

Distribution limited

WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.13

Paris, 3 December 2001

Original : English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fifth session

Helsinki, Finland

11 - 16 December 2001

Information document : Analysis of the application of cultural criterion (vi)

## BACKGROUND

At the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000), the Chairperson informed the Committee that given the various issues relating to the application of cultural criterion (vi) that had arisen during the session, a meeting to discuss all criteria would be held in Paris during the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau.

At its twenty-fifth session (June 2001) the Bureau examined document WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8 that presented a summary of the evolution in the wording and application of cultural heritage criterion (vi) over time. The Bureau

- a) clarified the use of cultural criterion (vi) with reference to the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a Balanced and Representative World Heritage List*; and
- b) proposed new wording of cultural criterion (vi) to be suggested to the Committee for inclusion in the revised *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

In response to the Chairperson's request at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, document WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8 was updated to incorporate the observations made by the Bureau. Observations made at subsequent meetings held between September and November have also been incorporated in this document.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. The evolution in the wording and application of cultural criterion (vi)</b>	
a) Overview	2
b) 1977 - 1997	2
c) 1998 - June 2001	4
<b>III Discussions concerning cultural criterion (vi) at, and subsequent to, the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee 25-30 June 2001</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>IV. Bibliography</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>TABLES</b>	
TABLE A The evolution in the wording of cultural criterion (vi) in the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	4
TABLE B Twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000) - nominations for which the application of cultural criterion (vi) was questioned	7
TABLE C Twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000) - other properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi)	8
TABLE D Proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi) (2000 - 2001)	9
TABLE E Proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi) (June 2001-October 2001)	13
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
ANNEX I List of 146 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) of the <i>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i>	16
ANNEX II List of 13 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (vi) of the <i>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i>	21
ANNEX III Annual number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List partly or only on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) between 1978 and 2000	22
ANNEX IV List of 9 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List <i>only</i> on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) and Property inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) and natural criteria	23
ANNEX V Recommendations from ICOMOS to the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 2001 to inscribe properties on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi)	24
ANNEX VI Extract of the <i>Report of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee</i>	26

## I. Introduction

1. The earliest cultural heritage criteria were adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1977. Since then, several significant changes have been made to all criteria including cultural criterion (vi).
2. According to the current version of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (March 1999), cultural criterion (vi) can be used when the property nominated is (**bold** added for emphasis):

*“... directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, ideas or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion on the list **in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural**)”.*

3. The wording of cultural criterion (vi) can be seen to have a basis in the *World Heritage Convention's* Article 1 definition of cultural heritage as follows (**bold** added for emphasis):

*"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 of 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.**"*

4. In 1992, the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee adopted three categories of World Heritage cultural landscapes. In particular, the third category of cultural landscapes, associative cultural landscapes is reliant on the application of cultural criterion (vi). Paragraph 39 (iii) of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* defines associative cultural landscapes as

*"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."*

5. In the past, a number of issues concerning the application of cultural criterion (vi) have arisen. These included:

- lack of consistency of application due to different perceptions of the role and application of the criterion;
- concern that restrictions to its application create a bias in favour of monumental heritage and limit the criterion's application to heritage related to living traditions, ideas and beliefs;
- a desire to protect against political and nationalistic uses of the criterion; and

- concern that there will be too many inscriptions using cultural criterion (vi) if restrictive wording is not adopted.

6. The aims of this document are to provide a brief overview of the evolution of the wording and application of cultural criterion (vi), and to raise key questions for discussion by the Bureau.

## II. The Evolution in the Wording and Application of Cultural Criterion (vi)

### a) Overview

7. **Annex I** is a list of all the 146 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi). **Annex II** is a list of 13 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (iii) and (vi). **Annex III** shows the annual number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List partly or only on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) between 1978 and 2000. **Annex IV** lists the 9 properties only inscribed under cultural criterion (vi) and the one property inscribed on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) and natural criteria. **Annex V** lists the properties that ICOMOS has recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List under criterion (vi), to be discussed at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 2001.

### b) 1977-1997

8. The first cultural heritage criteria associated with the *World Heritage Convention* were adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1977. At the second session of the World Heritage Committee in 1978, the first two sites out of a total of nine to date were solely inscribed under criterion (vi). These sites were L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site (Canada) and the Island of Gorée (Senegal).

9. The next major changes to the criteria were initiated by the second session of the Bureau in 1979. The discussion centred on the concept of "universal value", the need to revise the wording of cultural heritage criteria (i) and (vi) and the notion of "combined" cultural and natural properties. Following consideration of Edison National Historic Site (USA) at this meeting, attention was drawn to the difficulties of using criterion (vi). It was recommended that cultural heritage criteria (i) and (vi) be critically re-examined to ensure that "an unreasonably large number of nominations" were not received (UNESCO 1979(a): 3).

10. In 1979, following the preparation of a "Comparative Study of Nominations and Criteria for World Heritage Criteria" and the creation of several working groups to discuss the criteria, the Committee adopted the following principle concerning the application of cultural heritage criterion (vi):

(v) Particular attention should be given to cases which fall under criterion (vi) so that the net result would not be a reduction in the value of the List, due to the large potential number of nominations as well as to political difficulties. Nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularisms in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 30 November 1979: 9).

11. At the third session of the World Heritage Committee in Cairo and Luxor in October 1979, the Committee decided to inscribe Independence Hall (United States of America), Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions (Ghana), and Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland),

on the World Heritage List. Auschwitz Concentration Camp was considered a unique site and the Committee decided to restrict the inscription of other sites of a similar nature (UNESCO 1979(b): 11).

12. Since 1980 cultural heritage criterion (vi) has been limited in its application by the statement that “the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria”.

