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Abstract: This article explores the interplay between climate change and cultural heritage, in particular the intangible aspects of cultural heritage, in international legal frameworks, either existing or under development. The prime focus of the current climate change regime of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, leaving certain aspects of cultural heritage rather on the sidelines of debate and policy. However, where climate change combines with generally weak law and policy for culture and traditions, countries vulnerable to climate change may face significant cultural loss in the years to come.

In its inventory of present and contemplated legal protection options, this article draws particular attention to policymaking directed at shaping a “rights-based” system in the form of sui generis rights, to complement any existing intellectual property-based protection. If adequately motivated, indigenous people have a key role to play not only in observing change, but also in developing adaptive models to cope.

INTRODUCTION

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), an international scientific body organized to assess the risks of climate change, has found that the “unequivocal warming of the climate system” as observed in the increase of global average temperature, melting of glaciers and sea level rise is “very likely due to
anthropogenic” (i.e., originating in human activity) greenhouse gas concentration.\(^1\) Consistent with this finding, the prime focus of the current climate change regime led by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.\(^2\)

The UNFCCC’s utilitarian focus leaves certain aspects of cultural heritage on the sidelines of debate and policy. To what extent does climate change influence cultural heritage? Capturing a causal link between climate change and ever-changing cultural heritage presents a serious challenge. The distinction between normal climatic variability and anthropogenic causes adds complexity to such a determination. Recent observations that climate change increasingly makes people move appear to provide an existential foundation for linking climate causes and cultural heritage effects. As discussed in the following text, experts warn that one of the gravest effects of climate change concerns human mobility.\(^3\) In other words, a significant number of people are likely to be forced to, or to voluntarily leave their homeland because of, for example, shoreline erosion, coastal flooding, and agricultural disruption.\(^4\) Countries with populations on the verge of such displacement note that the impact of climate change concerns their survival and security, and “the cultural identity of an entire nation is under threat.”\(^5\)

So far, the adverse effects of climate change on cultural heritage tend to be considered primarily in connection with tangible or physical cultural properties, such as buildings, monuments, or archeological sites destroyed by extreme weather events.\(^6\) Conversely, the effects of climate change on less tangible cultural heritage such as the loss of oral tradition and languages have been receiving less attention.\(^7\)

While the interaction between climate change and cultural heritage has a range of tangible and intangible dimensions, the present article focuses on the “intangible aspects of cultural heritage”\(^8\) as affected by climate change. It explores legal and policy options to place climate change considerations in the context of ongoing efforts to protect intangible cultural heritage within the relevant international legal frameworks.

The second section of the article provides some factual background on climate change-driven migration in and from countries such as the Small Island Developing States (SIDS).\(^9\) Where climate change combines with generally weak law and policy for culture and traditions, some SIDS may face significant cultural loss in the years to come. To support this assessment, this section also presents selected statistics and data relevant to climate change displacement and cultural heritage in these regions.

Against this background of climate change displacement and vulnerability of cultural heritage, the third section of the article looks at several existing climate change-related international legal frameworks applicable to the protection of intangible cultural heritage. In terms of the relationship between climate change and cultural heritage, the climate change regime under the UNFCCC primarily recognizes the usefulness of traditional knowledge in the context of climate change adaptation. This acknowledges the role of local knowledge systems in the way in
which local communities understand and adapt to changes in climate.\textsuperscript{10} This section also touches on the risk management approach of UNESCO and principles under international refugee law to protect cultural rights of refugees.

The fourth section of the article draws attention to lessons from policymaking efforts on shaping a sui generis rights-based system for protecting “traditional cultural expressions” or “expressions of folklore”\textsuperscript{11} complementing any existing intellectual property-based protection through the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and certain regional intellectual property authorities. On the basis of those efforts, this section explores certain law and policy options to enhance the protection of intangible cultural heritage against cultural loss triggered by climate change displacement.

