

Distribution limited

WHC-99/CONF.204/10

Paris, 7 June 1999

Original : English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-third session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room X
5 - 10 July 1999

Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

SUMMARY

Background

At its twenty-second session in 1998, the Committee requested the Centre "to work with the advisory bodies, to further develop the revisions to Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* and submit them to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau should submit for adoption its recommendations to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee."

Furthermore, the Committee "... noted the proposal made by the Delegate of Italy concerning paragraph 65 [of the *Operational Guidelines*] and the recommendation of the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session, that evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies would be also sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties which had nominated sites for inscription ... While recognizing that there are merits in this proposal, the Committee noted that a more in-depth reflection was required and decided to request the Bureau at its twenty-third session to examine this proposal in the context of the overall revision of Section I."

Structure of this document

This document includes the following sections:

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. CHRONOLOGICAL BACKGROUND
- III. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS TO THE DECISIONS OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
- IV. COMMENTS FROM THE ADVISORY BODIES (IUCN, ICCROM AND ICOMOS)
- V. PROPOSED PROCESS AND TIMETABLE FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*
- ANNEX I COMMENTS FROM IUCN, 12 APRIL 1999
- ANNEX II COMMENTS FROM ICCROM AND ICOMOS, MAY 1999
- ANNEX III CURRENT DRAFT OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SECTION I OF THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

Action required: The Bureau is requested to examine the proposed process and timetable for further consideration of revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* in Section V of this document.

I. INTRODUCTION

The proposals to revise Section I of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, to which this document refers, derived specifically from an expert meeting held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands in March 1998. However a number of other recent discussions convened within the context of the Global Strategy (adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994) are of relevance. These include, an expert meeting held in the Parc de la Vanoise, France in March 1996, discussions by the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee and by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau. These various discussions are presented chronologically in Section II below.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

II.1 Eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, December 1994

At the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1994 a Global Strategy for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention was adopted. The Global Strategy had been proposed by a meeting of cultural heritage experts held in June 1994 to ensure a more representative and balanced World Heritage List. The eighteenth session of the Committee called for an additional meeting in an attempt to also reduce imbalances in the List for natural properties. Furthermore, the eighteenth session of the Committee also requested an experts meeting to facilitate:

- adjustment of the formal and scientific criteria for the evaluation of nominated cultural and natural sites respectively, taking into consideration also the cultural landscape approach;
- giving priority to thematic studies on the main types of ecosystems and developing strategies to implement the results without delay;
- reconsideration of the procedure for the assessment of nominated natural sites with special respect to the term “integrity”.

II.2 Expert Meeting on “Evaluation of general principles and criteria for nominations of natural World Heritage sites”, Parc National de la Vanoise, France (22-24 March 1996)

In March 1996 an expert meeting hosted by the French authorities on “Evaluation of general principles and criteria for nominations of natural World Heritage sites” was held at the Parc National de la Vanoise. The overarching goal of the Vanoise meeting was:

To establish the basis for an holistic, integrated Global Strategy, which represents the continuum of culture and nature in conformity with The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

The meeting addressed a broad agenda including the questions of what is “outstanding universal value” and what is meant by “exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance” in natural heritage criterion (iii)? The definition of “natural” and “integrity” and the interface between natural sites and cultural landscapes were discussed. The need to achieve a better coverage of natural sites on the List was discussed as were issues relating to the overall balance, manageability and “credibility” of the List. One of the points emphasized by the expert group

was the unifying concept of World Heritage embracing both cultural and natural heritage as outlined in the text of the *World Heritage Convention*. As a result of their discussions, the experts recommended changes to the *Operational Guidelines*.

II.3 Recommendations of the twentieth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, 1996

At its twentieth session, the Bureau took note of the Report of the Expert Meeting held at la Vanoise. It was decided that the Secretariat transmit the recommendations of the expert group to all States Parties and request their comments. A number of delegates expressed their view that the expert meeting brought up important questions concerning the spirit of the Convention and the unique links it makes between nature and culture and their protection. It was suggested that the Operational Guidelines be reorganized by the Secretariat in the form of a Manual to be presented at the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee.

The report of the Vanoise meeting was circulated under cover of a Circular Letter. Substantive replies were received from eleven States Parties. Some of these States Parties gave their general agreement and support for the recommendations of the Vanoise meeting. Several States Parties underlined however, the problem of the application of “outstanding universal value”, the usefulness of one set of criteria, the definition of universal beauty and the application of the conditions of integrity to all sites.

II.4 Decisions of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, 1996

At the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1996, several delegates noted that there was a more in-depth discussion required on:

- (a) the application of the “conditions of integrity” versus the “test of authenticity”,
- (b) the question of a unified or a harmonized set of criteria, and
- (c) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts.

Subsequently, a joint meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts was held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands in March 1998 to consider these three questions.

II.5 World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, 25 to 29 March 1998, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The Amsterdam meeting began its work by reviewing the main conclusions of the Expert Meeting held in the Parc de la Vanoise, France, in March 1996 (see Section II.2 above). Position papers by the three advisory bodies had been prepared in advance, as had position papers on integrity and authenticity and papers on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in different regions of the world. Specific case studies from all regions of the world were used as the basis for discussion in working groups on the application of the criteria, conditions of integrity and test of authenticity and the notion of “outstanding universal value” and the “credibility” of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage List.

With the generous support of the Government of the Netherlands, the full text of all of these papers, along with the report of the meeting, have recently been collated in a volume entitled “Linking Nature and Culture” edited by Bernd von Droste, Mechtild Rössler and Sarah Titchen.

The expert meeting in Amsterdam prepared a number of recommendations with the objective of ensuring greater recognition of the continuum of, and interactions between, culture and nature with respect to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

In summary, the Expert Meeting recommended that the criteria for natural and cultural properties be unified, that the conditions of integrity (to include the notion of authenticity, as appropriate) be related directly to each of the criteria (and be called “qualifying conditions”) and that sections C and D of the *Operational Guidelines* be revised.

On the subject of “outstanding universal value”, the Expert Meeting endorsed the Global Strategy’s regional and thematic approach to ensuring a more representative and balanced World Heritage List. The expert meeting called for an anthropological approach to the definition of cultural heritage and people’s relationship with the environment, the identification of sub-themes and for the increased availability of information about the Global Strategy.

The Expert Meeting also addressed the issue of the “credibility” of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage List. A series of specific recommendations were prepared with the aim of indicating that inscription of a property on the World Heritage List is, and must be seen to be, part of a process, not an isolated event, preceded and followed by a long-term commitment to its conservation.

At the Amsterdam meeting the consolidated view of the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS), was to:

- (i) recommend the application of conditions of integrity (incorporating the concept of authenticity) to cultural as well as natural properties, and
- (ii) recommend the abolition of the formal distinction between cultural and natural criteria and their amalgamation into a single list of ten criteria (without changes to the wording of the existing criteria) with a consequential focus on areas inscribed as “World Heritage sites”, rather than as World Heritage cultural and/or natural sites.

II.6 Recommendations of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee and twenty-second session of the Bureau, 1998

During the first half of 1998, the following technical issues were examined by the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee as had been requested by the twenty-first session of the Committee in December 1997:

- (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi);
- (b) the test of authenticity;
- (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List; and
- (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy.