13. Between 1981 and 1983, three sites were inscribed on the World Heritage List solely under criterion (vi). These were Head Smashed in Buffalo Jump Complex (Canada) in 1981, Rila Monastery (Bulgaria) in 1983, and La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site in Puerto Rico (USA) in 1983.

14. Although criterion (vi) was broadened in its applicability by the inclusion of living traditions and artistic and literary works in 1994, properties associated with **globally significant persons** were no longer specifically accommodated for inclusion in the World Heritage List using this criterion.

15. In December 1993 the Committee made a landmark decision for the recognition of outstanding intangible and indigenous cultural heritage values by inscribing Tongariro National Park (New Zealand) under cultural criterion (vi). The site had previously been inscribed under natural criteria (ii) and (iii) in 1990. The Committee decided that the stipulation in the *Operational Guidelines* that criterion (vi) only be applied “in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria” refers to other natural or cultural criteria. (UNESCO 1994: 39). In the following year, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Australia), already inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of its natural values, was successfully renominated on the basis of cultural criteria (v) and (vi).

16. At the twentieth session of the Committee (Merida, December 1996) Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (Japan) was inscribed on the World Heritage List on an exceptional basis under criterion (vi). Some States Parties expressed their opposition to the inscription.

17. As a result, the use of cultural criterion (vi) was further restricted. Cultural criterion (vi) was amended so that it should justify inclusion on the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural (UNESCO February 1997: 24). This restriction in the application of criterion (vi) makes the inscription of a property solely on the basis of its association with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works impossible. However, it is possible to inscribe a property solely on the basis of the other five cultural criteria. Such conditional usage of this criterion was not envisaged when the criteria were established.

18. A summary of changes to the wording of cultural criterion (vi) between 1977 and 1997 are indicated in Table A below.

**Table A: The evolution in the wording of cultural criterion (vi) in the *Operational Guidelines***

Date	Wording of cultural criterion (vi)
October 1977	"be most importantly associated with ideas or beliefs, with events or with persons, of outstanding historical importance or significance"
October 1980	"be <b>directly or tangibly</b> associated with events or with ideas or beliefs of outstanding <b>universal</b> significance ( <b>the Committee considered that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria</b> )"
November 1983	"be directly or tangibly associated with events or with ideas or beliefs of outstanding universal significance (the Committee <b>considers</b> that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria)"
December 1988	"be <u>directly or tangibly associated with events or with ideas or beliefs</u> of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria)"
February 1994	"be directly or tangibly associated with events or <b>living traditions</b> , with ideas, or with beliefs, with <b>artistic and literary works</b> of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria)"
February 1995	"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 or in conjunction with other criteria <b>cultural or natural</b> )"
February 1997 - March 1999	"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 <b>and</b> in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)"

(Text in bold indicates significant changes to the wording of criterion (vi))

**c) 1998 - June 2001**

19. The World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session (1998), requested that the Consultative Body examine technical issues including an analysis on the application of cultural heritage criterion (i) and (vi), the test of authenticity, the balance of the World Heritage List, and the implementation of the Global Strategy. (UNESCO 1998(a): 1)

20. At the Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting in Amsterdam, March 1998, the experts proposed a unified set of ten evaluation criteria for the inclusion of natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List. In discussions about the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi), the delegate of Zimbabwe noted that cultural criterion (i) was often used in nominations and was creating an over emphasis on monumentality rather than on intangible heritage which is addressed in cultural criterion (vi) (Sullivan 1998: 4).

21. The Delegate of Australia informed the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee (Kyoto, December 1998) about the deliberations of the Consultative Body and also referred to some of the main findings of the meeting of experts held in Amsterdam. Whilst noting that no change had been suggested to cultural criteria (i) and (vi), the Delegate noted that it was deemed necessary to suggest sparing use and a better definition of exactly how they should be used. She suggested that the advisory bodies may wish to review the qualifying conditions used to apply cultural criteria (i) and (vi) as part of their work to propose revisions to Section I of the *Operational Guidelines* (UNESCO 1999(a): 32).

22. With reference to the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi), the Committee did not suggest revisions. A number of Committee members did however suggest that a better understanding of the application of both criteria is required and explanatory text to accompany the criteria could be formulated to assist in this regard. (UNESCO 1999(a): 33)

23. The restrictive nature of the current wording of cultural criterion (vi) was evident in relation to the inscription of Robben Island (South Africa) on the World Heritage List at the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee (Marrakesh, 1999). The site was inscribed on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (vi) even though the primary justification for nomination was criterion (vi) as a “symbol of triumph of the human spirit over adversity”. There was total agreement before and after the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee that the application of criterion (vi) was justified in this instance. The Delegate of Thailand suggested “that criterion (vi) could be amended during the session so that the inscription of the site would be possible only under this criterion (vi)”. The decision however was taken not to amend the criterion at this stage. (Munjeri in UNESCO 2000(b): 2)

24. In Zimbabwe May 2000, a meeting on "Authenticity and Integrity in an African context" was held to provide a forum of discussions to European and African experts on the notions of authenticity and integrity for potential World Heritage properties in “traditional societies” (i.e. “non-industrial” and “non-urban”). In relation to discussions on the *Operational Guidelines*, it was pointed out that it is not judicious to make continuous changes to the *Operational Guidelines* because there is a need for continuity (UNESCO 2000(a): 14). Nevertheless, in relation to criterion (vi), it was felt that due to the specific spiritual character of some potential African World Heritage sites, the situation should be reviewed and a principled and specific recommendation be made. (UNESCO 2000(a): 14).