**BACKGROUND: CLIMATE CHANGE DISPLACEMENT AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**

*Climate Change Makes More People Move*

The frequency and severity of certain hazards combined with vulnerability have been generally attributed to climate change.\textsuperscript{12} The IPCC, which assesses scientific, technical, and socioeconomic information relevant to the understanding of climate change,\textsuperscript{13} notes migration as one of the likely key consequences of climate change,\textsuperscript{14} without asserting any “monocausal relationship.”\textsuperscript{15} International agencies concerned with migration and displacement observe that “gradual and sudden environmental changes are already resulting, with anywhere between 50 and 200 million people moving as a result [of rising sea levels, floods, droughts, famine and hurricanes] by the middle of the century, either within their countries or across borders, on a permanent or temporary basis.”\textsuperscript{16} (However, in the absence of a harmonized definition of climate change displacement\textsuperscript{17} and baseline information on levels of climate change causing displacement,\textsuperscript{18} such estimates may vary.)

To answer basic qualitative and quantitative questions,\textsuperscript{19} the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), a mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance among key United Nations (UN) and non-UN humanitarian organizations,\textsuperscript{20} set up an expert group in 2008. Taking an existing categorization for internally displaced persons as a basis, this expert group developed a typology classifying causes of movement, nature of movement, and existing legal frameworks for those moving within or beyond borders.\textsuperscript{21}

The first category is “sudden-onset disaster displacement”\textsuperscript{22} such as floods and storms: for example, 36 million people in 2008 (including 15 million in the Sichuan earthquake in China alone).\textsuperscript{23} The second category is “slow-onset disaster displacement”\textsuperscript{24} such as drought.\textsuperscript{25} The third category, singled out from the second, is displacement linked to sea-level rise.
Climate change displacement linked to sea-level rise is predicted to grow exponentially, particularly in SIDS, Africa, the Asian mega deltas, and the polar regions. Four relocation cases are often dubbed as “the climate canaries” heralding such trends: the Cartaret islands in Papua New Guinea, the Lateu village in Vanuatu, the Shishmaref village on Sarichef island in Alaska, and the submerged Lohachara island in India’s Hooghly River.

While in many cases climate change-displaced persons remain within their country, some may cross borders, into an uncertain legal status. In particular, SIDS have been considering the prospect of international climate change relocation. For example, in 2008 the president of the Maldives announced that the government would begin to divert a portion of the country’s tourist revenue to buying a new homeland as an insurance policy against climate change. He says Sri Lanka and India are regarded as suitable destinations because of their similar cultures, cuisines, and climates; and Australia is under consideration because of its vast unoccupied land.

Kiribati is also looking to acquire land elsewhere so as to relocate communities in danger of being uprooted by rising sea levels. Its government has been trying to secure enhanced labor migration options such as nursing, with an initial target of about 1,000 citizens annually to work in Australia and New Zealand. Through remittances, such migrants can support their extended family members remaining in Kiribati.

It should be noted that relocation between islands or abroad is increasingly common for Pacific islanders. For instance, Tuvalu is a small coral atoll nation—0.1 times the size of Washington, DC—with the highest point reaching only 16 feet above average sea level. It is often depicted as one of the areas most vulnerable to climate change. It had an estimated population of 10,000 as of July 2010. A significant number of additional Tuvaluans have left, including some 3,000 to New Zealand, 300 to Australia, and others to the United States. Such migration reportedly is motivated by environmental concerns, such as sea-level rise, tidal flooding, and salinity of limited arable land, in addition to other economic, political, and social reasons.

The Vulnerability of Cultural Heritage to Climate Change Displacement

When climate change causes migration, what does this mean for the cultural heritage of the land left behind? It has been observed that refugee camps generally show a high level of cultural activity. This phenomenon has been explained as “an empowering way of securing continuity and some semblance of stability” while “enabling [the refugees] to experiment with” new identities, strategies for adaptation and survival. Indeed, maintaining cultural values and traditions on a longer-term basis after settling in a foreign country poses a significant challenge.
A survey of the Tuvaluan community in New Zealand observes that, “although community-based culture is still evident through their church activities, island celebration functions and sports events, they are not as strong as back home in the islands.” Reported reasons include the changes in lifestyle and financial conditions that come with living in New Zealand. Naturally, the traditional Tuvaluan culture blends with that of New Zealand, with the dispersed nature of Tuvaluan settlement in the country further diluting the community-based culture.

