process stop? For example, the important linkage between coastal zones and riverine routes of exchange and movement. The East Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia group suggested that river routes with no clear connection to the coast should be ruled out of the MSR.

The broader links with the overland routes was discussed extensively. This represents a major intellectual and practical issue. The overland thematic study and nomination strategy could largely ignore these tensions as it focused on Central/Western China to the Mediterranean, through Central Asia and northern South Asia. It recognised the importance of riverine movement, for example along the Amy Darya and Syr Darya, but it did not radically alter the nomination issues. However, as the overland routes approach the Caucasus and Western Asia, the issues of sea crossings (Caspian Sea and Black Sea in particular), and the Mediterranean itself, and the need to integrate land and sea movement, are more problematic. The same can be said for the eastern part of the Silk Roads, with the Korean peninsula and Japan both presenting interconnected patterns of sea, river and overland connectivity and impact.

The division between land and maritime routes seems increasingly artificial in these contexts.

In general, trans-peninsular routes could provide an opportunity for smaller sites to gain recognition. A collection of sites under a larger conceptual framework could help highlight significance.

Wrecks, cargoes and museum collections

Considerable debate took place regarding the significance of cargoes, both in terms of sourcing materials, and understanding the organisation and networks of exchange. For

¹ Westerdahl, C. 1992. The maritime cultural landscape. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*. 21 (1), 5-14. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-9270.1992.tb00336.x

example, the shipwreck discussion group (see Annex 2) defined the ways in which shipwreck sites could be used in this project:

1. Trans-regional transfers of cargoes (at least more than two regions) and,
2. Trans-regional transfers of nautical technology (e.g. hull construction).

The group also suggested that 'valid' sites would constitute:

- Sites that have been excavated where the hull remains in place
- Sites that have been academically researched, excavated, and published (i.e. treasure-hunted sites and controversial sites would be omitted)
- That there should be a focus on indigenous shipwrecks.

The importance of excavated cargoes in articulating the complexity of the MSR through museum displays/collections was also highlighted. How these might be included in any nomination process was discussed, with no clear resolution of a way forward.

Intangible heritage

The issue of the intangible heritage of the MSR was discussed extensively and was clearly a major issue. Although not part of a tangible attribute to World Heritage nomination, under the existing implementations of the UNESCO Conventions, it is evidently a crucial issue when considering the impacts of the MSR and issues of cultural exchange.

Food and communities, not just trade and empire systems.

Markets: growth and size could be a tangible way of measuring impact.

World Systems Theory

Some argued World Systems Theory useful, as less nationalistic, and could help to reflect complexity. Others were much less comfortable with it in the context of the MSR.

Other points raised

Examining the movement of goods or people produces very different types of connections.

Sea and experience – new ways of thinking about the sea – the geography of the sea.

Technology – needs to be examined (see shipwrecks, Annex 2).

What constitutes a site? Debate on what else can be constituted as a 'site', such as mooring stones?

The importance of ethnographic research was highlighted.

The question of how to develop and sustain cross-regional research was raised.

Nomination strategy

During the course of the two days, the form of any nomination strategy for the MSR was frequently discussed. A number of key issues arose:

1. **Would it be best to integrate the MSR with the overland SR and consider these as a complex inter-connected phenomenon?** This would require reshaping the existing nomination strategy. **Or is it more appropriate to look at the MSR and SR as somewhat different, requiring their own approaches?**

2. Allied to point 1, **should the MSR follow the overland routes in establishing a Coordinating Committee, or should the existing Silk Roads Coordinating Committee consider extending its remit to incorporate the MSR?**
3. Should the MSR follow the overland Silk Roads Coordinating Committee's decision to advocate transnational working, in the broader spirit of the Silk Roads, or is the nature of exchange and impact so different for the MSR, with long-distance point-to-point impact, that single country nominations would be appropriate?
4. There is a need to reflect a range of sites, including smaller sites, in any nomination strategy. But how will State Parties want to do this – and do local communities want this to happen?
5. The significance of the material evidence of long-distance exchange (including cargoes, with their insights in to the organisation of this process) was broadly recognised, but it was also recognised that there was a difficulty including this in any World Heritage nomination process, as currently defined by the Operational Guidelines: any such evidence needs material expression at a place. However, **the definition of place-based heritage creates significant tensions with wider theoretically concepts of maritime heritage and its relationship with peoples and communities.**
6. Would an approach based around thematic aspects, such as took place with pearling (see the West Indian Ocean breakout group – see Annex 1), be useful?
7. There are already many World Heritage Sites along the MSR (a review of which would be useful). Could these develop a stronger dialogue? It was pointed out that there is currently a western bias in the present sites.
8. How to define the OUV of any specific MSR nominations?
9. The issues of the heritage preserved in International Waters and the approaches to safeguarding such material.

Next steps

1. The meeting concluded that the *draft discussion paper*, circulated in advance of the meeting, could be updated as a result of the meeting, to serve as a basis for further dialogue (Annex 4).
2. A **Concept Paper for the World Heritage nomination of the Maritime Silk Routes** was thought to be necessary. This should involve decisions regarding the role of the MSR in relation to the overland SR, and the relationship/role of the existing Silk Roads Coordinating Committee.
3. Another **Expert Meeting may be useful to enable further discussions, perhaps to draft a Concept Paper for the World Heritage Nomination of the Maritime Silk Routes**, before such a draft is circulated to the State Parties.
4. The Concept Paper should form a concrete platform from which dialogue and debate can advance. This will support, in turn, the development of **inventory projects and thematic studies**. Lists of surviving heritage, compiled by each State Party, to provide a basis for the discussion and refining of the criteria, ultimately leading to more robust tentative lists.

To facilitate the development of the **Concept Paper**, some issues that emerged from the meeting were:

- Consider whether to integrate the MSR with the overland SR, or look at the MSR as a separate project?
- Establishment of criteria for the nomination of the MSR heritage.
- Ensure that these criteria reflect the complex maritime networks, including human, religious, cultural, socio-economical, and technological movements. The need to explore these as inter-connected phenomenon, e.g. trade and pilgrimage were often closely connected.

- Explore the potential of 'SEAscapes'/cultural landscapes, instead of routes, as a way to incorporate tangible heritage (such as wreck sites), with non-tangible narratives (such as myths and cultural practices associated with the sea), and as a mechanism for management, tourism development and ideas of living heritage. How might these be conceptualized?
- Explore networks of connections and how they shifted in scale and complexity over time. 'Map' these relations for each site - identification of hinterland and riverine connections would be important.

Research issues

- Existing information on wreck sites, maritime routes, and cargo distribution could be consolidated. Recording networks of ceramic kilns and cargo types.
- There have been limited studies on how South and Southeast Asian interactions and transformations interplay with regional development, when compared to Western to Eastern literature.
- Case studies of existing World Heritage Sites (see thematic discussion group, Annex 2) could help to define issues.
- The MSR project could help promote high quality archaeological excavations, survey and research to identify key sites and chronologies.