25. The recommendations of the Expert Meeting to the Scientific Committee in relation to criterion (vi) were as follows:

*In considering criterion (vi) it was pointed out that cultural heritage can exist in spiritual forms in its own right with the absence of any tangible evidence at a particular site. Physical remains could be insignificant, which is often the case in sacred sites.*

*There could be cases where the absence of tangible evidence would not allow the inclusion in the List, although they may be of outstanding universal value. As a result two alternative solutions are being proposed:*

*(a) To revise the existing criterion (vi) to the form it was before 1996. This would mean that this criterion could be used alone without any other criteria.*

*(b) To consider the possibility of using criterion (iii) – the exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or civilization – or (v) – traditional human settlement or land use -, in relation to intangible testimony of a civilization. This would mean using criteria (iii) or (v) together*

*with (vi). It is noted that criteria (iii) and (v) so far have only been used for tangible evidence. Furthermore, it is pointed out, that outstanding universal value is the underlying concept of the Convention and has to be applied in all cases.*

*From an African point of view, it was expressed that there is a strong preference for option (a) since sites exist which may not be considered under any other criteria than (vi) (UNESCO 2000(a): 32).*

26. Based on the recommendations adopted at the Expert Meeting in Great Zimbabwe, the Second Scientific Committee Meeting on “Authenticity and Integrity in an African context” was held in Paris in September 2000. A comprehensive discussion took place on the issues relating to the current wording of criterion (vi) (UNESCO 2000(b): 1). It was suggested that Paragraph 24 (a) (vi) be amended as follows:

*"be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (**except in the case of living traditions**, the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and **preferably** in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)".*

27. The Scientific Committee also recommended to the Committee, when examining nominations, to widen the possibility of using criterion (iii) the exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or civilization, or (v) traditional human settlement or land use, in relation to intangible testimony of a civilization. Furthermore, it was pointed out that outstanding universal value is the underlying concept of the Convention and has to be applied in all cases (UNESCO 2000(a): 34).

28. At the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee in Cairns 2000, an extensive discussion took place on the application of criterion (vi) for cultural heritage properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List. It was evident that there were different perceptions amongst some Committee members and ICOMOS concerning the application of cultural criterion (vi) for the following sites:



**Table B: Twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000) - nominations for which the application of cultural criterion (vi) was questioned (UNESCO 2001: 41- 45 and ICOMOS 2000: 108, 183, 223)**

Property and ID No.	Criteria Inscribed under	ICOMOS explanation as to why criterion (vi) was applicable	Discussion and outcome
Gusuku Sites and Related Properties of the Kingdom of Ryuku, Japan (972)	C (ii) (iii) (vi)	The Ryukyu sacred sites constitute an exceptional example of an indigenous form of nature and ancestor worship that has survived intact into the modern age alongside other established world religions.	ICOMOS proposed criterion (vi) and there was no opposition from the Committee.
The Stone Town of Zanzibar, United Republic of Tanzania (173 Rev)	C (ii) (iii) (vi)	Zanzibar has great symbolic importance in the suppression of slavery, since it was one of the main slave-trading ports in East Africa and also the base from which its opponents such as David Livingstone conducted their campaign.	ICOMOS left the proposed application of criterion (vi) up to the Committee to decide, and no objections were made by the Committee.
The Historic Town of St George and Related Fortifications, Bermuda, United Kingdom (983)	C (iv)	St George represents the beginning of the English colonization of the New World, a step in the European settlement of North America that has resulted in developments of outstanding universal significance.	The Delegate of Thailand noted that the criterion had not been requested by the State Party. ICOMOS responded that the Advisory Bodies evaluated properties according to the procedures set out in the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> and recommended criteria deriving from their evaluations. The Committee inscribed the property only under cultural criterion (iv), indicating the possibility of re-nomination of the property under cultural criterion (vi) at a later date.
The Old City of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina (946)	C (iv) (vi)	ICOMOS recommended that this property be inscribed under criteria (vi) as the historic town represents the encounter between the cultures of the east, in the form of its Ottoman Turkish heritage, and of Europe, as witnessed by the monuments of the Austro-Hungarian period.	ICOMOS left the application of criterion (vi) up to the Committee to decide. Following information received from the UNESCO Office in Sarajevo concerning the threats to the site the Committee decided to <u>defer the inscription of this property.</u>

The Historic Centre of Brugge, Belgium (996)	C(ii) (iv) (vi)	It was the birthplace of the Flemish Primitives, a centre of patronage and development of painting in the Middle Ages with artists such as Jan van Eyck and Hans Memling.	The Delegates of Thailand and Mexico questioned the application of criterion (vi).
Rietveld Schröderhuis (Rietveld Schröder House), Netherlands (965)	C (i) (ii)	The house is considered to be a manifesto of the De Stijl movement and can be directly associated with ideas and artistic works of outstanding universal significance	Some delegates had reservations about the application of criterion (vi) and proposed further reflection on its application. The Committee deferred the application of criterion (vi).

29. Other properties that were inscribed by the Committee in Cairns (2000) according to cultural criterion (vi) without discussion are listed in Table C.

**Table C: Twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000) - other properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) (UNESCO 2001: 41- 45)**

Property, Location and ID No.	Criteria Inscribed under	Why criterion (vi) was applied
Mount Qingcheng and the Dujiangyan Irrigation System, China (1001)	C (ii) (iv) (vi)	The Temples of Mount Qingcheng are closely associated with the foundation of Taoism, one of the most influential religions of East Asia over a long period of history.
Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties, China (1004)	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)	The Ming and Qing Tombs are dazzling illustrations of the beliefs, world view, and geomantic theories of <i>Fengshui</i> prevalent in feudal China. They have served as burial edifices for illustrious personages and as the theatre for major events that have marked the history of China.
The Monastic Island of Reichenau, Germany (974)	C (iii) (iv) (vi)	The Monastery of Reichenau was a highly significant artistic centre of great significance to the history of art in Europe in the 10th and 11th centuries, as is superbly illustrated by its monumental wall paintings and its illuminations.
Assisi, the Basilica of San Francesco and other Franciscan sites, Italy (990)	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)	Being the birthplace of the Franciscan Order, Assisi has from the Middle Ages been closely associated with the cult and diffusion of the Franciscan movement in the world, focusing on the universal message of peace and tolerance even to other religions or beliefs.