Not only those who have left, but also those still on the islands experience “a deep sense of ‘loss’ or at least an expectation of inevitable looming ‘loss’ of place of the home islands which form the very core of their identities.” The loss of their culture and traditions is mentioned as one of the biggest concerns of South Pacific islanders preparing to move. Such feelings of “losing ground” are hardly surprising, because the relationship of indigenous peoples to their land is particularly important to their sovereignty and identity: Will they be able to maintain their culture on foreign soil?

Few available statistics specifically document the extent of climate change-related vulnerabilities of cultural heritage. Within the limits of this article, it may be useful to review certain indicators pertaining to SIDS: for example, whether or not a country is a member of UNESCO; the extent of UNESCO-listed cultural heritage; and the number of languages in the SIDS. Partial and secondary as some of these data may be, they do suggest that protecting the SIDS’ cultural heritage from the effects of climate change is more than an academic concern.

In terms of natural and tangible cultural heritage protection, all of the 38 SIDS that are UN members have also joined the UNFCCC and UNESCO. With five exceptions (Bahamas, Nauru, Singapore, Timor-Lésté, and Tuvalu), they are also members of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention. Although the number of actually inscribed World Heritage properties is relatively small, SIDS members of the convention count 28 items on the World Heritage List (whereas Belize’s Barrier Reef Reserve System also features on the list of World Heritage in Danger).


The Vanuatuan item exemplifies the intangible heritage involved, its vulnerability, and safeguarding efforts. Proclaimed a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity by UNESCO in 2003, Vanuatu’s sand drawings are artful geometric patterns produced directly on the ground to transmit traditional knowledge about local history, indigenous rituals, kinship systems, natural phe-
nomena, and farming techniques. Sand drawing also represents a means of communication among the members of various language groups in the north of the Vanuatu archipelago. Expert sand drawers possess intimate knowledge of the numerous graphic patterns and a deep understanding of their complex layers of meaning.

To help preserve the practice and meaning of Vanuatu sand drawing, Vanuatu’s National Cultural Council, a representative body of cultural policy, initiated a National Action Plan for the Safeguarding of Sand Drawing in 2000. Sponsored by UNESCO and Japan Funds-in-Trust for the Preservation and Promotion of Intangible Cultural Heritage, the National Action Plan consisted of two components: revitalization, transmission, and promotion; and legal protection, income generation, and inventory-making. One project outcome is the National Sand Drawing Festival established in 2004.

A further indicator of vulnerable cultural diversity are the local languages in SIDS. Statistics show SIDS’ rich linguistic heritage. For example, Papua New Guinea is one of the most linguistically diverse and complex areas in the world, with close to 850 indigenous languages spoken, and at least as many traditional communities, among a population of about 6 million. Among these languages,
UNESCO’s Atlas of the World Languages in Danger identifies at least 98 as vulnerable, endangered, or even extinct. See Figure 2.

Vanuatu, a much smaller country with a population of 240,000, still has 110 languages, 46 of which are considered to be at critical risk. Efforts to revitalize such languages notwithstanding, such findings appear to reflect a general trend. Table 1 lists the aforementioned selected indicators of protectable cultural heritage in SIDS, together with the net migration rate per country.

**CLIMATE CHANGE-RELATED INSTRUMENTS AND INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

*The Climate Change Regime Focuses on the Utility of Traditional Knowledge*

Historically, traditional knowledge has been an important source of local innovation to provide solutions for adjusting to the conditions of nature. In this sense, the use of traditional knowledge is often discussed in the context of knowledge...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Island Developing States (SIDS)</th>
<th>Parties to the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) Convention</th>
<th>Parties to the Cultural Diversity Convention</th>
<th>Number of World Heritage Properties Inscribed</th>
<th>Number of Representative Intangible Heritage Listed</th>
<th>Number of Languages (Extant/Extinct)&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Net Migration Rate per 1,000 Persons (2010 est.)&lt;sup&gt;74&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia (Federated States of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Island Developing States (SIDS)</th>
<th>Parties to the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) Convention</th>
<th>Parties to the Cultural Diversity Convention</th>
<th>Number of World Heritage Properties Inscribed</th>
<th>Number of Representative Intangible Heritage Listed</th>
<th>Number of Languages (Extant/Extinct)</th>
<th>Net Migration Rate per 1,000 Persons (2010 est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (4/0)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>841 (830/11)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2/0)</td>
<td>−11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (4/0)</td>
<td>−9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 (21/0)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2/0)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2/0)</td>
<td>−3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2/0)</td>
<td>−11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (3/0)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74 (71/3)</td>
<td>−1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (17/0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Lesté</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~1975</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (3/0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad Tobago</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (6/0)</td>
<td>−7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2/0)</td>
<td>−7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>✚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110 (108/2)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of SIDS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Average: −4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the World Heritage in Danger.
dissemination and technology transfer for climate change adaptation. For example, the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)\textsuperscript{77} documented the practical relevance of traditional knowledge in member countries\textsuperscript{78} for sustainable management of dryland ecosystems.\textsuperscript{79} The UNFCCC, too, acknowledges the importance of using traditional knowledge in climate change adaptation\textsuperscript{80} and aims to promote its dissemination in developing countries. Local knowledge systems can help communities understand and adapt to change in climate.\textsuperscript{81}