Practice

- The MSR agenda could raise interest in smaller sites and potentially lead to the dissemination of good research standards.
- The MSR could help to create a narrative that drew upon intangible heritage, such as sea nomad stories, to help unify the tangible sites for nomination.
- Exhibition narratives should be encouraged to stress the proper conduct of maritime research projects and highlight the losses from previous controversial and/or not well-regulated projects.

Annex 1 Breakout sessions: regional discussion groups

During the meeting, three regional discussion groups (East Asia; South East Asia & East Indian Ocean; Western Indian Ocean and Red Sea) and five thematic discussion groups (Port and hinterlands; Routes; Shipwrecks; Communities; Case Studies) were convened. Notes on most of these groups were compiled by group rapporteurs; the groups on Port and hinterlands; Routes; and Communities did not provide notes.

I. East Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia Group (notes by Phacharaporn PHANOMVAN and Bérénice BELLINA-PRYCE)

Participants

Phacharaporn Phanomvan, Bérénice Bellina-Pryce, Veronica Walker-Vadillo, Gamini Wijesuriya, Kwa Chong Guan, Brian Fahy, Himanshu Prabha Ray, Dean Sully, Haiming Yan, Jagjeet Lally, Sam Nixon

Chronology

We proposed that the start of maritime contacts in Southeast Asia began during the 4th century BCE with the appearance of Iron Age *entrepôts* and interactive communities in South Asia like Mantota, Beluwala, and Godhavaya. These coastal interactive settlements also appear in various locations in Southeast Asia such as Myanmar (i.e. Dawei), Vietnam (i.e. Oc Eo), Thailand (i.e. Khao Sam Kaeo), Malaysia (i.e. Sungai Batu), and Indonesia (Sumatra, Palembang).

We concluded that the concept of Maritime Silk Road should end with the invention of steam engine and modern freight system in the mid-19th century CE. The reason for this date was based on the idea of the influence of the Trade Winds in maritime transport, an element that was less relevant with the invention of the steam engine. There was a discussion over the transformative roles of European ships operating arbitrage in the South China Sea and the transfer of materials from the Americas, but we think that in a broad perspective the history of European interactions in the Maritime Silk Road should also be considered as part of the transformative process in the regional dynamics.

Name

We agreed that Maritime Silk Road is a mainstream term that appeals to the public. However, we think that it's necessary to stress narratives and references to non-silk activities.

Shipwrecks and material from shipwreck

We discussed the potential of looking at cargo types in wreck sites to identify networks of ceramic kilns and other cargo types such as iron. There are existing lists that could be used to consolidate information on wreck sites, maritime routes, and cargo distribution. We agreed that recording networks of ceramic kilns and cargo types are critical. There are also discussions of textiles (cotton/silk), tin, and other materials which are part of historical narrative but are not identifiable in shipwrecks. In practice, it may be useful to start with cargo types that are largely representative and beneficial.

We discussed that MSR could act as a premise for thorough archaeological excavations and research regarding identifying key sites and chronology. MSR agenda can raise interest in smaller along-the-route sites and potentially lead to trickle-down of good research standards

among smaller sites. Sites and routes can be lumped into key sites and its relationship with minor sites through proper chronology.

An important aspect that came up is the showcasing of more controversial material, how the exhibits are managed. The narratives should stress lessons about proper conduct, as well as losses from previously controversial or not well-regulated projects.

The potential of nominating 'SEAsCapes' instead of trade routes came up as a way to incorporate tangible heritage such as rich wreck sites with non-tangible narratives like myths and cultural practices associated with the sea.

Inter and Intra-Connections: Overlapping territories: materials aspect

We discussed the potential types of routes and how tangible heritage can be conceptualised to fit MSR. To separate land road from MSR, we agreed that river routes with no clear connection to the coast should be ruled out of the links to the MSR.

Things that should be identified by the States Parties as types of routes may include sites that are involved with:

- Hierarchy of the port: secondary port rises
- Junctions between land and maritime space
- System of coastal communities
- Have a historical and environmental connection to the sea: Locations for sites that are unique as port towns like, Melaka and Penang
- Tin routes and material routes
- Trans-peninsular routes
- Remains associated to peripheral groups dealing with transpeninsular routes (such as burials and collecting/transshipment locations).
- Business and cultural networks with China.
- Canal system that links to coastal sites
- Twin sites, or the idea of an intensive interaction network forming between two urban sites adapted to receive similar types of ships in terms of infrastructure.

What type of sites do we have?

Key sites that are already registered with UNESCO: Penang, Ayutthaya, Malaka, Goa

Secondary Sites: Angkor, Songkhla, Lopburi

International Sites: separated into those coastal on the mainland and island Southeast Asia
Thaninthari, Myeik, Guangjo, Mantota (SL): Mrauk U, Shantou, Manila, Palembang, Surabaya (Sri Vijaya), Semarang.

Trans-peninsular Routes: opens room for more smaller sites to gain recognition. Material and archaeological evidence sites alone may not be significant, but a collection of sites under a larger conceptual fieldwork can help highlight its significance. Landscapes along the transpeninsular routes could also be considered as Cultural Landscapes.

Sites can be also categorised into different period scopes, based on various characteristics such as hinterland and primary-secondary sites.

How SEA defines maritime landscape and ship: unique characteristics

We closed our discussion with how SEA defines maritime landscapes and ships. We think that SEA and east SA are located in an area that generates unique characteristics. We think

that there are limited studies on how eastern interaction and transformation interplay with regional and trade development, when compared to West to East literatures. For example, China's roles in transforming Vietnam and Cambodia. There are many sites related to MSR that have been listed but not yet incorporated into the maritime landscape. Creating a narrative out of unifying intangible heritage such as sea nomad stories might help unify the sites.

II. Western Indian Ocean group (notes by Eric STAPLES)

Participants

Dionisius Agius, Bulent Aksoy, Mark Beech, Gwyn Campbell, Susan Denyer, Robert Parthesius, Stéphane Pradines, Himanshu Ray, Eric Staples

The question of boundaries: the Mediterranean

The group began with a discussion on whether the Mediterranean should be included in the Maritime Silk Routes (MSR) nomination. Those in favour argued that the Mediterranean was deeply connected with the western Indian Ocean, and in particular with the Red Sea. However, those against including it within the western Indian Ocean region argued that, from a maritime perspective, the western Indian Ocean had a series of commonalities lacking in the Mediterranean; such as a shared boatbuilding and navigational practices that were distinctly different. There was a general, but not unanimous, consensus that while there were clearly a significant level of interaction and exchange between the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean should be considered a separate region. However, the option of adding the Mediterranean as an additional region included under the MSR umbrella could be considered at a future date if required.

The question of organizational units: the monsoonal trade route zones

The next big question was how to sub-divide the western Indian Ocean into meaningful categories. The main issue is that ports and coastal settlements are incredibly temporally specific and shift from one era to another, and that vessels rarely sail in a straight line one only from one port to another and back. However, the environmental constraints of the monsoons created a certain degree of *longue durée* continuity with certain routes. It was suggested that monsoonal route zones be considered as a meaningful organizational scheme. The West-Asian-East African zone was discussed as a potential route zone. Although the ports changed with time, the monsoons required that every year those from West Asia sail south along the East African coast during the northeast monsoons from October to January and then return in March-April, with the beginning of the southwest monsoons. Within this general framework, the changing complexity of the sailing routes could then be developed with localized sites and layers of specific periodization in order to provide a more nuanced and less port-specific approach to the routes.