A paper prepared by Australia, contributions from Greece, Malta, Zimbabwe and ICOMOS, and the report of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands in March 1998, formed the basis of discussion on the Technical Issues.

At its meeting on 29-30 April 1998, the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee endorsed the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting and recommended additional

work on the application of cultural heritage criteria (i) and (vi). Subsequently, the twenty-second session of the Bureau recommended to the twenty-second session of the Committee that it also endorse the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting. In addition, the Bureau asked the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the advisory bodies, to co-ordinate the preparation of draft revisions to the sections of the *Operational Guidelines* relating to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity for submission to, and the final decision of, the twenty-second session of the Committee.

The Consultative Body and the twenty-second session of the Bureau concluded that there should be a more stringent application of the Test of Authenticity, to places where the fabric is the most important. They also recommended further examination of the meaning of “authenticity” in different regional contexts and particularly for living cultures.

II.7 Preparation of draft revisions to Section I of the *Operational Guidelines*, September/October 1998

In September/October 1998, the World Heritage Centre prepared a revised draft of Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* based on (i) the recommendations of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands in March 1998, (ii) the recommendations of the Consultative Body and the twenty-second session of the Bureau and (iii) revisions proposed by the advisory bodies at a meeting held at the World Heritage Centre in September 1998. The draft revisions endeavoured to amalgamate the ten criteria into a single list and to develop conditions of integrity (incorporating the concept of authenticity) for cultural as well as natural properties. Following the recommendations of the Amsterdam meeting, these conditions were to be described as qualifying conditions.

II.8 Twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee, Kyoto, Japan 30 November to 5 December 1998

The report of the Amsterdam meeting and the revised draft of Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* were presented to the twenty-second session of the Committee. Whilst the Committee did not have the time to fully consider the revised draft, it requested the Centre "to work with the advisory bodies, to further develop the revisions to Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* and submit them to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau should submit for adoption its recommendations to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee."

Furthermore, the Committee "... noted the proposal made by the Delegate of Italy concerning paragraph 65 and the recommendation of the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session, that evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies would be also sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties which had nominated sites for inscription. The Representative of IUCN said that he saw the proposal of Italy as advantageous as it would formalize a process by which the States Parties concerned would receive copies of evaluations of properties they had nominated. While recognizing that there are merits in this proposal, the Committee noted that a more in-depth reflection was required and decided to request the Bureau at its twenty-third session to examine this proposal in the context of the overall revision of Section I."

III. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS TO THE DECISIONS OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

III.1 Meeting of the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre, IUCN Headquarters, 15 February 1999

Following the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee, IUCN provided additional comments on the revised draft of Section I of the *Operational Guidelines*. The revised draft was then tabled for discussion at a meeting of the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre held at IUCN Headquarters on 15 February 1999. The minutes of the meeting record that:

“Three general points were raised. First, that the frequency of change to the Operational Guidelines should be reduced, as it is very confusing for the users of the Guidelines, particularly field users. Second, that the possibility of making the Guidelines more "user friendly" should be explored, such as through the use of a loose leaf format and the development of "how to" guides to different sections of the Convention. Third, there were some specific concerns raised in relation to the content of the guidelines by ICOMOS and ICCROM representatives. It was also thought that a longer time period should be allowed for review of the changes to the Operational Guidelines.”

The meeting thus agreed:

- (a) that the advisory bodies would provide comments in writing on the latest draft of the Operational Guidelines to the Centre by the end of March 1999;
- (b) that the World Heritage Centre consider a revised timetable for consideration of the Operational Guidelines, which reflects the need for broader and wider consultation.

III.2 World Heritage Regional Thematic Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes in Africa, Tiwi, Kenya, 10 - 14 March 1999

In March 1999 the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Nairobi Office organized a World Heritage Regional Thematic Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes in Africa in Tiwi, Kenya (see Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.4). The recommendations of the expert meeting included the following recommendation concerning authenticity and integrity:

“Recommendation II.A(a)

The expert group: Having underlined the importance of the conditions of authenticity and integrity in the process of inscribing cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List, wished to clarify the concepts and their applicability in the African context; once again, pointed out the close links between tangible and intangible elements, natural and cultural aspects and underlined the symbolic and functional character of this heritage. They requested the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies to organize in March 2000 a meeting of African experts to follow-up the recommendations of the Nara Document and to formulate, on the basis of examples, ideally an African Charter.”

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE ADVISORY BODIES (IUCN, ICCROM AND ICOMOS)

Following the February meeting with the advisory bodies, the Director of the World Heritage Centre wrote to each of the advisory bodies requesting their written inputs to ensure implementation of the decision of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee concerning proposed revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*. He asked the advisory bodies to provide their reflections on the proposal to merge the natural and cultural heritage criteria into one set of ten criteria. He also asked for suggestions as to the best way to proceed with a further consideration of the issues relating to the proposed revisions to Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* and asked for suggestions as to an appropriate timetable for this work to be performed. The comments received from IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS appear in Annex I and Annex II. On the basis of the comments received from IUCN, the draft of Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* were again modified and are presented as Annex III.

V. PROPOSED PROCESS AND TIMETABLE FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

Action required:

1. The Bureau may wish to note the comments, suggestions and reservations concerning revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* expressed by the advisory bodies (see Annex I and Annex II).
2. The Bureau may wish to recommend that the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre continue their discussions and work concerning possible revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* and submit their conclusions, including any proposals to revise the *Operational Guidelines*, to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.
3. The Bureau may wish to recommend that the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre attempt to consolidate any proposals to revise the *Operational Guidelines* in light of:
 - (a) the recent comments of the advisory bodies (see Annex I and Annex II),
 - (b) the Global Strategy (adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994) (see Section II.1),
 - (c) the request of the Committee at its eighteenth session to ensure that the Global Strategy is applied to natural heritage as well as cultural heritage (see Section II.1 above);
 - (d) the recommendations of the expert meetings held at the Parc de la Vanoise, France in March 1996 and in Amsterdam, The Netherlands in March 1998 (see Sections II.2 – II.7),
 - (e) the various global and regional thematic expert meetings (including meetings on cultural landscapes, Global Strategy meetings, including those in Africa and the Pacific), and
 - (f) discussions by the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee and by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau.
4. The Bureau may wish to ask the advisory bodies to focus their work on a review of,
 - (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi),
 - (b) the wording of the qualifying conditions (of integrity and authenticity) for cultural criteria (i) to (vi),
 - (c) the best place to include text relating to “human interaction with the environment” – IUCN has suggested criteria (iii), (iv) or (v), and,

(d) a review of Paragraphs 24(b)(ii) and 44(b)(v) and (vi) of the *Operational Guidelines* concerning the management and protection of World Heritage properties.

5. The Bureau may wish to,

- (a) encourage ICOMOS to present the *Nara Document on Authenticity*, and a summary of subsequent discussions concerning authenticity, to the ICOMOS General Assembly in October 1999 (see Annex II), and,
- (b) invite ICOMOS to report to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee on any discussions concerning authenticity that take place at the ICOMOS General Assembly.

6. Furthermore, in light of the recommendations of the Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes of Africa held in Kenya in March 1999, the Bureau may wish to recommend to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee, that the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, organize a meeting of African experts in March 2000 to follow-up the recommendations of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* and to formulate, on the basis of examples, an African Charter on Authenticity (see Section III.2).