Conversely, given the primary concern with the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol, aspects of cultural heritage less utilitarian for the purpose of greenhouse gas reduction, such as traditional cultural expressions (TCEs) or expressions of folklore, hardly figure in the ongoing climate change discussion. For instance, the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects allow developed countries to invest in greenhouse gas emission reduction projects in developing countries, and in return they receive credit for the remission reduction or removal achieved.\textsuperscript{82} Not surprisingly, there is no current CDM project directly involving the protection of TCEs or expressions of folklore, or indeed of cultural heritage in a broader sense.\textsuperscript{83}

The National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA), intended to address the urgent adaptation needs of Least Developed Countries under the auspices of the UNFCCC,\textsuperscript{84} also seems to neglect projects directly related to the protection of cultural heritage. A few SIDS—Samoa, the Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu—have submitted NAPA projects in relation to their tourism industry,\textsuperscript{85} but without express reference to the protection of cultural heritage.

\textbf{UNESCO’s Risk Management Approach for Climate Change Adaptation: The ICOMOS Position}

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre, in its report on climate change and World Heritage,\textsuperscript{86} recognizes climate change as one of a range of factors affecting our natural and cultural heritage. Set out in the following text is UNESCO’s itemization of principal climate change risks and their impact on cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{87}

Noting that conservation of World Heritage is essentially about “the management of change” and that the climate is one such area of change, UNESCO recommends a three-part strategy for safeguarding World Heritage against the emerging climate conditions:\textsuperscript{89}

- Preventive actions: monitoring, reporting and mitigation of climate change effects through environmentally sound choices and decisions at a range of levels: individual, community, institutional and corporate.
- Corrective actions: adaptation to the reality of climate change through global and regional strategies and local management of plans.
• Sharing knowledge: including best practices, research, communication, public and political support, education and training, capacity building, networking, etc.  

Taking a similar approach, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) concludes that

climate change adaptation for cultural heritage should be mainstreamed into the existing methodologies for preservation and conservation of sites, buildings, settlements, landscapes, movable objects and the living traditions and that appropriate standards and protocols should be developed for the purpose. Equally cultural heritage needs and concerns should be mainstreamed into institutional processes and policies for disaster reduction.

Skeptical about such risk management approaches, some scholars observe that, in the climate change regime, cultural heritage struggles to compete against an “avalanche of other urgent resource-demanding concerns.” Part of the problem, they assert, is the cultural heritage regime itself paying little attention to the “cultural heritage values” for mankind. The human and cultural dimension of climate change implies “the need to consider how the loss of tangible heritage places, sites and structures will affect communities and the intangible aspects of culture, or on finding locally appropriate response to this potential loss.” Such understanding of how climate change jeopardizes entire cultures and ways of life is viewed as a catalyst for action. For example, if adequately motivated, indigenous people have a key role not only in observing change, but also in developing adaptive models to cope.

Emerging Climate Change Refugee Policy Proposals and Cultural Heritage

Current international refugee law incorporates the principles of nondiscrimination and national treatment. According to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (the 1951 Refugee Convention), the host country must not discriminate refugees on race, religion, or country of origin. Also, the host country is required to provide treatment “at least as favorable as that accorded to their nationals with respect to freedom to practice their religion and freedom as regards the religious education of their children.”