The question of periodization

Another big issue related to the start and end dates for the MSR. The question of whether an exact chronology had to be agreed upon between the three main regions (western Indian Ocean, eastern Indian Ocean and China Sea) was raised but not answered. It was suggested that the origins of the maritime trade in the Indian Ocean could begin with the Ubaid era networks, but others felt that Ubaid was too early, and that it belonged to a different narrative than the one trying to be told. No start date was agreed upon.

More time was spent discussing the end date. The role of the Europeans in altering the pre-existing trade networks was debated. On one hand, they definitely had an impact, but on the other hand, it was not a complete transformation. Once they became involved in the Indian

Ocean, it also increased Indian Ocean interaction with the Atlantic and later the eastern Pacific, but it was primarily agreed upon that these should not be included in the MSR. Many argued for a mid-to-end of the nineteenth century cut-off date, due to the shift from sail to steam, which freed shipping from its previous monsoonal patterns. However, others pointed out that the informal dhow economy continued well into the second half of the twentieth trade, contending that the dominant narrative of the transformational impact of steam technology on western Indian Ocean maritime routes should be challenged.

Some questioned whether a chronological end date was required at all. However, the point was made that if nineteenth- and twentieth-century sites were included, many of the significant pre-modern sites would be ignored by state parties in favour of the more recent and 'flashy' modern sites. There was no resolution, to either the beginning or end dates, but a variety of interesting points were made.

Pearling

The case study of pearling was mentioned as an interesting model for a transnational element of the MSR, which had the potential to connect the Gulf States with other producers such as Sri Lanka, or with markets such as India. Previous cooperation between Gulf States regarding pearling heritage has been limited, but perhaps this could change with a transnational, UNESCO-organized framework.

III. East Asian Regional Group (notes by Jun KIMURA)

Participants

Jun Kimura, Roland Lin Chih-Hung, Lu Zhou, Yunci Cai, Wang Shaohan, Bobby Orillaneda, Jun Kimura, Gay Lacsina, Nia Ridwan, Tim Winter, Wang Shaochen, Pang Rui, Seoung-ok Beack, Lu Qiong, Lu Zhou, Yijie Zhuang, Susan Whitfield

Aim

- Defining the regional segments and chronology of the Maritime Silk Routes in East Asia
- Examining East Asian sea corridors to be presented in the existing MSR concept and resources
- Identifying the physical evidence of the MSR (Cultural heritage related to the Port and hinterlands; Routes; Shipwrecks; Communities; Case Studies) in East Asia.

Discussion topics

There were regional maritime networks in the States Parties of all East Asian countries, some of which could play a significant role in the MSR: the MSR in East Asia stretched from the southern China to Japan. The regional maritime networks could develop in rich waters of East Asia: along the coasts of the East China Sea, the South China Sea, and the Korean Peninsula as well as in the Marginal Sea, including the West Sea and the East Sea, connected to Inland Sea (e.g. Setonailai), and inland water systems (cannels in the mainland China and in the Korean Peninsula).

The existing concept of the MSR does not necessarily represent the complex regional maritime networks, which need to be re-evaluated with a focus on human movements, religious, cultural, socio-economical, and technological elements related to seafaring past, such as *ritual practices for safe voyage* (e.g. Okinoshima), *Buddhism pilgrim seafaring routes* (e.g. Chinese monks travelled India), *maritime trading policy and system developments* (e.g. Korean Silla merchant activities and Chinese Officers Shibosi), and *innovations* (e.g. shipbuilding).

What is the remaining evidence for the MSR in East Asian, which can potentially be nominated as the cultural heritage of the MSR? *Excavated artefacts and museum collections of the imported MSR trading items* (e.g. glass, spices, aroma woods, metal objects, Shosoin collections, etc.), *production sites of exportation seaborne commodities* (e.g. Changsha kiln sites and silk production sites), *port cities* (e.g. Guangzhou in China, Baekje in Korea, and Hakata in Japan), and Underwater Cultural Heritage (e.g. Shinan shipwreck).

Suggestions

- Establishment of criteria for the nomination of the MSR heritage in East Asia
- Development of the potential lists of surviving heritage by each East Asian State Parties.

Annex 2 Breakout sessions: thematic discussion groups

A. Thematic group on Shipwrecks as part of a possible Maritime Silk Route World Heritage property (notes by Gay LACSINA)

Participants

Brian Fahy, Bobby Orillaneda, Jun Kimura, Gay Lacsina, Veronica Walker-Vadillo, Nia Ridwan.

Notes

The aim was to discuss the potential of using shipwreck sites as a tool to support the nomination of the Maritime Silk Route as a World Heritage property.

We were initially tasked with attempting to define a 'beginning' and 'end' date to the nomination using shipwrecks as a rubric. The team concluded that the Godavaya Shipwreck, dating to the 1st Century BCE, would be the earliest site throughout the route that can be catalogued and approved academically.

An upper limit was tentatively given, namely right before the Colonial Age, given that if we considered The Colonial Age, we would need to incorporate several European countries in ratification and we would also need to extend the Maritime Silk Route eastward across the Pacific, then including the Americas. (Note: in the post-thematic discussion, it was largely agreed that there should be no upper limit to the nomination.)

We needed to define in what way shipwreck sites could be used in this context. We would need to understand these sites as:

1. Trans-regional transfers of cargoes (at least more than two regions) and,
2. Trans-regional transfers of nautical technology (e.g. hull construction)

To identify shipwrecks as 'sites', we needed to decide what would constitute a 'valid' site.

These can come in many forms:

- Sites that have been excavated that the hull remains in place
- Sites that have been academically researched, excavated, and published (i.e. treasure-hunted sites and controversial sites would be omitted)
- A focus on indigenous shipwrecks.

There was a debate on what else can constitute a 'site'. Can we include mooring stones? Can we include stone anchors?

Sites that we can be sure to include (this list is incomplete):

- Godavaya Shipwreck- 1st Century BCE Sri Lanka
- Cirebon – 10th Century CE lashed lug (while this was commercially excavated, the lashed-lug remains are in situ and can be re-examined)
- Lena Shoal – 15th Century CE Southeast Asian hybrid junk, Philippines
- Butuan Boats – Philippines (there are boat remains)
- Punjuharjo – 7th Century CE
- Nanhai I
- Nanao I
- Huangguangjiao !

- Rang Kwien
- Ko Si Chang III
- Santa Cruz

Sites that we should not use do to the nature of the excavations (treasure hunted) include amongst others Bakau and Beilitung.

B. Thematic group on selecting three case studies for Maritime Silk Routes (notes by Tim WINTER)

Participants

Robert Parthesius, Roland Lin Chih-Hung, Bérénice Billina-Pryce, Gamini Wijesuriya, Himanshu Prabha Ray, Veronica Walker-Vadillo, Lu Zhou, Yunci Cai, Wang Shaohan, Kwa Chong Guan, Tim Winter.