30. Some Committee members and observers stressed that cultural criterion (vi) must be applied only in exceptional cases and remarked negatively on its liberal application. Following this discussion, it was recommended that further reflection be made on the application of criterion (vi) as it is indispensable for the future work of the World Heritage Committee.

31. At a meeting of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in March 2001, there was agreement that the current wording of criterion (vi) is not adequate to ensure the inclusion of certain

types of heritage that are not currently represented on the World Heritage List. Possible changes were discussed, but it was stressed that a new change should not be seen as “going back”, but rather going forward. The simplest solution was thought to be to follow the text developed during the Zimbabwe meeting, inserting the word “preferably” into the existing text as follows:

*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 preferably in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)*(ICCR0M 2001 :2).

32. A summary of the proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi) made at meetings between 2000 and June 2001 is included in Table D below.

**Table D: Proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi) (2000 - June 2001)**

Source	Proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi)
May 2000, Meeting on «Authenticity and Integrity in an African context», Great Zimbabwe National Monument, Zimbabwe	From an African point of view, there is a strong preference to revise the existing criterion (vi) to the form it was before 1996. This would mean that this criterion could be used alone without any other criteria.
September 2000, Second meeting of the Scientific Committee – Authenticity and Integrity in an African Context, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris	It was suggested that the wording of criterion (vi) be altered as follows:  "be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance ( <b>except in the case of living traditions</b> , the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and <b>preferably</b> in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)"
March 2001 Meeting of the Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM) and the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM, Rome	It was agreed that the wording of criterion (vi) should be altered as follows:  "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 <b>preferably</b> in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)"

### **III. Discussions concerning cultural criterion (vi) at, and subsequent to, the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee 25 –30 June 2001**

#### **Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (25 –30 June 2001)**

33. At its twenty-fifth session, the Bureau was requested to examine document WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8 that presents a summary of the evolution in the wording and application of cultural heritage criterion (vi) over time.

## Key issues presented to the twenty-fifth Bureau session relating to the application of cultural criterion (vi)

34. The Bureau was informed that an emerging trend is for the *Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List* and the category of associative cultural landscapes<sup>1</sup> to recognize outstanding spiritual and sacred associative indigenous and/or intangible values. The revision of cultural criterion (iii) in 1994 to accommodate cultural traditions which are "living" assists in this recognition. However, restriction of the use of cultural criterion (vi) limits these possibilities.

35. The Bureau was also informed that the wording and application of cultural criterion (vi) can be interpreted as being "out of step" with the implementation of the *Global Strategy*. The *Global Strategy* is one of the key priorities of the World Heritage Committee to identify new World Heritage properties in under represented regions and categories of heritage to better reflect the world's outstanding cultural and natural diversity. Since 1997 it has been effectively impossible to utilise criterion (vi) for living heritage without a site also meeting another criterion (King in UNESCO, 2000(b): 3).

36. The key issues below were proposed for discussion in an attempt to clarify the role and application of cultural criterion (vi).

a) When the World Heritage criteria were established, it was understood that no criterion was of a higher order than another. However, according to the current wording, cultural criterion (vi) cannot be used by itself. This implies that the values it is assessing are not at the same level or threshold as the other outstanding universal values implied by the application of the other criteria.

b) The exact meaning of "exceptional circumstances" in cultural criterion (vi) is not defined.

c) Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (Japan), Robben Island (The Republic of South Africa), Island of Gorée (Senegal) and Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) are inscribed partly or totally on the basis of cultural criterion (vi). If the application of cultural criterion (vi) is restricted to being used only in conjunction with other cultural or natural criteria, it is not apparent how other outstanding "places of memory" will be inscribed on the World Heritage List in the future.

d) Cultural criterion (iii) can be used for the inscription of sites that "bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition which is ..... living" and is therefore applicable for sites where there is a physical manifestation of the living cultural tradition. However, it is only cultural criterion (vi) that recognises an association with "living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs".

Cultural criterion (i) can be used for the inscription of sites that "represent a masterpiece of human creative genius", therefore cultural criterion (i) is applicable for sites where there is a physical manifestation of the "artistic". However, it is only cultural criterion (vi) that recognises an association with "artistic and literary works".

The restricted use of cultural criterion (vi) could continue the bias of the World Heritage List in favour of monumental heritage and restrict the recognition of outstanding intangible values (including spiritual, indigenous and artistic values) associated with a place.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 39(iii) of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, adopted by the Committee at its sixteenth session in 1992: "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."

e) UNESCO's Director-General proclaimed the first list on intangible cultural heritage on 18 May, 2001. This initiative, and the possibility of establishing an international standard setting instrument to protect intangible cultural heritage, demonstrates the current importance of international protection and recognition of intangible values. The implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and in particular the application of cultural criterion (vi) to recognise intangible or associative values, could be examined to ensure complementarity with the new intangible cultural heritage list and possible international instrument.

### **Recommendations made to the twenty-fifth session of the Committee**

37. The Bureau was asked to make recommendations to the twenty-fifth session of the Committee to:

- a) clarify the use of cultural criterion (vi) with reference to the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a Balanced and Representative World Heritage List*;
- b) obtain agreement as to the final wording of cultural criterion (vi) to be suggested to the Committee for inclusion in the revised *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*; and
- c) establish a clear framework for strict application of cultural criterion (vi).

38. In response to action a) the Delegates of Australia, Finland, Zimbabwe and Ecuador responded positively that cultural criterion (vi) has a role to play in ensuring balance and representivity of the World Heritage List.