7. The Bureau may also wish to recommend to the twenty-third session of the Committee that it invite ICOMOS and ICCROM to co-operate in efforts to ensure further discussion and dissemination of information on the subject of authenticity (particularly as it relates to the conservation of World Heritage properties) to cultural heritage management professionals.

8. Finally, on the basis of the comments of the advisory bodies (see Annex I and Annex II), the Bureau may wish to recommend to the twenty-third session of the Committee to proceed with the following revisions to Paragraph 65 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The revisions would foresee evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies being sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties who had nominated properties for inscription on the World Heritage List. New text is in bold, text to be deleted is ~~struck through~~.

H. Procedure and timetable for the processing of nominations

65. ...

During April/May

The Secretariat ~~checks~~ **receives** the evaluations of the non-governmental organizations and ensures that States members of the Committee, **as well as the States Parties concerned**, receive them ~~by 1 May~~ **six weeks in advance of the Bureau session** with available documentation.

COMMENTS FROM IUCN, 12 APRIL 1999

Dr Bouchenaki
 Director
 UNESCO World Heritage Centre
 7, place de Fontenoy 75352
 Paris 07 SP
 France

Ref: DAS/jce/ 12 April 1999

Dear Dr Bouchenaki

Subject: Revisions to Section I of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

Thank you for your letter of 6 April (Ref: WHC/1/SMT) extending to 30 April 1999 the time for comments on the revised draft submitted to the meeting of the Advisory Bodies of the World Heritage Committee on 15 February 1999.

IUCN had not responded earlier as this draft took into account all of the suggestions and issues raised by IUCN in comprehensive comments handed to Centre personnel during the course of the Committee Session at Kyoto.

However, as your letter of 6 April raises some specific questions and as the meeting of the IUCN World Heritage Operation Panel took place this week in Gland I took the opportunity of consulting the panel which has endorsed this response. This response has been prepared by Bing Lucas on behalf of the Operational Panel.

The first issue raised in your letter relates to the proposal by the Delegate of Italy made at Kyoto that "evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies would also be sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties which had nominated sites for inscription." Your letter correctly says that "The Representative of IUCN said that he saw the proposal as advantageous as it would formalize a process by which the States Parties concerned would receive copies of evaluations of properties they had nominated". This would, of course be in advance of their receiving the evaluations as part of a session agenda. The recollection of IUCN participants at Kyoto was that the IUCN intervention was made in response to a comment by the then Director of the Centre to the effect that States Parties concerned could approach the relevant advisory body to obtain the evaluation. IUCN felt, and feels, that this is inappropriate as its contractual obligation is to provide evaluations to the Centre and it is then a matter for the Centre to handle advance distribution to the State Party concerned if it is decided that such a procedure should be followed. IUCN feels it is inappropriate that the onus of sending an evaluation to a State Party should rest with the relevant advisory body as, essentially, it sees these evaluations as being, in effect, the "property" of the Centre until such time as they are in the public domain. It seems to IUCN that the procedure is one for the Committee to decide and certainly not one for the advisory bodies.

I would like now to comment on the three points quoted from the minutes of the meeting of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies on 15 February 1999.

1. IUCN agrees completely that the frequency of change to the Operational Guidelines should be reduced as often it is found that States Parties are working from copies of the Guidelines which have been superseded. Another very significant consequence of cumulative changes to the Guidelines is to leave confusion as to the basis on which sites have been inscribed on the World Heritage List with past changes to criteria. An example which comes to mind is the Garajonay National Park WH Site (Spain). Here, UNESCO publication WHC.98/15 giving *Brief Descriptions: Sites Inscribed on the World Heritage List* shows this site inscribed in 1986 under Natural criteria ii and iii. A check with the IUCN technical evaluation in 1986 shows that the equivalent criteria under the current Operational Guidelines are Natural criteria ii and iv. This illustrates the importance of trying to maintain continuity of approach but also the need (if specific criteria references are to be quoted in publications) to undertake the task of revising the record and updating the relevant criteria so the true picture is given relating to current criteria. Perhaps the suggested move to a sequence of ten WH criteria will provide that opportunity to bring past decisions into line with the new sequence of criteria, otherwise the situation will be complicated beyond reason.

2. IUCN strongly supports the suggestion of aiming for more "user friendly" guidelines with "how to" guides to different sections of the Convention.
3. As will be noted, IUCN did not share the concerns of the other Advisory Bodies about a longer time being needed in reviewing the proposed changes to the Guidelines. The basic issues involved - rather than the detail - have been well canvassed within the IUCN constituency through a global workshop on World Heritage at the World Conservation Congress in Montreal in 1996, through extensively circulated publications and papers and through regional working sessions of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas. No negative reaction has resulted. The IUCN feeling is that the availability of the records of the expert meetings at La Vanoise and Amsterdam and the record of subsequent discussions at sessions of the World Heritage Bureau and Committee have raised expectations of change and that the sooner decisions are made on possible changes, and they are accepted or rejected by the Committee, the better.

Your letter asks specifically for IUCN's reflections on the proposal to merge the natural and cultural heritage criteria into one set of ten criteria. The IUCN response to 3. above in effect conveys that response. While it is true that some people within the IUCN family may have reservations that the change may work to the detriment of sites of natural value, there is general recognition that the proposed change is a logical one which must not be allowed to impact adversely on the representation of the natural heritage on the World Heritage List..

The IUCN view is that the proposal to focus on a single set of World Heritage criteria takes account of the unique role of the Convention in bringing nature and culture under a single Convention umbrella and reinforces the nature/culture continuum by focussing on a single list of sites considered to be of "*outstanding universal value*", representative in total of the nature/culture spectrum.

As to procedure, IUCN believes that is in the hands of the WH Committee and that the procedure established by the Committee needs to be adhered to.

Some specific comments follow on the draft guidelines.

In a number of cases, IUCN's past comments appear as footnotes and these are adhered to with one exception. That is, footnote 4 to draft para 14 questioning whether or not the issue of balance refers to numerical balance. A careful reading of the draft para shows that it clearly relates to balance between "*the numbers*" of properties of cultural and natural value. That being so, IUCN feels that a numerical approach does not take into account the large size of some sites inscribed mainly for their natural values compared with cultural sites which are often quite small and may be focussed on a single structure. IUCN sees "balance" as being much more than a numbers issue to include issues of scale, geographical and thematic balance.

IUCN would like to reinforce its concern noted in footnote 5 to draft criterion viii. For the reasons outlined there IUCN is strong in its conviction that the reference to "*human interaction with the environment*" should be removed from draft criterion (vii) as IUCN is concerned at the confusion which would be created in bringing the human element specifically into this draft criterion when this seems far more appropriate to the criteria relevant to cultural landscapes - draft criteria (iii), (iv) or (v).

Finally, having suggested a re-ordering of the "Management requirements" section of the draft guidelines from draft para 25, IUCN has attempted such a re-ordering and a working copy of IUCN's proposals is enclosed. The re-ordering suggests, as noted, that the result could be a telescoping of some of the paragraphs.

I hope you will find this contribution helpful.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely

David Sheppard
Head
Programme on Protected Areas

Encs.