Notes

The aim was to identify three case study sites that could be conceptualized and reframed through the lens of the Maritime Silk Routes. It was agreed that this exercise would be most productive by choosing three sites already listed as World Heritage properties. The group discussed how this would be undertaken both conceptually and pragmatically and a short list of sites was identified.

It was identified that the process to re-nominate a World Heritage property is effectively the same as a new nomination. Hence this would be a lengthy and significant process to pursue. The group therefore identified other approaches for reframing the three selected sites as Maritime Silk Routes.

It was initially discussed that a Maritime Silk Route could be conceptualized as a cultural landscape. This would offer an appropriate methodology for dealing with problems of management, tourism development and ideas of living heritage. It was however recognized that the cultural landscape approach brings its own problems. The cultural landscape methodology raised questions of possibly identifying seascapes or maritime cultural landscapes and how they might be conceptualized.

An alternative methodology would be to establish a time-space continuum. This approach identifies the networks of connections for a particular place, and how they shifted in scale and complexity at different moments in history. The aim would be to 'map' these time-space relations for each site. One key point here was the identification of hinterland and riverine connections.

In broad terms, a key aim would be to identify networks of connections. These could include trade, religion, gastronomy, technologies, urban planning and material culture histories. The aim, therefore, would be to reinterpret these three existing World Heritage Sites in terms of connections to the environment and other locations in their region and across the Maritime Silk Routes. The key idea here then is the possibility for new forms/approaches to site interpretation. This raised questions of historiography and whether approaches such as world systems theory could offer new insights? Or whether normative accounts of empire and trade could be productively reconstructed.

Approaching a site as a landscape of the Maritime Silk Route could also involve the identification of other heritage assets, not previously designated as significant within the existing world heritage nomination. The example of Galle was given whereby shipwrecks in the harbour and a number of intangible values associated with wrecks could be identified.

It was suggested that museums could be a productive means for offering new interpretations. And the idea of identifying various interpretation mechanisms such as guides, signage, tour guides could also be explored as a means for producing new heritage narratives.

The group identified a short list for the three case studies:

- Macau
- Malacca
- Galle
- Ayutthaya
- Ajanta
- Lamu
- Frankincense Trail
- Kilwa

The group agreed this exercise represented a good model for future cooperation. To that end Robert Parthesius indicated he was happy to consider how he might be able to take this forward in a way that would be integrated with the 'NEXT STEPS' identified for the group as a whole.

Annex 3 Participants

(See the cover page of the report: Group photo of the London UNESCO Expert Meeting participants)

UNESCO-ICOMOS-UCL Core team/co-organisers

1. **Dr Feng JING**, Chief, Asia/Pacific Unit, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris (f.jing@unesco.org)

Educated in English literature, international studies and the history of architecture at Lanzhou University and Tsinghua University of China, from which he also holds a PhD in the history and theory of architecture. For the past thirty years, his career has combined professional experience in heritage management and international cooperation for culture. He has directed and managed the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and other major World Heritage conservation projects throughout the region of Asia and the Pacific, from the perspective of both the States Parties (as a member of the World Heritage Committee between 1992 and 1997) and the Secretariat (as a member of staff at the World Heritage Centre since 1997). He is currently Chief of the Asia and the Pacific Unit at UNESCO's World Heritage Centre (Paris), where he is responsible for the implementation of the 1972 World Heritage Convention in 47 countries. He also heads the UNESCO Culture Sector's programme activities for tangible heritage in the Asia and the Pacific region and other associated World Heritage programmes in 14 Field Offices. In addition, Dr Jing serves as the UNESCO Director-General's representative to the Governing Council of the Centre of World Natural Heritage Management and Training for the Asia and the Pacific Region in Dehradun (India), a Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO. He is also Chief Coordinator of the Silk Roads World Heritage nomination project since 2005. Dr Jing has published and co-authored several publications and some 20 articles on World Heritage and UNESCO.

2. **Prof/Dr Roland LIN Chih-Hung**, Project Officer, Asia/Pacific Unit, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris (r.lin@unesco.org)

Is a Sino-French city planner and art historian, and currently Project Officer of the Asia-Pacific Unit of the World Heritage Centre at UNESCO Headquarters in France. Within the World Heritage Centre, he coordinates UNESCO cultural heritage safeguarding projects in Central and South Asia, notably the Silk Roads World Heritage Serial and Transnational Nominations; South Asian Cultural Landscape Preservation project in Bhutan and Lumbini, birthplace of the Lord Buddha preservation project in Nepal. He also manages World Heritage issues in India, Nepal, Bhutan, the Maldives, as well as five Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). Born in Taiwan, but living and working in Paris, France since 1991, Prof/Dr Lin received his PhD in Art History and Archaeology from Paris-Sorbonne University in 1998, in addition to previous diplomas in City Planning and Oriental Metropolis Studies, as well as Gardens, Landscape and Territorial Studies. In addition to his duties at UNESCO, he holds two Visiting Professorships in China (Tianjin University and Tongji University) and contributes his expertise as Research Fellow to a number of research institutions in France (Sorbonne University and Ecole d'Architecture Paris Belleville) and Germany. He previously contributed as Expert & Advisor for the sustainable urban development of Qufu, Birthplace of Confucius, a World Heritage city in China, through the European Commission's Asia Urbs Programme. He has published extensively, authoring three academic works/books on landscape, historic cities, and World Heritage issues in French and Chinese. He has written over seventy specialized papers on the need for safeguarding world and cultural heritage in Asia.

3. **Susan DENYER**, World Heritage Adviser, ICOMOS London, United Kingdom (SusanDenyer@icomos-uk.org)

World Heritage Adviser for the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Paris, and Secretary of ICOMOS-UK. Has worked for the National Trust, where she was closely involved with the restoration of the Hill Top interior, and helped to set up the Beatrix Potter Gallery in Hawkshead. She has lectured at the Universities of Bath and York, and has written widely on cultural landscapes, including the Lake District.

4. **Tim WILLIAMS**, Reader in Silk Roads Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, UCL (tim.d.williams@ucl.ac.uk)

Degree Programme coordinator for the MA Managing Archaeological Sites & the MA Urban Archaeology, Director of the Ancient Merv Project (Turkmenistan), Member of ICOMOS and the International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM). Background in urban archaeology, especially Roman, Islamic & Central Asian; approaches to complex stratigraphy; earthen architecture conservation; and archaeological site management. Worked for the Department of Urban Archaeology (Museum of London), then Head of Archaeology Commissions at English Heritage, before joining UCL in 2002. Undertook the ICOMOS thematic study of the Silk Roads.