The latter principle of national treatment is also applied to the protection of industrial property and of rights in literary, artistic, and scientific works. A refugee must be accorded in the country in which he or she has his habitual residence the same protection as is accorded to the nationals of that country. In addition, the 1951 Refugee Convention provides for “intergenerational transmission and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Indicator</th>
<th>Climate Change Risk</th>
<th>Physical, Social, and Cultural Impacts on Cultural Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric moisture change</td>
<td>• Flooding (sea, river)</td>
<td>• pH changes to buried archeological evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intense rainfall</td>
<td>• Loss of stratigraphic integrity caused by cracking and heaving from changes in sediment moisture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in water-table levels</td>
<td>• Data loss preserved in waterlogged/anaerobic/anoxic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in soil chemistry</td>
<td>• Eutrophication accelerating microbial decomposition of organics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ground water changes</td>
<td>• Physical changes to porous building materials and finishes caused by rising damp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in humidity cycles</td>
<td>• Damage caused by faulty or inadequate water disposal systems; historic rain-water goods incapable of handling heavy rain and often difficult to access, maintain, and adjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in time of wetness</td>
<td>• Crystallization and dissolution of salts caused by wetting and drying affecting standing structures, archaeology, wall paintings, frescos, and other decorated surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sea salt chlorides</td>
<td>• Erosion of inorganic and organic materials caused by flood waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Biological attack of organic materials by insects, molds, fungi, and invasive species such as termites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Subsoil instability, ground heave, and subsidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relative humidity cycles/shock causing splitting, cracking, flaking, and dusting of materials and surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Corrosion of metals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other combined effects (e.g., increase in moisture combined with fertilizers and pesticides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature change</td>
<td>• Diurnal, seasonal, extreme events (heat waves, snow loading)</td>
<td>• Deterioration of facades due to thermal stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in freeze-thaw and ice storms, and increase in wet frost</td>
<td>• Freeze-thaw/frost damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Damage inside brick, stone, or ceramics that has gotten wet and frozen within material before drying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Biochemical deterioration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in <em>fitness for purpose</em> of some structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inappropriate adaptation to allow structures to remain in use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Indicator</th>
<th>Climate Change Risk</th>
<th>Physical, Social, and Cultural Impacts on Cultural Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sea-level rise</td>
<td>• Coastal flooding</td>
<td>• Coastal erosion/loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sea-water incursion</td>
<td>• Intermittent introduction of large masses of strange water to the site, which may disturb the metastable equilibrium between artifacts and soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permanent submersion of low-lying areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Population migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disruption of communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of rituals and breakdown of social interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>• Wind-driven rain</td>
<td>• Penetrative moisture into porous cultural heritage materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wind-transported salt</td>
<td>• Static and dynamic loading of historic or archeological structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wind-driven sand</td>
<td>• Structural damage and collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wind gusts and changes in direction</td>
<td>• Deterioration of surfaces caused by erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desertification</td>
<td>• Drought</td>
<td>• Erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heat waves</td>
<td>• Salt weathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fall in water table</td>
<td>• Impact on health of population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Abandonment and collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of cultural memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and pollution acting together</td>
<td>• pH precipitation</td>
<td>• Stone recession by dissolution of carbonates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in deposition of pollutants</td>
<td>• Blackening of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence of biocolonialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and biological effects</td>
<td>• Proliferation of invasive species</td>
<td>• Collapse of structural timber and timber finishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spread of existing and new species of insects</td>
<td>• Reduction in availability of native species for repair and maintenance of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., termites)</td>
<td>• Changes in the natural heritage values of cultural heritage sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in mold growth</td>
<td>• Changes in appearance of landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes to lichen colonies on buildings</td>
<td>• Transformation of communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decline of original plant materials</td>
<td>• Changes the livelihood of traditional settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in family structures as sources of livelihood become more dispersed and distant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-interference of this transmission,” a right of association, and freedom of movement.