IUCN PROPOSALS TO RE-ORDER SECTION

(b) Management requirements

Attached is a cut-and paste version of this section re-ordered in a way designed to provide a more logical flow.

The approach is to begin with the local base for management, moving on to mechanisms, management plans and buffer zones.

There are, of course, a variety of approaches which could be followed in reordering the paragraphs but this is offered as a starting point for consideration.

One point brought out by the re-ordering of the paragraphs is the possibility of reducing the number of paragraphs. For example, it would seem that existing para 25 could be incorporated into existing para 27.

For ease in reviewing possible re-ordering the attached retains the numbering of paragraphs used in the document submitted to the meeting of the advisory bodies held on 15 February 1999.

COMMENTS FROM ICCROM AND ICOMOS, MAY 1999¹

During October 1998, ICOMOS and ICCROM developed together revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* to respond to the recommendations of the Amsterdam meeting concerning the integration of the cultural and natural criteria. In particular, the revisions proposed by ICCROM and ICOMOS addressed implications for the application of the “test of authenticity”. These draft revisions were included in the documents made available to the World Heritage Committee during the 22nd session of the Committee held in Kyoto. During this session, the World Heritage Committee asked the World Heritage Centre to work with the advisory bodies to further review Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* and to submit proposed revisions to the 23rd ordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau in July 1999.

The advisory bodies discussed the proposed changes to the *Operational Guidelines* during the advisory bodies/ World Heritage Centre meeting of Feb. 15, 1999, in Gland, Switzerland. Both ICOMOS and ICCROM expressed reservations about the consequences of the Committee moving too quickly to adopt the draft revisions (which indeed they had developed for consideration by the Committee and which had been presented to the Committee in December, 1998). Several points are important to consider in understanding the nature of these reservations:

1. ICCROM and ICOMOS agree with the recommendations of the Amsterdam meeting concerning the bringing together of the natural and cultural criteria. This effort fulfills one of the important premises upon which the World Heritage Convention was based and offers a practical opportunity to strengthen collaboration between cultural and natural sectors in all areas of the Committee's work. However, the amalgamation of the 10 criteria in one consolidated list falls short of the potential which exists to fuse consideration of cultural and natural values within individual criteria. While adoption of such an approach would radically alter the evaluative framework used by the Committee since its beginnings, it is nevertheless a logical outcome of a commitment to bring together treatment of cultural and natural heritage within the Committee's work. At this stage, it is not clear to ICCROM and ICOMOS to what extent the Committee would support continuing efforts to blend the criteria, or whether the Committee feels a final stage of agreement has now been reached. In other words, are the conclusions of Amsterdam to be understood as interim steps in a still continuing process, or are they a final end, in and of themselves? If the former, ICCROM and ICOMOS would suggest that changes not be introduced to the *Operational Guidelines* until the theoretical framework for combining treatment of cultural and natural values is clear and final.
2. The draft revisions to article 22 involve introduction of substantial amounts of new wording for treatment of cultural heritage, to strengthen use and understanding of the concept of authenticity in relation to each of the 6 original cultural criteria. While this language (or language approximating it) would be necessary to accompany each criterion with explicit guidance in applying the *conditions of integrity/ test of authenticity*, introduction of new scientific material on this scale risks confusing the treatment of these issues in evaluation, given the fact that the conclusions presented are still very much in discussion and development within the cultural heritage field. In November, 1994, the Committee supported the initiative of the Government of Japan and ICOMOS to undertake an examination of the issue of authenticity in a meeting in Nara. The *Nara Document* which resulted has strengthened respect for cultural diversity in conservation judgements, and has inspired more than 35 subsequent meetings, at regional and national levels, and these meetings continue. ICOMOS has the intention to present the *Nara Document* to the ICOMOS General Assembly for the first time during its General Assembly of October 1999. ICCROM and ICOMOS believe that it is important that material adopted for use in the *Operational Guidelines* which has doctrinal implications follow and respect consensus now being developed in the field among professionals around these issues rather than attempting to direct the field.

¹ Subsequent to the receipt of this text, ICOMOS informed the World Heritage Centre that it had no objections to the proposal to amend Paragraph 65 of the *Operational Guidelines*, to ensure that evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies would also be sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties who had nominated sites for inscription.

3. The tabular format proposed by the Centre for amalgamating both cultural and natural criteria, and their related “qualifying conditions” places “integrity” and “authenticity” on the same level, as if they were equal concepts meaning more or less the same thing in their respective cultural and natural contexts. While ICCROM and ICOMOS respect the desire to use the tabular format to simplify use and understanding of concepts expressed, and have used it in their draft revisions, we also recognize here another potential source of confusion. In their respective fields, and within the *Operational Guidelines*, the two concepts are not equivalent. Authenticity is understood as a qualifier of values: a reflection of the realness, the completeness, the truth, the credibility of the testimony concerning those values, as expressed by the various attributes carrying the values (design, material, setting, workmanship – and, since Nara – tradition and function). Here, integrity (completeness) can be understood as a subset of authenticity by cultural heritage practitioners. However, as used in the *Operational Guidelines* with respect to natural heritage, integrity is a larger concept than authenticity, denoting both the degree to which natural features and processes are intact, but also necessary conditions and levels of protection. The amalgamation of the two concepts within one table blurs the important distinctions between the two in practice. ICCROM and ICOMOS believe that it is important for the credibility of the Convention and the nomination and evaluation processes, that practitioners working in the field are comfortable with, and able to identify with the language used in assessment, and that the two concepts (“*test of authenticity*” and “*conditions of integrity*”) retain their particular specificity and use within the cultural and natural contexts to which they are respectively applied.

(As an historical note, the detailed meeting records of then ICOMOS Secretary-General Ernest Allan Connally suggest that during the writing of the original *Operational Guidelines* in 1976 and 1977, it had been proposed to use the concept of integrity (which is used in some countries – in Canada and the USA for example, within national level policies and administrative mechanisms), as a qualifying condition for both cultural and natural heritage nominations. ICCROM and ICOMOS delegates argued at the time that it was important to use the word “authenticity” for cultural heritage assessments, given its high recognition value among practitioners in the field. It was ultimately decided to adopt the separate practices for cultural and natural heritage now in place.)

4. ICCROM and ICOMOS are also very concerned at a more general level that continuing revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* are counter-productive. Those in the field in our experience are often working with versions of the document which are very dated, and the more the *Guidelines* are changed, the more difficult it becomes for the system and those involved with it to work in a consistent and clear manner. Perhaps it is time to look at development of a 2 part explanatory vehicle, a relatively fixed set of procedures accompanied by “commentaries” which could change regularly with time.

CURRENT DRAFT OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SECTION I OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Please note: Throughout this document, text to be deleted is ~~struckthrough~~ and new text is shown in **bold**.

Footnotes that will form part of the revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* are in normal text whilst footnotes used for the purposes of discussion and to illustrate proposed changes to the text are shown in **bold text in Courier font**.

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

(...)

B. The Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List

7. A *Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List* was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994. The *Global Strategy* was initially developed with reference to heritage of cultural value. At the request of the World Heritage Committee, the *Global Strategy* was subsequently expanded to also include reference to heritage of natural value and combined cultural and natural value.