International attendees

Japan

5. **Dr Jun KIMURA**, Associate Professor at Tokai University (junkimura@tsc.u-tokai.ac.jp)

A maritime archaeologist with interests in the archaeological study of historical shipbuilding technology and wreck sites related to naval campaigns and maritime trades in Asia. His expertise extends to Underwater Cultural Heritage management and protection. His PhD is from Flinders University in South Australia. His major publication includes *Archaeology of East Asian Shipbuilding*. He is currently an advisory member of the National Underwater Site Investigation Examination Committee of Japan's Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. He is also Principal investigator of the international project on the study of the eight/ninth-century South-East Asian shipwreck found in Vietnam.

Republic of Korea

6. **Seoung-ok BEACK**, Chief Curator Korean National Maritime Museum, Republic of Korea (kaya100@knmm.or.kr)

Chief Curator of the Korean National Maritime Museum, which houses important collections of Maritime Silk Routes material.

China

7. **Dr Haiming YAN**, Associate Research Fellow, Chinese Academy of Cultural Heritage (CACH) (haimingyan@outlook.com)

As a sociologist, his research interests include cultural sociology, historical sociology, heritage and globalization, and collective memory. He has published in the *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, as well as other journals and edited a number of books. He has been engaged in studying the Maritime Silk Roads over the last two years.

8. **LU Qiong**, ICOMOS China (janeluchina@126.com)

BA in World History and an MA in Art History (Peking University), Director of Department for Law and Polices, SACH, China. Member of ICOMOS China, Research Fellow in a museum in Beijing (2004-2005); Council Member of ICCROM (2011-2015); Board Member of ICOMOS (since 2014). Extensive experience in conservation, management, monitoring and nomination of World Cultural Heritage in China, and actives concerning research, communication and promotion of ICOMOS's concepts. Since 2006, has been involved in the serial transnational nomination of Silk Roads in China.

9. **Prof ZHU Tiequan**, Sun Yat-sen University (zhutq@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

Zhu Tiequan received a bachelor degree from Northwest University of China, majoring in Cultural Relics Preservation, and then a PhD in Archaeometry from the University of Science and Technology of China. Since 2007, he has worked in the School of Sociology and Anthropology. His current research involves maritime archaeology, focusing on the provenance, manufacturing technology, and distribution of Chinese ancient exported porcelain (including the Changsha coloured porcelain, Qingbai wares, longquan & its imitations, and Qinghua porcelain); East African archaeology; conservation of ancient shipwrecks; and intangible cultural heritage (the traditional ceramic manufacturing crafts).

10. **Prof LYU (LU) Zhou**, Professor Tsinghua University, Director of National Heritage Centre, Tsinghua University and Vice-president of ICOMOS-China (lvzhou@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn)

Founder of the Cultural Heritage Conservation Center, president of Architectural History Society of China, and a Council member of ICCROM 2003 to 2011. He has been working in the field of cultural heritage conservation since 1985. In 2003 his project on the conservation and re-use of “Gongziting” (an ancient garden) in Beijing received the UNESCO Asian Pacific Cultural Heritage Conservation Award. After the Wenchuan earthquake in Sichuan Province in 2008, Lyu Zhou with his team undertook the conservation plan and the conservation and restoration project for the damaged historic buildings, listed as World Heritage monuments: ER-wang Temple and Fu-Long Temple. The project of Er-wang Temple received the highest award for conservation in China. The project of Fu-Long Temple received the UNESCO Asian Pacific Cultural Heritage Conservation Award. This work is published in: *The Investigation Report of Post-earthquake Rescue and Conservation of Er-wang Temple in Dujiangyan* (by Cultural Relics Press, 2010). He has participated in many international conservation activities: in 2004, China hosted the 28th World Heritage Committee Session in Suzhou during which he was the cultural heritage advisor to the chair. From 2004-2006 he conducted a feasibility study for the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for Asia and Pacific Region (WHITRAP). In 2005, for his contribution on the exchange and co-operation between China and Italy, the President of Italy conferred him “Ha Coferto l’Onorificenza di Cavaliere”. Since 2009, he is engaged with the revision of the Principles of Conservation of Cultural Heritage in China for (ICOMOS-China) and he is an advisor for the World Heritage site nomination works of Kamakura, Hiraizumi, Mt. Fuji and Mozu-Furuichi Kofungun in Japan. ICCROM general assembly in 2013 offered him ICCROM Award as recognition of his work.

South-Eastern Asia

See also Dr Bérénice Bellina-Pryce & Phacharaporn Phanomvan (below)

Philippines

11. **Dr Ligaya LACSINA**, Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Division, National Museum of the Philippines (gaylacsina@gmail.com)

Gay Lacsina undertook a PhD candidate at Flinders University's Department of Archaeology. In 2009, she received both an MA in Archaeology from the University of the Philippines and a Graduate Certificate in Maritime Archaeology from Flinders. She has worked as a Museum Researcher at the National Museum of the Philippines Archaeology Division since 2004.

12. **Bobby ORILLANEDA**, National Museum of the Philippines (bobby.orillaneda@linacre.ox.ac.uk)

A Museum Researcher at the Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage (MUCH) Division at the National Museum of the Philippines and currently finishing his doctoral studies at the Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology (OCMA) at the University of Oxford. He started doing maritime archaeology in 1999 and has been involved in shipwreck exploration and excavation projects in the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Egypt. He is also part of a training team that carries out maritime archaeology capacity-building programs in Taiwan, Thailand and Indonesia. His research interests include Southeast Asian maritime trade, Southeast Asian and Chinese ceramics and the Manila galleon trade.

Indonesia

13. **Nia Naelul Hasanah RIDWAN**, Research Institute for Coastal & Marine Resources & Vulnerability, Indonesia (niahasanah79@gmail.com)

Maritime Archaeology Research Scientist working in Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries since 2005. Head of Research Cooperation and Technical Services Division since 2011. Graduated from Department of Archaeology, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, and hold a Master of Social Science-Environment and Heritage from James Cook University, Australia. Carried out numerous research on underwater heritage sites throughout Indonesian. For her dedication in researching underwater heritage for its preservation and investigating an illicit trafficking of underwater remains, The President of Republic Indonesia awarded her with Satya Lancana Wira Karya Award in August 2015. Besides underwater heritage sites, her research also focuses on the relationship between underwater heritage and its environment, including heritages' vulnerability from natural and human threats, exploring ways to mitigate these and to examine the integrated preservation and management of underwater heritage. Her skills and interest include conservation and preservation, maritime history, environmental history, cultural heritage policy, maritime museum affairs, community engagement on heritage preservation, marine-heritage tourism, and illicit trafficking of underwater remains.

Nia attended the UNESCO Foundation Course on Underwater Cultural Heritage (2010) and UNESCO In Situ Preservation Course (2011) in Thailand; 3 training courses organized by ICCROM - SEAMEO SPAFA-The Getty Foundation in Thailand (2010), in Singapore (2011), and in The Philippine (2011); Course on Managing Climate Risks towards a Sustainable Conservation of Mutual Cultural Heritage in Brazil (2011) organized by The Netherlands Cultural Heritage Agency; ICCROM Forum on Science in Conservation in Italy (2013), and several training courses in national level. She has published 55 articles in journals, books, newsletters, and also presented her research results at many conferences. In November 2016, she delivered speech on UNESCO 2001 Convention Roundtable: Connecting Underwater Cultural Heritage Research and Protection Worldwide in Fremantle, Australia.