One limitation of national treatment or most-favored nation clauses is that, if the host country does not offer its nationals adequate protection of cultural identity or heritage per se, climate change refugees can hardly expect better protection. Considering that international refugee law does not yet cater to issues specifically associated with climate change displacement, some are advocating the creation of a treaty covering climate change refugees. Proponents of such an agreement argue that as climate change refugees’ intangible cultural heritage “is no longer preserved by the laws and institutions of their home state, the legal protection of [climate change refugees’] cultural autonomy may be regarded as a mechanism of preservation, . . . and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage can further support the relocation of entire population and social groups.” Further, some argue that environmental refugees should be given a right to “constitute themselves collectively and maintain their collective identity.”

LESSONS FROM RIGHTS-BASED PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

A wide range of public considerations underlies ongoing efforts to protect intangible cultural heritage. While the 2003 UNESCO Convention does not provide a separate definition of protection as such, the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (the 2005 UNESCO Convention) defines it as “the adoption of measures aimed at the preservation, safeguarding and enhancement of the diversity of cultural expressions.” The 1985 UNESCO-WIPO Model Provisions for National Laws on the Protection of Expressions of Folklore against Illicit Exploitation and Other Prejudicial Actions (the 1985 UNESCO-WIPO Model Provisions) states inter alia that “protection should be against any improper utilization of expressions of folklore [or traditional cultural expressions], including the general practice of making profit by commercially exploiting such expressions outside their originating communities without any recompense to such communities.”

For practical purposes, protection of intangible cultural heritage needs to focus on two goals: to prevent “misappropriation” by third parties without prior informed consent; and, especially relevant in the context of climate change, to prevent loss as such. Increasingly, it is thought that both of these goals can be served by according specific rights to holders of intangible cultural heritage and that tailored rights can motivate them to preserve, practice, and promote their traditional assets even after they leave their homeland. In this regard, this section of the article briefly describes the soft-law making process for the protection of traditional cultural expressions at WIPO and other intergovernmental institutions and situates the climate change dimension in that process.
Rights-Based Mechanisms in Some South Pacific Countries

It has been noted that, for South Pacific islanders,

the concept of ownership (either by individuals, families or communities) of songs, dances and other forms of traditional knowledge and custom has been well-established for a long period of time ... and the knowledge [of such traditional cultural expressions] was a commodity exchanged between local groups in the past.\textsuperscript{114}

To decide ownership disputes, courts often relied on customary law.\textsuperscript{115} An example is In the Matter of the Nagol Jump, in which case a group of applicants tried to prevent others from performing the Nagol jump on the island of Santo (the Nagol jump is a traditional ceremony, similar to bungee jumping, from the island of Pentecost).\textsuperscript{116} The Supreme Court of Vanuatu decided the case on “substantial justice” and “in conformity with custom”, finding that the Nagol jumping should “return” to its origins in Pentecost.\textsuperscript{117}

In recent years, a growing number of South Pacific countries have been formally integrating the protection of traditional cultural expressions into existing intellectual property law\textsuperscript{118} and, additionally, have been developing a sui generis protection system generally based on the Secretariat of Pacific Community’s 2002 Model Law on Traditional Knowledge and Expression of Culture (“South Pacific Model Law”).\textsuperscript{119} Administration and advancement of the South Pacific Model Law are now in the hands of the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, which has further established the Traditional Knowledge Implementation Action Plan,\textsuperscript{120} with the aim of assisting the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Palau, Papua New Guinea, and Vanuatu in their implementation of traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions protection. Similar activities address the needs of other SIDS such as Niue, Samoa, and the Solomon Islands.\textsuperscript{121}

Major Components of Sui Generis Protection

International efforts to provide a sui generis basis for the protection of traditional cultural expressions have focused primarily on instruments of soft law, such as the aforementioned 1985 UNESCO-WIPO Model Provisions.\textsuperscript{122} In 2000 the WIPO General Assembly created the WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC) to negotiate appropriate protection mechanisms.\textsuperscript{123} In 2006 the IGC developed draft objectives, principles, and substantive provisions for the protection of traditional cultural expressions/expressions of folklore (IGC Draft).\textsuperscript{124} While the IGC work has progressed to a stage of text-based expert meetings,\textsuperscript{125} regional developments saw not only the creation of the South Pacific Model Law, but also the adoption by the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO) of the Swakopmund Protocol on the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Ex-
pression of Folklore within the Framework of ARIPO. The principal elements of these instruments may be summarized as follows.