8. In order to ensure for the future a World Heritage List that is at the same time representative, balanced, and credible, the *Global Strategy* seeks to increase the types of heritage and the regional representation of the List. It also endeavours to take into account the expanded notions of what comprises heritage² that have developed over the last twenty or more years. The *Global Strategy* seeks to redress the imbalances in the types of heritage included in the List namely the high number of monumental properties of cultural value from some regions of the world. It also seeks to achieve greater balance between the number of properties of natural value compared to cultural value inscribed on the World Heritage List. At the same time, by recognising that the concept of cultural landscapes “can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape” (see Paragraph 38) the World Heritage Committee has re-emphasized the uniqueness of the Convention in bringing together the protection of both natural and cultural values as part of the World Heritage. The *Global Strategy* seeks to ensure a more balanced and

² The diversity of types of potential World Heritage properties includes for example, groups of urban buildings and cultural landscapes. Guidance concerning the nomination of these types of properties is provided in Annex 1.

Note: In future years it is proposed that Annex 1 will be expanded to reflect the outcomes of other meetings and studies carried out under the aegis of the *Global Strategy*. The purpose of Annex 1 is to provide guidance to States Parties concerning the nomination of a diversity of types of properties of cultural and/or natural value (to reflect a thematic and regional diversity) for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

representative World Heritage List by encouraging more countries to become States Parties to the *Convention*, to prepare tentative lists and to harmonise them, and to prepare nominations of properties from categories and regions currently not well represented on the World Heritage List.

9. The *Global Strategy* takes the form of an action programme designed to identify the major gaps relating to types of properties, regions of the world, cultures, periods, biogeographical provinces, biomes in the List. Since 1994, a number of regional and thematic *Global Strategy* meetings and comparative and thematic studies have been organized for this purpose. States Parties and the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM) are encouraged to participate in the implementation of the *Global Strategy* in co-operation with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and other partners.

(a) Indications to States Parties concerning the preparation of tentative lists

~~10.~~⁷ The Committee requests each State Party to submit to it a tentative list of properties which it intends to nominate for inscription to the World Heritage List during the following five to ten years. This tentative list will constitute the "inventory" (provided for in Article 11 of the Convention) of the ~~cultural and natural~~ properties **of cultural and/or natural value** situated within the territory of each State Party and which it considers suitable for inclusion on the World Heritage List. The purpose of these tentative lists is to enable the Committee to evaluate within the widest possible context the "outstanding universal value" of each property nominated to the List. The Committee hopes that States Parties that have not yet submitted a tentative list will do so as early as possible. States Parties are reminded of the Committee's earlier decision not to consider ~~cultural~~ nominations of properties of cultural value unless such a list of ~~cultural~~ properties of cultural value has been submitted.³

~~8.~~¹¹ In order to facilitate the work of all concerned, the Committee requests States Parties to submit their tentative lists in a standard format (see Annex 1) which provides for information under the following headings:

- the name of the property;
- the geographical location of the property;
- a brief description of the property;
- a justification of the "outstanding universal value" of the property in accordance with the criteria and conditions of authenticity or integrity set out in paragraph 24 ~~and 44~~ below, taking account of similar properties both inside and outside the boundaries of the State concerned.

~~Natural~~ Properties **of predominantly natural value** should be grouped according to biogeographical provinces and cultural properties should be grouped according to cultural periods or areas. The order in which the properties listed would be presented for inscription should also be indicated, if possible.

³ IUCN has noted that this should also be the case for natural property nominations.

(b) Comparative assessments to be prepared by States Parties at the time of nomination

12. 9. The fundamental principle stipulated in the Convention is that properties nominated must be of “outstanding universal value” and the properties nominated therefore should be carefully selected. The criteria and conditions of authenticity or integrity against which the Committee will evaluate properties are set out in paragraphs 24 ~~and 44~~ below. Within a given geo-cultural region, it may be desirable for States Parties to make comparative assessments for the harmonization of tentative lists and nominations of cultural properties. Support for the organization of meetings for this purpose may be requested under the World Heritage Fund (see **Paragraphs 90 and 91**).

13. 12. ~~When nominating properties belonging to certain well-represented categories of cultural properties of cultural value⁴ the nominating State Party should provide a comparative assessment evaluation of the property in relation to other properties of a similar type, as already required in paragraph 10 7 with regard to the tentative lists.~~

(c) Maintaining a balance between the numbers of cultural and natural properties included in the World Heritage List

14. 15. ~~In nominating properties to the List, States Parties are invited to keep in mind the desirability of achieving a reasonable balance⁴ between the numbers of cultural heritage and natural heritage properties of cultural and natural value included in the World Heritage List.~~

15. 18. ~~In keeping with the spirit of the Convention, States Parties should as far as possible endeavour to include in their submissions properties which derive their outstanding universal value from a particularly significant combination of cultural and natural features.~~

(d) Nomination of serial properties

16. 19. ~~States Parties may propose in a single nomination a series of cultural or natural properties of cultural and/or natural value in different geographical locations, provided that they are related because they belong to:~~

- (i) the same historico-cultural group or
- (ii) the same type of property which is characteristic of the geographical zone
- (iii) the same geomorphological formation, the same biogeographic province, or the same ecosystem type

and provided that it is the series as such, and not its components taken individually, which is of outstanding universal value.

17. 20. ~~When a series of cultural or natural properties of cultural and/or natural value, as defined in paragraph 19 above, consists of properties situated in the territory of more than one~~

⁴ See additional comments from IUCN in Annex I of WHC-99/CONF.204/10.

State Party to the Convention, the States Parties concerned are encouraged to jointly submit a single nomination.

(e) Nomination of transboundary properties

18. 16. In cases where a ~~cultural and/or natural~~ property **of cultural and/or natural value** which fulfills the criteria adopted by the Committee extends beyond national borders the States Parties concerned are encouraged to submit a joint nomination.

(f) Nomination of immovable property which is likely to become movable

19. 25. Nominations of immovable property which are likely to become movable will not be considered **for inclusion in the World Heritage List.**

C. Criteria for the inclusion of ~~cultural~~ properties in the World Heritage List

20. 10. Each nomination should be presented in the form of a well-argued case. It should be submitted ~~in an~~ the appropriate **format form** (see paragraph 64 below) and should provide all the information to demonstrate that the property nominated is truly of "outstanding universal value". **“Outstanding universal value”, or World Heritage value, is determined on the basis of criteria and qualifying conditions presented in paragraph 24 below.**

21. 23. The criteria for the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List should always be seen in relation to one another and should be considered in the context of the definitions set out in Articles 1 **and 2** of the Convention which ~~is~~ **are** reproduced below:

Article 1

For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”:

monuments : architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science ;

groups of buildings : groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science ;

sites : works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view.

Article 2

For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “natural heritage”:

natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view ;

geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation ;

natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

22.(a) 24.Nomination criteria. A property nominated ~~A monument, group of buildings or site as defined above which is nominated~~ for inclusion in the World Heritage List will be considered to be of “outstanding universal value” for the purposes of the Convention when the Committee finds that it meets one or more of the ~~following~~ **nomination criteria described in para. 24.** ~~and the test of authenticity.~~ Each property nominated should therefore ~~also fulfil the following conditions of integrity.~~

(b) Qualifying conditions.