39. In response to action b), four possible options for the revised wording of cultural criterion (vi) were proposed by the Chairman as follows:

1. delete the words within parentheses after "exceptional circumstances":

24(a)(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~~).

2. make all the words in parentheses only relevant to "living traditions":

24(a)(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 (**except in the case of living traditions**, 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).

3. add the word "preferably" after "exceptional circumstances and..." in parentheses:

24(a)(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 **preferably** in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural).

4. delete all the wording within parentheses:

24(a)(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).~~

Most members of the Bureau were in favour of the fourth option. The Delegates of Canada and Thailand expressed their preference for the third option.

40. In response to action c) the Chairperson stressed the importance of applying the standards of "outstanding universal value" when applying cultural criterion (vi).

41. The Representatives of ICOMOS and ICCROM were heartened by the decision of the Bureau, noting that cultural criterion (vi) is of immense importance to recognize non-monumental heritage and values related to place and that the discussion was in line with the three meetings held in 2000 and 2001. The Chairperson requested that document WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8 be updated, to incorporate the observations made by the Bureau for submission to the World Heritage Committee and be used as a resource document in the future. An excerpt of the *Report of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee* summarising the discussions held is contained in Annex VI .

#### **Thematic Expert Meeting on Asia-Pacific Sacred Mountains (Wakayama, Japan, 5-10 September 2001)**

42. At the Thematic Expert Meeting on Asia-Pacific Sacred Mountains (WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.9) the participants discussed criterion (vi) and decided that its application was the most appropriate for assessing the associative values of sacred mountains. However, the participants recognized that the world cultural heritage criteria (i) – (v) may also be applicable for sacred mountains.

43. The participants recommended a comprehensive assessment of all cultural criteria for sacred mountains as cultural landscapes. Moreover, it was recognized that within the context of sacred mountains, the current wording of cultural heritage criterion (vi) is not satisfactory as some sites may only qualify through intangible values linked to the natural environment. Therefore, it is recommended that cultural heritage criterion (vi) be amended as follows:

“This criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and preferably in conjunction with other criteria, cultural or natural.”

44. It was recommended that a review of the associative and other cultural values of existing natural World Heritage sites in the region be conducted as it would be useful for undertaking comparative analyses of sacred mountains in the Asia-Pacific Region. States Parties with existing World Heritage mountain properties were urged to review associated cultural heritage values. Upon assessing their significance, such States Parties may consider renominating these properties under cultural criteria.

**Meeting of the *Drafting Group for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 8-12 October 2001)**

45. At the meeting of the *Drafting Group for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, the experts endorsed the recommendation of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in relation to cultural criterion (vi) to delete the words in parentheses.

**The World Heritage Indigenous Peoples' Council of Experts (WHIPCOE) Working Group Workshop (Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, 5-8 November 2001)**

46. In November 2001, a workshop was held in Winnipeg, Canada to further develop the proposal for a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples' Council of Experts (WHIPCOE). At the workshop, criteria for membership were discussed. It is expected that the future membership of WHIPCOE could include indigenous peoples and indigenous site managers from properties inscribed on the World Heritage List according to cultural criterion (vi).

47. The table below summarises the proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi) made at and subsequent to the twenty-fifth Bureau session

**Table E: Proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi) (June 2001-October 2001)**

Source	Proposed wording of cultural criterion (vi)
Twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee 25 –30 June 2001	Most members agreed to delete all the wording within parentheses:  24(a)(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 <del>(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).</del>
Thematic Expert Meeting on Asia-Pacific Sacred Mountains (Wakayama, Japan, 5-10 September 2001)	24(a)(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 <del>(the Committee considers that</del> This criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and <u>preferably</u> in conjunction with other criteria, cultural or natural.)
Meeting of the <i>Drafting Group for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i> (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 8-12 October 2001)	24(a)(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 <del>(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).</del>

#### IV. Bibliography

ICCROM, 2001. *Draft Minutes, Meeting of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Convention, Rome 2-3 March 2001*, 16 March 2001.

International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), 2000. UNESCO World Heritage Convention World Heritage Committee 24th ordinary session (27 November - 2 December 2000) Cairns (Australia) *Evaluations of Cultural Properties WHC-2000/CONF.204/INF.6*.

Sullivan, S. 1998. Discussion Paper: *Meeting of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee, 29-30 April 1998*.

Titchen, S.M. 1995. "On the construction of outstanding universal value. UNESCO's World Heritage Convention (Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972) and the identification and assessment of cultural places for inclusion on the World Heritage List", PhD dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

UNESCO, 1972. *Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session*, Paris, 16 November 1972.

UNESCO, 1979(a). *Report of the Rapporteur, 2nd Meeting of the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, CC-79/CONF.005/6, Paris 20 July 1979.

UNESCO, 1979(b). *Report of the 3rd Session of the World Heritage Committee, Cairo and Luxor, 22-26 October 1979*, CC-79/CONF.003/13, Paris, 30 November 1979.

UNESCO, 1993. *Report of the 17th Session of the World Heritage Committee, Cartagena, Columbia, 6-11 December 1993*, WHC-93/CONF.002/14, 4 February 1994.

UNESCO, 1998(a). *Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, 22nd Session Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda: Report on the World of the Consultative Body of the Committee, Paris 22-27 June 1998*, WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr. Paris 24 June 1998.

UNESCO, 1998(b). *Linking Nature and Culture, Report of the Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, 25 to 29 March 1998, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*. von Droste, B. Rossler, M and Titchen, S. (eds) UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris.

UNESCO, 1999(a). *Report of the 22nd Session of the World Heritage Committee, Kyoto, Japan, 30 November – 5 December 1998*, WHC-98/CONF.203/18, Paris, 29 January 1999.

