

The primary issues that emerged during the meeting centred on the following points:

- re-examining the ethical frameworks and terminology used in conservation;
- devising better methods to facilitate community consultation and participation;
- improving legal frameworks;
- identifying ways to demonstrate the socioeconomic benefits of conservation;
- developing simple, practical tools to support shared conservation decision-making.

It is challenging to capture the energy and concentration of these five days of discussion in a few words. A key feature of the meeting was that it drew people from entirely diverse areas – from immovable to movable heritage; from practical conservation, art history, archaeology, architecture and natural science; from management, museum curation, social anthropology and the law. As such the meeting's findings are particularly significant as they express common issues that affect many areas of cultural heritage conservation, and reflect the current *Zeitgeist* or 'spirit of the time' for the heritage conservation field.

New concepts of cultural heritage

The seminar explored some of the most challenging categories of cultural heritage and approaches to their conservation. The highlighted categories were archaeological heritage, contemporary art and architecture, digital heritage and living heritage. These types of heritage are problematical for a variety of reasons: the complexity of the materials; the rapid growth in the amount of heritage; and the increase in risks and threats, which in part are due to the particular relationship of the heritage to current social reality. In response to these challenges, their conservation calls for a revision of current approaches and tools.

The changing uses and expanding range of material goods and formats identified as cultural heritage, combined with a growing awareness of additional factors such as intangible heritage and living heritage, mean we have to redefine our approaches to conservation. This does not necessarily imply a complete revision of past principles, but the dilemmas raised by new types of cultural heritage require more than just a reappraisal of materials and methods.

Accordingly, it is necessary to revisit the concepts, objectives, scope, approaches, and terminologies used in the past to examine the established approaches within conservation. This would include evaluating how well 'traditional' conservation approaches fit with the