**Subject Matter and Scope of Protection**

As defined in the IGC Draft, “traditional culture expressions” or “expressions of folklore” are any forms, whether tangible or intangible, in which traditional culture and knowledge are expressed, appear or are manifested, and comprise forms of expressions or combinations that are verbal, musical, by action, or tangible. Such expressions should be protected against acts of misappropriation.

The South Pacific Model Law recognizes concepts of “traditional cultural rights” and “moral rights” to traditional knowledge or expressions of culture. Moral rights thereby refer to the right of attribution of ownership, the right against derogatory treatment, and the right to equitable benefits from derivative works with commercial nature.

Traditional cultural rights are described as encompassing rights in relation to cultural expressions to authorize or prevent their reproduction, publication, public performance or display, broadcast, translation, adaptation, arrangement, transformation, modification, fixation (such as by making a photograph, film, or sound recording), making available online, creation of derivative works, making, using, offering for sale, selling, importing, exporting, or use in any other material form.

**Exceptions and Limitations**

The IGC Draft foresees exceptions and limitations to these rights for teaching and learning, noncommercial research or private study, criticism or review, reporting news or current events, use in the course of legal proceedings, the making of recordings and other reproductions of traditional cultural expressions for purposes of their inclusion in an archive or inventory for noncommercial cultural heritage safeguarding purposes, and incidental uses. Interestingly, the South Pacific Model Law limits the teaching exception to “face to face” teaching and does not provide exceptions for the making of recordings for purposes of archiving.

**Beneficiaries**

The beneficiaries are the indigenous people and traditional and other cultural communities in whom the custody, care, and safeguarding of the traditional cultural expressions are entrusted in accordance with their customary law and practice; and who maintain, use, or develop the traditional cultural expressions as being characteristic of their cultural and social identity and cultural heritage.

**Term of Protection**

The South Pacific Model Law states that traditional cultural rights as well as moral rights continue in perpetuity, are inalienable, and cannot be waived or transferred. Conversely, the IGC Draft foresees protection as long as traditional cultural expressions remain registered or notified according to any rules on formalities; and for secret traditional cultural expressions, as long as they remain secret.
Formalities

As a general rule, the protection as such of traditional cultural expressions is not dependent on any formality. However, registration or notification systems may be envisaged.

In terms of user procedures, the South Pacific Model Law identifies two contractual avenues for a prospective user of traditional cultural expression for noncustomary purposes to seek prior informed consent: (1) applying to a ‘Cultural Authority’ in charge of identifying beneficiaries and acting as a liaison between prospective users and the beneficiaries; or (2) directly dealing with the beneficiaries.

Sanctions, Remedies and Exercise of Rights

The IGC Draft states that accessible, appropriate, and adequate enforcement and dispute-resolution mechanisms, border measures, sanctions, and remedies, including criminal, civil, and administrative remedies should be available in case of breach of protected traditional cultural expressions. In addition, the South Pacific Model Law specifically refers to public apology, alternative dispute resolution (ADR), and customary law options.

Relationship with Intellectual Property Protection and Other Forms of Protection

The IGC Draft provides that the envisaged sui generis protection does not replace, but is complementary to, protection under intellectual property laws and programs for the safeguarding, preservation, and promotion of cultural heritage, and other available legal and nonlegal measures. Likewise, the South Pacific Model Law affirms that traditional cultural rights do not affect any rights existing under intellectual property law or other national law. It may thereby be noted that while creators of works derived from traditional cultural expressions benefit from intellectual property protection, under the South Pacific Model Law such third parties would also be subject to obligations to the original right holders.

International and Regional Protection

In dealing with the “technical question of how rights and interests of foreign holders” in traditional cultural expressions should be recognized in national laws, the IGC Draft takes the notion of national treatment as a starting point and proposes to supplement it with mutual recognition, reciprocity or assimilation. The South Pacific Model Law refers to enforcement through reciprocal arrangement.

Adding the Climate Change Dimension

Building on the principal components of sui generis protection of traditional cultural expressions cited as an example, this final part adds three brief and diverse
considerations that might usefully figure in negotiation and implementation of these instruments, with a view to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the face of climate change and climate change displacement.