UNESCO, 1999(b). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, WHC.99/2 Paris, March 1999.

UNESCO 2000(a). *Synthetic Report of the Meeting on «Authenticity and Integrity in an African context», Great Zimbabwe National Monument, Zimbabwe, 26-29 May 2000*, in WHC-2000/CONF.204/INF.11, Paris, October 2000.



UNESCO, 2000(b). *Second meeting of the Scientific Committee – Authenticity and Integrity in an African Context, Comments on Criterion (vi)*, 29 September 2000, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 21 September 2000.

UNESCO, 2000(c). *The Regional Expert Meeting on Cultural Landscapes in Eastern Europe, Bialystok, Poland*, 29 September - 3 October 1999, Warsaw, 2000.

UNESCO, 2001. *Report of the 24th Session of the World Heritage Committee, Cairns, Australia, 27 November – 2 December 2000* WHC-2000/CONF.204/21 Paris, February 2001.

UNESCO, 2001. *Discussion paper on the application of cultural criterion (vi)*, presented at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, 25-30 June 2001, WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8, Paris, 19 June 2001

UNESCO, 2001. *Report of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, 25-30 June 2001*, WHC-2001/CONF.205/10, Paris, 17 August 2001

UNESCO, 2001. *Thematic Expert Meeting on Asia-Pacific Sacred Mountains, Wakayama, Japan*, 5-10 September 2001, WHC-2001/CONF.208/INF.9, Paris 15 October 2001

UNESCO, 2001 *Report of the Drafting Group for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris 8-12 October 2001, WHC-2001/CONF.208/6

## ANNEX I

### List of 146 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

Unique no.	Date Inscribed	Property	State Party	Criteria
147	1981	Kakadu National Park	Australia	N (ii) (iii) (iv) C (i) (vi)
181rev	1982	Tasmanian Wilderness	Australia	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) C(iii) (iv) (vi)
447rev	1987 & 1994	Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park*	Australia	N (ii) (iii) C (v) (vi)
784	1996	Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg	Austria	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
322	1985	Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur	Bangladesh	C (i) (ii) (vi)
996	2000	Historic Centre of Brugge	Belgium	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
420	1987	City of Potosi	Bolivia	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
309	1985	Historic Centre of Salvador de Bahia	Brazil	C (iv) (vi)
216	1983	Rila Monastery	Bulgaria	C (vi)
4	1978	L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site	Canada	C (vi)
158	1981	Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump	Canada	C (vi)
300	1985	Historic District of Québec	Canada	C (iv) (vi)
437	1987	Mount Taishan	China	N (iii) C (I) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)
438	1987	The Great Wall	China	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
440	1987	Mogao Caves	China	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)
441	1987	Mausoleum of the First Qin Emperor	China	C (i) (iii) (iv) (vi)
449	1987	Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian	China	C (iii) (vi)
704	1994	Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu	China	C (i) (iv) (vi)
705	1994	Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains	China	C (i) (ii) (vi)
778	1996	Lushan National Park	China	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
779	1996	Mount Emei Scenic Area, including Leshan Giant Buddha Scenic Area	China	N (iv) C (iv) (vi)
911	1999	Mount Wuyi	China	N (iii) (iv) C (iii) (vi)
1001	2000	Mount Qincheng and the Dujiangyan Irrigation System	China	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
1004	2000	Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties	China	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
707bis	1994	The Potala Palace and the Jokhang Temple Monastery, Lhasa	China	C (i) (iv) (vi)
285	1984	Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena	Colombia	C (iv) (vi)
79	1980	Paphos	Cyprus	C (iii) (vi)
616	1992	Historic Centre of Prague	Czech Republic	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
526	1990	Colonial City of Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	C (ii) (iv) (vi)

86	1979	Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur	Egypt	C (i) (iii) (vi)
87	1979	Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis	Egypt	C (i) (iii) (vi)
88	1979	Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae	Egypt	C (i) (iii) (vi)
89	1979	Islamic Cairo	Egypt	C (i) (v) (vi)
80	1979	Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay	France	C (i) (iii) (vi)
83	1979	Palace and Park of Versailles	France	C (i) (ii) (vi)
84	1979	Vézelay, Church and Hill	France	C (i) (vi)
160	1981	Palace and Park of Fontainebleau	France	C (ii) (vi)
163	1981	Roman Theatre and its Surroundings and the “Triumphal Arch” of Orange	France	C (iii) (vi)
601	1991	Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims	France	C (i) (ii) (vi)
770	1996	Canal du Midi	France	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
868	1998	Routes of Santiago de Compostela in France	France	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
3	1978	Aachen Cathedral	Germany	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
367	1986	Roman Monuments, Cathedral St. Peter and Liebfrauen Church in Trier	Germany	C (i) (iii) (iv) (vi)
729	1996	Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar and Dessau	Germany	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
783	1996	Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg	Germany	C (iv) (vi)
846	1998	Classical Weimar	Germany	C (iii) (vi)
897	1999	Wartburg Castle	Germany	C (iii) (vi)
974	2000	Monastic Island of Reichenau	Germany	C (iii) (iv) (vi)
34	1979	Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions	Ghana	C (vi)
393	1987	Archaeological Site of Delphi	Greece	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
404	1987	Acropolis, Athens	Greece	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
454	1988	Mount Athos	Greece	N (iii) C (i) (ii) (iv) (v) (vi)
491	1988	Archaeological Site of Epidaurus	Greece	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
517	1989	Archaeological Site of Olympia	Greece	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
530	1990	Delos	Greece	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
941	1999	Archaeological Sites of Mycenae and Tiryns	Greece	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
942	1999	Historic Centre (Chorá) with the Monastery of Saint John “the Theologian” and the Cave of the Apocalypse on the Island of Pátmos	Greece	C (iii) (iv) (vi)
180	1982	National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers	Haiti	C (iv) (vi)
286	1984	Vatican City	Holy See	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
91bis	1980	Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura	Holy See/Italy	C (i) (ii) (iii) (vi)
129	1980	Maya Site of Copan	Honduras	C (iv) (vi)
758	1996	Millenary Benedictine Monastery of Pannonhalma and its Natural Environment	Hungary	C (iv) (vi)