Singapore

14. **Dr Kwa Chong GUAN**, Visiting Fellow, Archaeology Unit of the Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies; Adjunct Associate Professor at the History Department of the National University of Singapore; Senior Fellow at the S Rajaratnam School of International Studies at the Nanyang Technological University (hiskcg@nus.edu.sg)

Works on the intersections of history, archaeology and security studies of Southeast Asia. Kwa is interested in the long cycles of Southeast Asian history and also works on a range of regional security issues with a focus on the implicit narratives underlying our framing of regional security. He started his career working on policy analysis in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and then the Ministry of Defence before being assigned to reorganize the Oral History Department in the National Archives and concurrently, the old National Museum. He continues to be associated with these heritage institutions in various advisory capacities and as Chairman of the National Archives Advisory Committee. His latest publications includes *The Maritime Silk Road; History of an Idea*, Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Working Paper No. 23 (ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute 2016); *Early Southeast Asia Viewed from India; An Anthology of Articles from the Journal of the Greater India society* (2013). Other books includes *Singapore: A 700-Year History; From Early Emporium to World City* (2009), co-authored with Derek Heng and Tan Tai Yong; *China-ASEAN Sub-regional Cooperation; Progress, Problems and Prospects* (2011), co-edited with Mingjiang Li, *Energy Security; Asia Pacific Perspectives* (2010), co-edited with Virendra Gupta, and *Maritime Security in Southeast Asia* (2007), co-edited with John Skogan.

India

15. **Prof Himanshu Prabha RAY**, Honorary Professor, Distant Worlds Graduate Studies Programme, Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich and Research Fellow, Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies. Former Chairperson of National Monuments Authority, New Delhi, and Professor, Centre for Historical Studies (CHS), Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi (rayhimanshuprabha@gmail.com)

Himanshu Prabha Ray is recipient of the Anneliese Maier research award (2013-2018) of the Humboldt Foundation and is affiliated to Ludwig Maximilian University Munich. She is former Chairperson of the National Monuments Authority (NMA), Ministry of Culture, Government of India and former Professor, Centre for Historical Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. During her tenure at NMA, she presented Project Mausam on behalf of the Ministry of Culture at the June 2014 World Heritage Committee meeting in Doha, Qatar. Her publications on the theme include edited volumes: *Bridging the Gulf: Maritime Cultural Heritage of the Western Indian Ocean*, India International Centre & Manohar Publishers, 2016; *Mausam: Maritime Cultural Landscapes across the Indian Ocean*, NMA and Aryan Books, 2014. She is currently working on a monograph tentatively titled: *Sailing to Suvarnabhumi: Cultural Routes and Maritime Landscapes* at the invitation of Research and Information Systems for Developing Countries, New Delhi.

Sri Lanka

16. **Gamini WIJESURIYA**, ICCROM (gw@iccrom.org)

Gamini Wijesuriya is a project manager of the Sites Unit of ICCROM (since 2005) and his current work involves World Heritage, planning and implementation of a variety of capacity development programmes. Gamini was a lead author of the resource manual on Managing Cultural World Heritage and has many publications to his credit. Previously he

held the posts of Director-Conservation of the government of Sri Lanka (1983-1999) and Principal Regional Scientist of the Department of Conservation (2001-2005) in New Zealand.

Abu Dhabi Emirate

17. **Dr Mark BEECH**, Head of Coastal Heritage and Palaeontology Section, Historic Environment Department at Department of Culture and Tourism (DCT), Abu Dhabi (mark.beech@tcaabudhabi.ae & beeceh@emirates.net.ae)

Since 2012 Head of Coastal Heritage and Palaeontology in the Historic Environment Department at TCA Abu Dhabi. Dr Beech was Senior Resident Archaeologist for the Abu Dhabi Islands Archaeological Survey (ADIAS) from 1994-2006, then Head of Cultural Landscapes in the Historic Environment Department at the Abu Dhabi Authority for Culture and Heritage (ADACH) from 2006-12. He has a Bachelor of Science Honours Degree in Archaeology from UCL Institute of Archaeology (1982-85), a Masters Degree (with Distinction) in Environmental Archaeology from the University of Sheffield (1986-87), and a PhD in Archaeology from the University of York, UK (1997-2001). In 2009 Dr Beech received the Sheikh Mubarak Bin Mohammed Natural History Prize for 2008 from the Emirates Natural History Group, in recognition of his services to the Archaeology of the UAE.

Oman

18. **Dr Eric STAPLES**, Assistant Professor at Zayed University, Abu Dhabi and Director of Maritime Heritage Projects at The Sultanate of Oman (emstapl@yahoo.com)

Eric Staples is an interdisciplinary maritime historian whose interests include Indian Ocean shipbuilding, seafaring and navigation. He received his PhD in Islamic History from the University of California, Santa Barbara in 2008. In addition to his historical pursuits, he has also been actively involved in a variety of maritime archaeology and experimental archaeology projects. He was the documentation manager and navigator for the Jewel of Muscat Project, a joint Omani-Singapore government initiative to build and sail a reconstruction of a ninth-century sewn ship from along the Maritime Silk Route from Oman to Singapore. From 2010 to 2016, he was the Director of Oman Maritime, overseeing different maritime heritage projects for the Omani government. He is currently an assistant professor at Zayed University, Abu Dhabi, in the United Arab Emirates.

Turkey

19. **Associate Professor Dr Bulent AKSOY**, Gazi Üniversitesi, Department of Social Studies, Turkey (baksoy28@gmail.com)

Dr AKSOY graduated in 1997 from Gazi University Gazi Education Faculty Geography Teaching Department. He worked as a Geography Teacher in Ankara Beypazarı Çayırhoğlu Elementary School between 1997-1998. In 1998, he was appointed as Research Assistant to Geography Education Department of Gazi Education Faculty. He completed his master's degree education in Gazi University in 2000 and doctorate education in 2004. He worked as a lecturer in Gazi Education Faculty Geography Education Department between 2005-2008. In 2008, he was appointed as Assistant Professor in the Department of Social Studies Education of Gazi Education Faculty. In 2015, he acquired the title of associate professor in the field of Geography Education. His research interests are Geography Education, Silk Road and Political Geography studies. Bulent AKSOY has published articles and notices in international and nationally recognized journals, and book sections published in national and international books.

East Africa

See also Stéphane Pradines (below)

International scholars

20. **Dr Bérénice BELLINA-PRYCE**, Senior Researcher, Maison Archéologie Ethnologie, CNRS (berenice.bellina@cnrs.fr)

Research focuses on exchange and cultural transfer processes around the Indian Ocean and more especially between South and Southeast Asia. She uses the technological analysis of industries as a means to comprehend socio-political processes and to reconstruct the impact of long-distance exchange and local resource acquisition on ethnicity and identity construction. Since 2005, she is the director of the Thai-French Archaeological Mission in Upper Thai-Malay Peninsula that investigates the co-evolution of the different populations and ecosystems in relation to long-distance exchange from the early/mid first millennium BC to the late first millennium AD. She also has developed an interest in heritage, with a special focus on present-day representations and uses of the past in Southeast Asia. The Thai-French Research programme is involved with local communities participative patrimonialisation in the frame of the creation of a heritage centre in the region of Chumphon; a project combining social anthropology, technologies, archaeology, history, botany and museology.