Cross-Border Protection

The cross-border aspect of climate change displacement lends weight to the international dimension of protection of intangible cultural heritage. Acknowledging such international protection as priority,\(^{151}\) the IGC in its norm-setting process for traditional cultural expressions explored, inter alia, whether it should seek to determine at the international level how their misappropriation and use should be suppressed, and through what kind of legal instruments.\(^{152}\) Taking the existing international protection of copyright as an example, the Berne Convention prescribes minimum standards of protection that are binding on all member states. However, with views differing among participants in the IGC process on the desirable degree of protection for traditional knowledge or traditional cultural expressions, and its relation to the existing international intellectual property rights system, the IGC Draft eventually opted for “a neutral form so as not to preempt the policy choices.”\(^{153}\)

National treatment is helpful where the host country provides sufficient protection for the intangible cultural heritage of its nationals. Likewise, reciprocal arrangements, such as those adopted in the South Pacific Model Law, are useful if the host country and the country of origin share an effective standard of protection of such rights. The challenge is how to accommodate national self-determination in this regard while ensuring international protection. Further awareness of the cultural impact of climate change migration might stimulate the development of a minimum standards approach coupled with an international registration system, perhaps somewhat comparable maybe to the system for appellations of origin established by the Lisbon Agreement.\(^{154}\)

More Funding Initiatives

Legal protection alone cannot maintain intangible cultural heritage. Funding is essential, for example to support education, promotion, recording and archiving. One of the first initiatives in this direction is the WIPO Voluntary Fund for Accredited Indigenous and Local Communities, launched in 2010.\(^{155}\) One year earlier, the 2005 UNESCO Convention\(^{156}\) created the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD). The purpose of the IFCD is to promote sustainable development and poverty reduction in developing countries through support for projects and activities aiming to foster the emergence of a dynamic cultural sector.\(^{157}\) The first batch of funding requests has been received, but only few came from SIDS and none were related to climate change.\(^{158}\) Here again, further awareness of the threat that climate change poses to intangible cultural heritage may improve the financial basis for giving effect to legal protection.
Training, Good Practices, National Policies: It Takes a Village

A 2007 survey of practices and protocols regarding the safeguarding of cultural heritage and related intellectual property issues revealed a strong interest on the part of museums, libraries, and archives in South Pacific countries in receiving training on such issues and developing good practices and guidelines.159

To respond to such needs, WIPO operates the Creative Heritage Project,160 which aims to offer practical training to local communities, museums, and archives in developing countries on recording, digitizing, and disseminating their creative cultural expressions as well as on intellectual property issues.161 A pilot program undertaken with a Maasai community and National Museums of Kenya confirmed the introduction of intellectual property rights management as a useful tool for promoting the safeguarding and legal protection of intangible heritage.162

Becoming increasingly aware of their cultural interests, some South Pacific countries are taking the lead in researching the impact of climate change on their cultural heritage. For example, Vanuatu has adopted a cultural research policy163 under which the Vanuatu National Cultural Council approves research projects consistent with the country’s research priorities, such as language documentation, cultural and historic site documentation, documentation of indigenous histories, and case studies of contemporary social change. Research projects must substantially involve indigenous communities, scholars and students,164 and commercial proceeds of any research products are to be shared between the council and the researcher.165

CONCLUSION

The impact of climate change on cultural heritage hardly figures in current climate change policymaking, with its dominant focus on greenhouse gas emissions and their direct consequences. Likewise, the conventional perspective of cultural heritage risk management concerns especially the loss of tangible heritage sites and structures, and to a lesser extent how such loss will affect communities and the intangible aspects of culture. However, as climate change displacement materializes, these human dimensions will demand increasing attention.

One perspective on cultural property is as part of “the cultural heritage of all mankind,”166 whatever the place of origin or present location.167 Another view of cultural property is as “a national cultural heritage” invoking in nations or communities a special interest to attribute unique character to their cultural objects and to legitimize demands for retaining cultural property.168

The emergence of international climate change issues in cultural heritage, intangible as well as tangible, could complicate such distinction of interests. Accommodation may need to be made for climate change-related regulation, international human rights law concerning climate change refugees, and intellectual property rights or sui generis rights relevant to the protection and promotion of traditional
knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, especially in terms of cross-border protection.
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