234	1986	Churches and Convents of Goa	India	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
242	1983	Ajanta Caves	India	C (i) (ii) (iii) (vi)
243	1983	Ellora Caves	India	C (i) (iii) (vi)
246	1984	Sun Temple, Konarak	India	C (i) (iii) (vi)
249	1984	Group of Monuments at Mahabalipuram	India	C (i) (ii) (iii) (vi)
524	1989	Buddhist Monuments at Sanchi	India	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
592	1991	Borobudur Temple Compounds	Indonesia	C (i) (ii) (vi)
593	1996	Sangiran Early Man Site	Indonesia	C (iii) (vi)
114	1979	Persepolis	Iran	C (i) (iii) (vi)
115	1979	Meidan Emam, Esfahan	Iran	C (i) (v) (vi)
277rev	1985	Hatra	Iraq	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
94	1979	Rock Drawings in Valcamonica	Italy	C (iii) (vi)
174	1982	Historic Centre of Florence	Italy	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
394	1987	Venice and its Lagoon	Italy	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)
395	1987	Piazza del Duomo, Pisa	Italy	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
733bis	1995	Ferrara, City of the Renaissance and its Po Delta	Italy	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)
825	1998	Archaeological Area and the Patriarchal Basilica of Aquileia	Italy	C (iii) (iv) (vi)
990	2000	Assisi, the Basilica of San Francesco and Other Franciscan Sites	Italy	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
660	1993	Buddhist Monuments in the Horyu-ji Area	Japan	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
775	1996	Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome)	Japan	C (vi)
776	1996	Itsukushima Shinto Shrine	Japan	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
870	1998	Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara	Japan	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
913	1999	Shrines and Temples of Nikko	Japan	C (i) (iv) (vi)
972	2000	Gusuku Sites and Related Properties of the Kingdom of Ryukyu	Japan	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
148	1981	Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls	Jerusalem	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
295	1984	Byblos	Lebanon	C (iii) (iv) (vi)
299	1984	Tyre	Lebanon	C (iii) (vi)
190	1982	Archaeological Site of Cyrene	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
131	1980	City of Valletta	Malta	C (i) (vi)
414	1987	Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan	Mexico	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
482	1988	Historic Town of Guanajuato and Adjacent Mines	Mexico	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
585	1991	Historic Centre of Morelia	Mexico	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
836	1997	Archaeological Site of Volubilis	Morocco	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
599	1991	Island of Mozambique	Mozambique	C (iv) (vi)
121	1979	Kathmandu Valley	Nepal	C (iii) (iv) (vi)
666rev	1997	Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha	Nepal	C (iii) (vi)
421rev	1990 & 1993	Tongariro National Park*	New Zealand	N (ii) (iii) C (vi)
938	1999	Sukur Cultural Landscape*	Nigeria	C (iii) (v) (vi)
139	1980	Taxila	Pakistan	C (iii) (vi)
790	1997	Historic District of Panamá, with the Salón Bolívar	Panama	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
30	1980	Historic Centre of Warsaw	Poland	C (ii) (vi)
31	1979	Auschwitz Concentration Camp	Poland	C (vi)

206	1983	Central Zone of the Town of Angra do Heroísmo in the Azores	Portugal	C (iv) (vi)
263	1983	Monastery of the Hieronymites and Tower of Belem in Lisbon	Portugal	C (iii) (vi)
265	1983	Convent of Christ in Tomar	Portugal	C (i) (vi)
737	1995	Haeinsa Temple Changgyong P'ango, the Depositories for the Tripitaka Koreana Woodblocks	Republic of Korea	C (iv) (vi)
540	1990	Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments	Russian Federation	C (I) (ii) (iv) (vi)
545	1990	Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow	Russian Federation	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
604	1992	Historic Monuments of Novgorod and Surroundings	Russian Federation	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
26	1978	Island of Gorée	Senegal	C (vi)
915	1999	Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs	South Africa	C (iii) (vi)
916	1999	Robben Island	South Africa	C (iii) (vi)
316	1984	Burgos Cathedral	Spain	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
318	1984	Monastery and Site of the Escorial, Madrid	Spain	C (i) (ii) (vi)
347	1985	Santiago de Compostela (Old town)	Spain	C (i) (ii) (vi)
383rev	1987	Cathedral, Alcazar and Archivo de Indias in Seville	Spain	C (i) (ii) (iii) (vi)
665	1993	Royal Monastery of Santa Maria de Guadalupe	Spain	C (iv) (vi)
669	1993	Route of Santiago de Compostela	Spain	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
805	1997	San Millán Yuso and Suso Monasteries	Spain	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
876	1998	University and Historic Precinct of Alcalá de Henares	Spain	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
200	1982	Sacred City of Anuradhapura	Sri Lanka	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
201	1982	Ancient City of Polonnaruva	Sri Lanka	C (i) (iii) (vi)
450	1988	Sacred City of Kandy	Sri Lanka	C (iv) (vi)
561	1991	Golden Temple of Dambulla	Sri Lanka	C (i) (vi)
20	1979	Ancient City of Damascus	Syrian Arab Republic	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
22	1980	Ancient City of Bosra	Syrian Arab Republic	C (i) (iii) (vi)
37	1979	Site of Carthage	Tunisia	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
38	1979	Amphitheatre of El Jem	Tunisia	C (iv) (vi)
499	1988	Kairouan	Tunisia	C (i) (ii) (iii) (v) (vi)
849	1998	Archaeological Site of Troy	Turkey	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
370	1986	Durham Castle and Cathedral	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
371	1986	Ironbridge Gorge	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)