Sites proposed for inclusion on the World Heritage List should also satisfy application of the “qualifying conditions” (test of authenticity / conditions of integrity) to ensure that the values for which nomination is proposed are genuinely manifested through the site’s significant attributes and that their attributes will be maintained.

(b.i.) Test of authenticity.

Application of the test of authenticity involves verifying the degree to which the attributes of particular sites are credible and genuine expressions of the cultural values for which inscription has been proposed. The Nara Document on Authenticity provides a practical basis for examining the authenticity of sites of cultural value nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List. The document notes that:

“conservation of cultural heritage in all its forms and historical periods is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage. Our ability to understand these values depends in part on the degree to which information sources about these values may be understood as credible and truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of cultural heritage, and their meaning, is a requisite basis for assessing all aspects of authenticity. Authenticity considered in this way and confirmed in the Charter of Venice appears as the essential qualifying factor concerning values.” (Nara Document on Authenticity, Art. 9 and 10)

The Nara Document goes on to note that:

“depending on the nature of cultural heritage, its cultural context, and its evolution through time, authenticity judgements may be linked to the worth of a great variety of sources of information. Aspects of these sources may include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors.” (Nara Document on Authenticity, Art. 13)

Hence, sites may be understood to meet the test of authenticity if their cultural values (as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a site's attributes (referred to in the Nara Document as "information sources"): form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, and location and setting. Ephemeral attributes noted in the Document such as spirit and feeling do not lend themselves easily to practical applications of the test of authenticity, but nevertheless are important indicators of character and sense of place (*genius loci*), for example, in communities maintaining tradition and cultural continuity.

(b.ii.) Conditions of integrity

The conditions of integrity for properties nominated predominantly for their natural values are designed to ensure that (a) the values which justified the inclusion in the World Heritage List are not compromised at the time of, and subsequent to, inscription and (b) the World Heritage Committee is satisfied, at the time of inscription, that their condition will be maintained or enhanced in the future.

The expert meeting held at the Parc de la Vanoise in March 1996 under the aegis of the *Global Strategy* (see Paragraphs 7-9) proposed the following definition:

"A natural area is one where bio-physical processes and landform features are still relatively intact and where the primary management goal of the area is to ensure that natural values are protected. The term "natural" is a relative one. It is recognised that no area is totally pristine and that all natural areas are in a dynamic state. Human activities in natural areas often occur and, when sustainable, may complement the natural values of the area.

Key aspects of meeting the conditions of integrity are that natural features and natural processes of "outstanding universal value" are intact and that conditions and the level of protection ensure that the natural values are protected.

To meet the conditions of integrity a site should, in brief, (i) contain all or most of the key interrelated and interdependent elements in their natural relationships; (ii) have sufficient size and contain the necessary elements to demonstrate the key aspects of processes that are essential for the long-term conservation of the ecosystems and the biodiversity they contain; (iii) be of outstanding aesthetic value and include areas that are essential for maintaining these values; and (iv) contain habitats for maintaining the most diverse fauna and flora characteristic of the relevant biogeographical province/s. Clearly, adequate legislative and/or traditional protection mechanisms, management planning and capacity are also essential to ensure a site's integrity is intact and can be maintained.

22. 45-In principle, a site could be inscribed on the World Heritage List as long as it satisfies one of the ~~four~~ **ten** criteria and the relevant conditions of integrity and authenticity. However, most inscribed sites have met two or more criteria. Nomination dossiers, IUCN **and/or** ICOMOS evaluations and the final ~~recommendations~~ **decisions** of the Committee on each inscribed site are available for consultation by States Parties who may wish to use such information as guides for identifying and elaborating nomination of sites within their own territories.

24. CRITERIA

QUALIFYING CONDITIONS

<p>(i) represent a masterpiece of the human creative genius; or</p>	<p>(i) The sites inscribed under this criterion should be considered authentic if they are credible and genuine demonstrations of the creative values for which inscription is proposed.</p> <p>For example: the authenticity of a designed building or landscape, or an engineered structure proposed under this criterion would be evident in the degree to which its particular design qualities (aesthetic or technological excellence/innovation, etc.), may be identified and understood, particularly through surviving material (fabric) and form.</p>
<p>(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town-planning and landscape design ; or</p>	<p>(ii) The sites described under this criterion should be considered authentic if they are credible and genuine demonstrations of the type of interchange of human values for which inscription has been proposed.</p> <p>For example: the authenticity of the buildings, landscapes or urban layouts proposed under this criterion would be evident in the degree to which the interchanges (interactions, exchanges, influences, etc.) of human values, from which they result, may be identified and understood, particularly through their surviving material (fabric), form and traditions.</p>
<p>(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared ; or</p>	<p>(iii) The sites under this criterion should be considered authentic if they are credible and genuine demonstrations and testimonies to a cultural tradition or civilization for which inscription has been proposed.</p> <p>For example: the authenticity of archaeological sites or landscapes proposed under this criterion would be evident in the degree to which the qualities of their testimonies (particularly in surviving material (fabric), form and setting) may be identified and understood. The authenticity of living communities proposed under this inscription criterion</p>

	<p>would be evident in the degree to which the qualities of their testimonies may be identified and understood, particularly through the continuity of use of culturally meaningful materials, forms, traditions and functions, and in relation to their setting and spirit.</p>
<p>(iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history ; or</p>	<p>(iv) The sites inscribed under this criterion should be considered authentic if they are credible and genuine demonstrations of the building, architectural or landscape typologies for which nomination has been proposed.</p> <p>For example: the authenticity of the buildings, ensembles or landscapes proposed under this criterion would be evident in the degree to which the qualities relating to their type (excellence, uniqueness, representativeness, prototypicality, etc.) may be identified and understood, particularly through their surviving form, material (fabric) and use.</p>
<p>(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land/sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change ; or</p>	<p>(v) The sites inscribed under this criterion should be considered authentic if they are credible and genuine demonstrations of the representative qualities of a culture (or cultures) for which inscription has been proposed.</p> <p>For example: the authenticity of the traditional human settlements or land-use proposed under this criterion would be evident in the degree to which their qualities (excellence, representativeness, etc.) may be identified and understood, particularly through their surviving material (fabric), form, traditions, setting, use and spirit.</p>
<p>(vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural) ; or</p>	<p>(vi) The sites inscribed under this criterion should be considered authentic if they are credible and genuine demonstrations of the associative values for which inscription has been proposed.</p> <p>For example: the authenticity of the sites proposed under this criterion would be evident in the degree to which their associative qualities may be identified and understood, particularly in the spirit and feeling that they manifest.</p>

<p>(i)(vii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features ; or</p>	<p>(vii) (i) The sites inscribed according to this criterion described in 44(a)(i) should contain all or most of the key interrelated and interdependent elements in their natural relationships.</p> <p>For example, an "ice age" area should include the snow field, the glacier itself and samples of cutting patterns, deposition and colonization (e.g. striations, moraines, pioneer stages of plant succession, etc.); in the case of volcanoes, the magmatic series should be complete and all or most of the varieties of effusive rocks and types of eruptions be represented.</p>
<p>(ii) (viii) be outstanding examples representing human interaction with the environment or⁵ significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals ; or</p>	<p>(viii) (ii) The sites inscribed according to this criterion described in 44(a)(ii) should have sufficient size and contain the necessary elements to demonstrate the key aspects of processes that are essential for the long-term conservation of the ecosystems and the biological diversity they contain and the process of past and/or continuing human interaction with the environment.⁶</p> <p>For example, an area of tropical rain forest should include a certain amount of variation in elevation above sea-level, changes in topography and soil types, patch systems and naturally regenerating patches; similarly a coral reef should include, for example,</p>

⁵ At a meeting with the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies on 21-22 September 1998, the representatives of ICCROM and IUCN, expressed their concern about including this text in this criterion as had been recommended by the Expert Meeting in Amsterdam (March 1998). They questioned whether this text would be better included as a separate criterion or as an addition to criterion (ix).