21. **Professor Gwyn CAMPBELL**, Director Indian Ocean World Centre, McGill University, Canada (gwyn.campbell@mcgill.ca)

Gwyn Campbell is a Canada Research Chair and Founding Director of the Indian Ocean World Centre (IOWC), McGill University (<http://indianoceanworldcentre.com/>). Director of Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) researching ‘The Rise of the Indian Ocean World Global Economy in the Context of Human-Environment Interaction’ tenable to 2018, he also holds a Humboldt Award (2017-19) in Indian Ocean World studies. He is General Editor of the Indian Ocean World Studies series, Palgrave Macmillan and Founder and Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Indian Ocean World Studies (JIOWS). Selected publications include: *Africa and the Indian Ocean World from early times to 1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming); with Pedro Machado and Sarah Fee, eds., *An Ocean of Cloth: Textile Trades, Consumer Cultures and the Textile Worlds of the Indian Ocean* (London: Palgrave Macmillan in press); ed., *Africa and the Early Indian Ocean World Exchange to circa 1300* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); ed., *The Structure of Slavery in Indian Ocean Africa and Asia* (London: Frank Cass, 2004).

22. **Professor Tim WINTER**, Deakin University & President Association of Critical Heritage Studies (timwinter@me.com)

Tim Winter is Research Professor at the Alfred Deakin Institute, Deakin University, Melbourne. He is also President of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies and been a Scholar at the University of Cambridge, The Getty and Asia Research Institute, Singapore. He has published widely on cultural heritage, urban conservation, and the international politics of heritage. His recent publications include *The Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia and Preservation and Diplomacy (Future Anterior)*. He is currently finalising a book on the Silk Roads, addressing the links between cultural heritage, conservation and the trade and diplomatic agendas of Belt and Road.

23. **Dr Robert PARTHESIUS**, Director Dhakira, Center for Heritage Studies in the UAE, and Associate Professor New York University Abu Dhabi (rp1768@nyu.edu)

Robert is Chairman of the Center for International Heritage Activities, and Associate Professor Archaeology at the Leiden University in The Netherlands. Initially working as curator of the Amsterdam Museum and lecturer at the University of Amsterdam he developed a track record of research projects and museum exhibitions in Europe, Asia and Australia. Significant projects were initiation of the Maritime Archaeological Unit and the excavation of the Dutch East-Indiaman *Avondster* in Galle, Sri Lanka (1997-2007). He curated international exhibitions on cultural exchange between Europe and Asia in the Australia, Japan, Sri Lanka and Amsterdam. In 2010 the Amsterdam University Press published his book 'Dutch Ships in Tropical Waters'. During his work in Sri Lanka Robert Parthesius developed an interest in heritage studies and the complex relationship between local communities, indigenous knowledge and the management of World Heritage Sites. In 2006 he was appointed as director of the CIE–Centre for international Heritage Activities and associate professor at the University of Leiden, The Netherlands. This institutional base allowed him to further his ideas on alternative heritage management models in our globalizing world. The program of rehabilitation of the cultural sector in Afghanistan and the heritage programs in Sub Sahara Africa in cooperation with Robben Island Museum allowed him, a network of local communities and his research group to bring theory in practice. In the publication 'A changing World, Perspectives on Heritage' (2015) the experiences in Afghanistan are shared. In his capacity as visiting professor at New York University Abu Dhabi he is working since 2013 on the HeritageLab as concept for more inclusive and sustainable models for heritage management. He has organized research and field schools for NYUAD on World Heritage Sites connected through historical Arabian Trade Routes. He has organized at NYUAD the international conferences 'The Unpredictable Past' (2014) and 'Connected Through Heritage' (2015) and is co-organizer of 'Dialogues with the Past' (2016) and Scientific Research for Cultural Heritage (2017)

24. **Emeritus Professor Dionisius A AGIUS**, Exeter University and University of Toronto
(D.A.Agius@exeter.ac.uk)

Dr Dionisius A. Agius is a Fellow of the British Academy. He is Emeritus Al-Qasimi Professor of Arabic Studies and Islamic Material Culture at the University of Exeter and Distinguished Professor at the King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah. An ethno-linguist, his focus is on the material culture, the traditional watercraft, and the people of the sea in the western Indian Ocean. He is author of: *Seafaring in the Arabian Gulf and Oman: People of the Dhow* 2009; *In the Wake of the Dhow: The Arabian Gulf and Oman* 2010; and *Classic Ships of Islam: From Mesopotamia to the Indian Ocean* 2014.

UCL organisation team/helpers and UK attendees

25. **Dr Dean SULLY**, Lecturer in Conservation, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
(d.sully@ucl.ac.uk)

Dean co-ordinates the MSc in Conservation for Archaeology and Museums. This programme teaches a values-based approach to the conservation process, and prepares students for entry into the conservation profession on graduation. He joined UCL in 2000, after studying conservation at UCL, and working as a conservator for the National Heritage Board (Singapore), The Museum of London, The British Museum, and Monmouthshire District Council Museum's Service. Since 2001, as the National Trust's Conservation Advisor for Archaeological Artefacts, he has been involved with the conservation of Hinemihi, the Maori meeting house at Clandon Park, UK. This led to the publication of *Decolonising Conservation* in 2007, and the development of a peoples-based approach to heritage conservation. This advocates a shift in conservation practice from a specialist technical service aimed at preserving heritage, to a mechanism for the creation and recreation of culture.

26. **Dr Gai JORAYEV**, Silk Roads tourism specialist, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
(g.joraev@ucl.ac.uk)

Works at the UCL Institute of Archaeology Centre for Applied Archaeology. Primary research interests are in modern uses of heritage. Currently working on heritage related research initiatives in Central Asia, China and North Africa, with a focus on preservation, public outreach and local capacity building. Gai contributed to work that led to nomination of the overland Silk Roads on the World Heritage List, and he currently collaborates with UNESCO and the World Tourism Organisation on Silk Roads research and heritage-based tourism in Central Asia.

27. **PANG Rui**, Silk Roads project specialist, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
(ruipang@ucl.ac.uk)

Works for the International Centre for Chinese Heritage and Archaeology, and teaches MA course Archaeological Heritage Management in Asia at the UCL Institute of Archaeology. Her PhD research focuses on the management of the Han City of Chang'an. She has been involved in several Silk Roads related projects, including the Silk Roads Interpretation and Presentation Research Project with Northwest University (Chinese National Social Science Foundation) and the Chinese edition of the Silk Roads: an ICOMOS Thematic Study.

28. **Shaohan WANG**, PhD Student, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
(shaohan.wang.15@ucl.ac.uk)

Doctoral student working on the overland Silk Roads transnational nominations and monitoring.

29. **Shaochen WANG**, PhD Student, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
(shaochen.wang@ucl.ac.uk)

Doctoral student working on the Tea & Horse routes in south-western China.

30. **Associate Professor Stéphane PRADINES**, The Aga Khan University, London
(stephane.pradines@aku.edu)

Lectures on Muslim cultures of the Indian Ocean & Indian Ocean trade, working on the Swahili medieval harbour of Kenya; research project concerns navigation, trade and the beginnings of Islam in the Western Indian Ocean: the Swahili Coast, focusing particularly on the beginnings of the Muslim connections with East Africa and how trade propagated Islam in sub-Saharan Africa, including Dembeni, which at its apogee in the 9th - 12th centuries was a period of intensive trade, first with the Abbasids in the Persian Gulf then with the Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt.

31. **Dr Yijie ZHUANG**, Senior Lecturer in Chinese Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, UCL
(y.zhuang@ucl.ac.uk)

Degree Programme co-ordinator MA in Archaeology and Heritage of Asia. Researching diverse trajectories to social complexity in East, South and Southeast Asia. Specialising in geoarchaeology; ecology of early agriculture; long-term land use and landscape changes; irrigation and water management.

32. **Dr Jagjeet LALLY**, Lecturer in the History of India, Department of History, UCL
(jagjeet.lally@ucl.ac.uk)

Undertaken a project on the history of the early modern Silk Roads told from a South Asian perspective, reconstructed through the histories of four commodities: cotton cloth,

horses, indigo, and silk. Also undertaking work on global history of the Himalaya region, developing histories of commodities (opium, sugar, tea, hemp products, salt), and combining this with the histories of pilgrims, mercenaries, spies, and other mobile agents who criss-crossed and connected India with Central and East Asia.

33. **Dr Susan WHITFIELD**, Head of the International Dunhuang Project, British Library (susan.whitfield@bl.uk)

Dr Susan Whitfield is an historian of medieval China and the Silk Roads, and curator of the Stein and related collections of 50,000 Central Asian manuscripts from Dunhuang and other Silk Roads sites at the British Library. She has curated several major exhibitions, lectures internationally and has published many books and articles. Using technology, old and new, to ensure that the collections are preserved for future generations while made fully accessible for this generation has always been an essential part of her work at the British Library. In 1994, along with colleagues worldwide, she was instrumental in establishing an international collaboration to achieve these aims. Although named 'The International Dunhuang Project' (IDP) its remit includes all archaeological artefacts from sites throughout Chinese Central Asia. Most recently she has been working on the material culture of the Silk Roads, on the source and supply of the pigments used in portable and wall paintings, and illuminated manuscripts in India and Central Asia. She is also working, with colleagues, on the spread of paper and textile technology through Central Asia and the Silk Roads, and the development of local centres using local materials. She is increasingly working on the archives resulting from the expeditions of the early 20th century expeditions.

34. **Dr Sam NIXON**, Senior Research Associate, Sainsbury Institute for the Study of Japanese Arts and Cultures (Sam.Nixon@uea.ac.uk)

His research is concerned with investigating pre-modern global trade processes, with a focus on the medieval era of global commerce. Sam has principally conducted research on the Sahara and West Africa, commencing with his PhD on the medieval-era trans-Saharan trading towns of West Africa (UCL, 2008). His excavations at the trans-Saharan trading town of Tadmekka (Republic of Mali) are the subject of a monograph to be published this year with the *Journal of African Archaeology*, and he is also currently preparing a synthetic monograph on trans-Saharan trade for Thames & Hudson, entitled *The Gold Route*. More recently Sam has commenced research on the Silk Road, associated with the development of a research and exhibition project, 'The Arrival of Belief: religion and art at the extremities of the Silk Roads, AD 500-800'. This project, led by Dr Simon Kaner (Sainsbury Institute), intends to explore new perspectives on the Silk Road through investigating the furthest 'extremities' of early medieval Eurasian trade and exchange networks, with a specific focus on Japan and north-western Europe.

35. **Dr Veronica WALKER-VADILLO**, Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology, University of Oxford (veronica.walker@arch.ox.ac.uk)

Veronica Walker-Vadillo holds a BA in History from the University of Alcalá, a Diploma in Far East Asian Studies from Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, an MA in Maritime Archaeology from University College London, and a PhD in Archaeology from the University of Oxford. She specialises in Southeast Asian maritime archaeology, looking particularly at river trade networks during the Angkor era. Her work focuses on the cultural biography of boats and the applications of Westerdahl's concept of the maritime cultural landscape in Southeast Asia. She also works as a professional writer for National Geographic.

36. **Dr Brian FAHY**, Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology, University of Oxford (brian.fahy.arch@gmail.com)

Brian Fahy received his DPhil from the University of Oxford in 2015 on *Holistic Shipwreck Assemblages in 14th and 15th Century Southeast Asia*. Currently he is a Postdoctoral Research Assistant at the Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology, working on coastal ports in the Southeast Asian region. He is also holds a research affiliation with the National Museum of the Philippines and the Underwater Archaeology Division in Thailand.

37. **Phacharaporn PHANOMVAN**, Clarendon Scholar at St. John's College, University of Oxford (phacha.phanomvan@sjc.ox.ac.uk)

Studying for a D.Phil in Economic History at the University of Oxford. Her work focuses on the quantitative history of Southeast Asia during the first millennium CE, focusing on the economic geography of early urban landscapes and cultural/trade networks. Her thesis consolidates archaeological data on trade and settlements from Myanmar, Thailand, and Malaysia. She specializes in Mainland Southeast Asian connectivity with India and China. She is currently directing a research collaboration between Chulalongkorn University and Thailand Ministry of Culture to study early settlements in Eastern Thailand and their roles in the Southern Maritime Silk Road. She also teaches Chinese Economic History at the London School of Economics.

Student helpers/observers

38. **Mr LIU Ji**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, Final year PhD student working on historic village management
39. **Ms Yunci CAI**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, Final year PhD student working on Southeast Asian museology
40. **Mr Konpal Preet KAUR**, MPhil Candidate specialising in maritime archaeology in the Indian Ocean, Kellogg College, University of Oxford
41. **Ms Afifa KHAN**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student
42. **Ms Alison COXHEAD**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student
43. **Ms Elimarie GARCIA COSME**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student
44. **Ms Irene Marti GIL**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student
45. **Ms Jaehee HAN**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student
46. **Ms Sarah FORGESSON**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student
47. **Ms Yunxiao LIU**, UCL Institute of Archaeology, MA student

Annex 4 Discussion paper (attached as a separate document)

A draft discussion paper was circulated in advance of the meeting. Very minor modifications were made to this after the meeting; the paper is attached as a separate document. In the future, this paper could be updated to integrate the results of the discussions reflected in this document. An editorial group was agreed at the meeting: Susan Denyer (ICOMOS), Gamini Wijesuriya (ICCROM), Tim Winter (Deakin University, Australia), Eric Staples (Maritime Heritage Projects, Abu Dhabi), Himanshu Prabha Ray (Jawaharlal Nehru University, India), Yan Haiming (CACH, China).