IUCN have recently reiterated the request to delete this text stating that this is essentially a 'natural' criterion. Article 1 of the Convention places the 'combined works of nature and man in the definition of 'cultural heritage'. Also, Operational Guidelines paragraph 37 says that the term 'cultural landscape' embraces 'a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and the natural environment'.

Furthermore, IUCN suggests that the text could instead be included in criteria (iii), (iv) or (v).

⁶ Text suggested by ICOMOS at a meeting with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory bodies on 21-22 September 1998. Given IUCN's comments in Footnote 5 above, this text would also need to be deleted and included elsewhere in the qualifying conditions for criteria (iii), (iv) or (v).

	seagrass, mangrove or other adjacent ecosystems that regulate nutrient and sediment inputs into the reef.
(iii) (ix) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic and/or spiritual importance ; or	(ix) (iii) The sites inscribed according to this criterion described in 44(a)(iii) should be of outstanding aesthetic value and include areas that are essential for maintaining the beauty and/or spiritual importance⁷ of the site. For example, a site whose scenic values depend on a waterfall, should include adjacent catchment and downstream areas that are integrally linked to the maintenance of the aesthetic qualities of the site.
(iv) (x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.	(iv) (x) The sites inscribed according to this criterion described in paragraph 44(a)(iv) should contain habitats for maintaining the most diverse fauna and flora characteristic of the bio-geographic province and ecosystems under consideration. For example, a tropical savannah should include a complete assemblage of co-evolved herbivores and plants; an island ecosystem should include habitats for maintaining endemic biota; a site containing wide-ranging species should be large enough to include the most critical habitats essential to ensure the survival of viable populations of those species; for an area containing migratory species, seasonal breeding and nesting sites, and migratory routes, wherever they are located, should be adequately protected; international conventions, e.g. the Convention of Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), for ensuring the protection of habitats of migratory species of waterfowl, and other multi- and bilateral agreements could provide this assurance.

(b) Management requirements⁸

25. ii) Properties nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List must have adequate **long-term legal, regulatory, institutional, and/or** contractual and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated ~~cultural~~ properties ~~or cultural landscapes~~. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or

⁷ Additional text suggested by IUCN.

⁸ IUCN suggest that these paragraphs be re-ordered for a more logical presentation.

municipal level and/or a well-established contractual or traditional protection as well as of adequate management and/or planning control mechanisms is therefore essential and, ~~as is clearly indicated in the following paragraph~~, must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws and/or contractual and/or traditional protection as well as of these management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of **properties cultural sites**, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.

~~26. 22.~~ Where the intrinsic qualities of a property nominated are threatened by **human** action ~~of man~~ and yet meet the criteria and the **qualifying** conditions ~~of authenticity or integrity~~ set out in paragraph ~~24 24 and 44~~, an action plan outlining the corrective measures required should be submitted with the nomination file. Should the corrective measures submitted by the nominating State not be taken within the time proposed by the State, the property will be considered by the Committee for delisting in accordance with the procedure adopted by the Committee.

~~(b) (i) 27.~~ ~~Cultural properties should meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components. (the Committee stressed that Reconstruction is only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture).~~

~~28. (v) The sites described in paragraph 44(a) should have a management plan. When the mechanisms described in Paragraphs 27 and/or 28 are not in place a site does not have a management plan at the time when the property is nominated for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party concerned should indicate when such mechanisms a plan will become available and how it proposes to mobilize the resources required for the preparation and implementation of the mechanism plan. The State Party should also provide a description of the legal, contractual and/or traditional protection, other document(s) (e.g. operational plans) which will guide the management of the site until such time as when a management plan or mechanism is finalized.~~

~~29. 44.~~ Under the management section of the nomination form States Parties should provide, in addition to the legal texts protecting the property being nominated, an explanation of the way in which these laws actually operate are implemented. Such an analysis is preferable to a mere enumeration or compilation of the legal texts themselves.

~~30.~~ States Parties are encouraged to prepare plans for the management of each **property natural site** nominated ~~and for the safeguarding of each cultural property nominated~~. All information concerning these plans should be made available when technical co-operation is requested.

~~31.~~ The boundaries of a **World Heritage property nominated according to criteria (i) to (vi)** ~~that site~~ should reflect **[text to be proposed by ICOMOS & ICCROM]**.

32. ~~(vii)~~ Sites **inscribed according to criteria (vii) to (x)** described in paragraph 44(a) should **include** ~~be~~ the most important sites for the conservation of biological diversity.⁹ Biological diversity, according to the ~~new global~~ Convention on Biological Diversity, means the variability among living organisms in terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part and includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems. Only those sites which are the most biologically diverse are likely to meet criterion ~~x (iv)~~ of paragraph 44 (a).

33. ~~(vi)~~ A site described in paragraph 44(a) should have adequate long term legislative, regulatory or institutional protection. The boundaries of a **World Heritage property nominated according to criteria (vii) to (x)** that site should reflect the spatial requirements of habitats, species, processes or phenomena that provide the basis for its nomination for inscription on the World Heritage List. The boundaries should include a **buffer zone composed of** sufficient areas immediately adjacent to the area of outstanding universal value in order to protect the site's heritage values from direct **adverse** effects of human encroachment and impacts of resource use outside of the nominated area. The boundaries of the nominated site may coincide with one or more existing or proposed protected areas, such as national parks or biosphere reserves. While an existing or proposed protected area may contain several management zones, only some of those zones may satisfy criteria described in paragraph **24** 44(a); other zones, although they may not meet the criteria set out in paragraph **24** 44(a), may be essential for the management to ensure the integrity of the nominated site. For example, in the case of a biosphere reserve, only the core zone may meet the criteria and the conditions of integrity, although other zones, i.e. buffer and transitional zones, would be important for the conservation of the ~~biosphere reserve~~ **World Heritage property** in its totality.

34. ~~17.~~ Whenever necessary for the proper conservation of a ~~cultural or natural~~ property nominated, an adequate "buffer zone" around a property should be provided and should be afforded the necessary protection. A buffer zone can be defined as an area surrounding the property which has restrictions placed on its use to give an added layer of protection; the area constituting the buffer zone should be determined in each case through technical studies. Details on the size, characteristics and authorized uses of a buffer zone, as well as a map indicating its precise boundaries, should be provided in the nomination file relating to the property in question.

⁹ IUCN have noted that criteria (vii), (viii) and (ix) could qualify as of 'outstanding universal value' without being 'the most biologically diverse'.

The following paragraphs would become part of Section G FORMAT AND CONTENT OF NOMINATIONS

10. Each nomination should be supported by all the necessary documentation, including suitable slides and maps and other material. ~~With regard to cultural properties,~~ States Parties are invited to attach to the nomination forms a brief analysis of references in world literature (e.g. reference works such as general or specialized encyclopaedia, histories of art or architecture, records of voyages and explorations, scientific reports, guidebooks, etc.) along with a comprehensive bibliography. With regard to newly-discovered properties, evidence of the attention which the discovery has received internationally would be equally helpful.

13. In certain cases it may be necessary for States Parties to consult the Secretariat and the specialized NGO concerned (**IUCN AND/OR ICOMOS**) informally before submitting nomination forms.¹⁰ The Committee reminds States Parties that assistance for the purpose of preparing comprehensive and sound nominations is available to them at their request under the World Heritage Fund.

14. Participation of local people in the nomination process and management after nomination is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site.

¹⁰ IUCN do not entirely agree with this paragraph and suggest that it requires clarification as to how far it should be applied.

The following text would become the new Annex I with a footnote in paragraph 8

Guidance concerning the inclusion of groups of urban buildings and cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List

A. Guidance concerning the inclusion of groups of urban buildings on the World Heritage List

26. With respect to groups of urban buildings, the Committee has furthermore adopted the following Guidelines concerning their inclusion in the World Heritage List.

27. Groups of urban buildings eligible for inclusion in the World Heritage List fall into three main categories, namely:

- (i) towns which are no longer inhabited but which provide unchanged archaeological evidence of the past; ~~these generally satisfy the criterion of authenticity and~~ their state of conservation can be relatively easily controlled;
- (ii) historic towns which are still inhabited and which, by their very nature, have developed and will continue to develop under the influence of socio-economic and cultural change, a situation that renders the assessment of their authenticity more difficult and any conservation policy more problematical;
- (iii) new towns of the twentieth century which paradoxically have something in common with both the aforementioned categories: while their original urban organization is clearly recognizable and their authenticity is undeniable, their future is unclear because their development is largely uncontrollable.

28. The evaluation of towns that are no longer inhabited does not raise any special difficulties other than those related to archaeological sites in general: the criteria which call for uniqueness or exemplary character have led to the choice of groups of buildings noteworthy for their purity of style, for the concentrations of monuments they contain and sometimes for their important historical associations. It is important for urban archaeological sites to be listed as integral units. A cluster of monuments or a small group of buildings is not adequate to suggest the multiple and complex functions of a city which has disappeared; remains of such a city should be preserved in their entirety together with their natural surroundings whenever possible.

29. In the case of inhabited historic towns the difficulties are numerous, largely owing to the fragility of their urban fabric (which has in many cases been seriously disrupted since the advent of the industrial era) and the runaway speed with which their surroundings have been urbanized. To qualify for inclusion, towns should compel recognition because of their architectural interest and should not be considered only on the intellectual grounds of the role they may have played in the past or their value as historical symbols under criterion (vi) for the inclusion of ~~cultural~~ properties in the World Heritage List (see paragraph 24 above). To be eligible for inclusion in the List, the spatial organization, structure, materials, forms and, where possible, functions of a group of buildings should essentially reflect the civilization or succession of civilizations which have prompted the nomination of the property. Four categories can be distinguished:

- (i) Towns which are typical of a specific period or culture, which have been almost wholly preserved and which have remained largely unaffected by subsequent developments. Here the property to be listed is the entire town together with its surroundings, which must also be protected;
- (ii) Towns that have evolved along characteristic lines and have preserved, sometimes in the midst of exceptional natural surroundings, spatial arrangements and structures that are typical of the successive stages in their history. Here the clearly defined historic part takes precedence over the contemporary environment;
- (iii) "Historic centres" that cover exactly the same area as ancient towns and are now enclosed within modern cities. Here it is necessary to determine the precise limits of the property in its widest historical dimensions and to make appropriate provision for its immediate surroundings;
- (iv) Sectors, areas or isolated units which, even in the residual state in which they have survived, provide coherent evidence of the character of a historic town which has disappeared. In such cases surviving areas and buildings should bear sufficient testimony to the former whole.

30. Historic centres and historic areas should be listed only where they contain a large number of ancient buildings of monumental importance which provide a direct indication of the characteristic features of a town of exceptional interest. Nominations of several isolated and unrelated buildings which allegedly represent, in themselves, a town whose urban fabric has ceased to be discernible, should not be encouraged.

31. However, nominations could be made regarding properties that occupy a limited space but have had a major influence on the history of town planning. In such cases, the nomination should make it clear that it is the monumental group that is to be listed and that the town is mentioned only incidentally as the place where the property is located. Similarly, if a building of clearly universal significance is located in severely degraded or insufficiently representative urban surroundings, it should, of course, be listed without any special reference to the town.

32. It is difficult to assess the quality of new towns of the twentieth century. History alone will tell which of them will best serve as examples of contemporary town planning. The examination of the files on these towns should be deferred, save under exceptional circumstances.

33. Under present conditions, preference should be given to the inclusion in the World Heritage List of small or medium-sized urban areas which are in a position to manage any potential growth, rather than the great metropolises, on which sufficiently complete information and documentation cannot readily be provided that would serve as a satisfactory basis for their inclusion in their entirety.

34. In view of the effects which the entry of a town in the World Heritage List could have on its future, such entries should be exceptional. Inclusion in the List implies that legislative and administrative measures have already been taken to ensure the protection of the group of buildings and its environment. Informed awareness on the part of the population concerned,

without whose active participation any conservation scheme would be impractical, is also essential.

B. Guidance concerning the inclusion of cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List¹¹

35. With respect to cultural landscapes, the Committee has furthermore adopted the following guidelines concerning their inclusion in the World Heritage List.

36. Cultural landscapes represent the "combined works of nature and of man" designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. They should be selected on the basis both of their outstanding universal value and of their representativity in terms of a clearly defined geo-cultural region and also for their capacity to illustrate the essential and distinct cultural elements of such regions.¹²

~~**37.** The term "cultural landscape" embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment.~~

38. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. ~~The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity.~~

39. Cultural landscapes fall into three main categories, namely:

- (i) ~~The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined~~ landscapes designed and created intentionally by man. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.
- (ii) The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:
 - a relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.
 - a continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life,

¹¹ All suggested changes to this section were proposed by IUCN.

¹² IUCN questions the meaning of the term 'geo-cultural'.

and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

- (iii) The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.

40. The extent of a cultural landscape for inclusion on the World Heritage List is relative to its functionality and intelligibility. In any case, the sample selected must be substantial enough to adequately represent the totality of the cultural landscape that it illustrates. The possibility of designating long linear areas which represent culturally significant transport and communication networks should not be excluded.

41. The general criteria for conservation and management laid down in paragraphs **25 to 34** ~~24.(b).(ii)~~ above are equally applicable to cultural landscapes. It is important that due attention be paid to the full range of values represented in the landscape, both cultural and natural. The nominations should be prepared in collaboration with and the full approval of local communities.

42. The existence of a category of "cultural landscape", included on the World Heritage List on the basis of the criteria set out in paragraph 24 above, ~~does not exclude~~ **includes** the possibility of sites of **outstanding universal value** ~~exceptional importance~~ in relation to both cultural and natural ~~value criteria~~ continuing to be included **as properties with mixed cultural and natural value**. ~~In such cases, their outstanding universal significance must be justified under both sets of criteria.~~