496	1988	Canterbury Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey, and St Martin's Church	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	C (i) (ii) (vi)
795	1997	Maritime Greenwich	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
173rev	2000	The Stone Town of Zanzibar	United Republic of Tanzania	C (ii) (iii) (vi)
78	1979	Independence Hall	United States of America	C (vi)
266	1983	La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site in Puerto Rico	United States of America	C (vi)
307	1984	Statute of Liberty	United States of America	C (i) (vi)
442	1987	Monticello and University of Virginia in Charlottesville	United States of America	C (i) (iv) (vi)
602rev	1993	Historic Centre of Bukhara	Uzbekistan	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
385	1986	Old City of Sana'a	Yemen	C (iv) (v) (vi)
611	1993	Historic Town of Zabid	Yemen	C (ii) (iv) (vi)
389	1986	Studenica Monastery	Yugoslavia	C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)
364	1986	Great Zimbabwe National Monument	Zimbabwe	C (i) (iii) (vi)

\* Properties inscribed as cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List. World Heritage cultural landscapes are justified for inclusion in the World Heritage List when interactions between people and the natural environment are evaluated as being "outstanding universal value". (UNESCO, 2000(c) p.119-120)

## ANNEX II

### List of 13 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (vi) of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

Unique no.	Date Inscribed	Property	State Party	Criteria
449	1987	Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian	China	C (iii) (vi)
911	1999	Mount Wuyi	China	N (iii) (iv) C (iii) (vi)
79	1980	Paphos	Cyprus	C (iii) (vi)
163	1981	Roman Theatre and its Surroundings and the "Triumphal Arch" of Orange	France	C (iii) (vi)
846	1998	Classical Weimar	Germany	C (iii) (vi)
897	1999	Wartburg Castle	Germany	C (iii) (vi)
593	1996	Sangiran Early Man Site	Indonesia	C (iii) (vi)
94	1979	Rock Drawings in Valcamonica	Italy	C (iii) (vi)
666rev	1997	Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha	Nepal	C (iii) (vi)
139	1980	Taxila	Pakistan	C (iii) (vi)
263	1983	Monastery of the Hieronymites and Tower of Belem in Lisbon	Portugal	C (iii) (vi)
915	1999	Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs	South Africa	C (iii) (vi)
916	1999	Robben Island	South Africa	C (iii) (vi)

## ANNEX III

**Annual number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List partly or only on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) between 1978 and 2000**

<b>Year</b>	<b>No. of properties inscribed <i>partly</i> on the basis of cultural criterion (vi)</b>	<b>No. of properties inscribed <i>only</i> on the basis of cultural criterion (vi)</b>
1978	3	2
1979	17	3
1980	7	
1981	5	1
1982	6	
1983	7	2
1984	9	
1985	4	
1986	7	
1987	14	
1988	6	
1989	2	
1990	5	
1991	5	
1992	2	
1993	5	
1994	3	
1995	3	
1996	10	1
1997	5	
1998	6	
1999	8	
2000	7	
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>9</b>



## ANNEX IV

### List of 9 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List *only* on the basis of cultural criterion (vi)

Property Name and Number	State Party	Year of Inscription
Island of Gorée (26)	Senegal	1978
L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site (4)	Canada	1978
Forts and Castles, Volta, Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions (34)	Ghana	1979
Auschwitz Concentration Camp (31)	Poland	1979
Independence Hall (78)	United States of America	1979
Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump (158)	Canada	1981
Rila Monastery (216)	Bulgaria	1983
La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site in Puerto Rico (266)	United States of America	1983
Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (775)	Japan	1996

### Property inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) and natural criteria

Property Name and Number	State Party	Years of Inscription	Criteria
Tongariro National Park (421Rev)	New Zealand	1990 1993	N (ii) (iii) C (vi)

## ANNEX V

### Recommendations from ICOMOS to the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 2001 to inscribe properties on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi)

Property	Recommended criteria (cultural or natural) by ICOMOS	ICOMOS comments relating to relevance of criterion (vi)
The Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) No. 1033	C (ii), (iv) and (vi)	Vienna has an essential role as the European capital for music being associated with all major personalities, from Viennese Classicism to modern music. Vienna is rich in architectural ensembles, including particularly baroque castles, gardens, as well as the late 19th century Ringstrasse ensemble.
Lamu Old Town (Kenya) No. 1055	C (ii), (iv) and (vi)	Lamu Old Town is the oldest and best preserved example of Swahili settlement in East Africa, retaining its traditional functions. Built in coral stone and mangrove timber, the town is characterised by simplicity of structural forms enriched by features. Owing to the conservative character of its Muslim community, Lamu has continued important religious celebrations from the 19th century, and has become significant for the study of Islamic and Swahili cultures.
Norbulingka (China) No. 707ter	C (v), (iv) and (vi)	ICOMOS recommended that the nominated Norbulingka area be inscribed as an extension to the existing World Heritage Site of the Potala Palace, Lhasa, maintaining the existing criteria (v), (iv) and (vi). The palace and gardens of Norbulingka are intimately linked with the Potala Palace. It became the summer residence of the Dalai Lamas. The site is closely linked with religious and political issues, having been a place for contemplation and for signing political agreements
Troodos (Cyprus) No. 351bis	C (i), (ii), (iii), (vi) and (vi) (States Party recommendation only)	ICOMOS recommend that an extension of this property be approved. The remarkable post-Byzantine wall paintings of the Church of the Transfiguration of the Saviour (Ayia-Sotira) at Palaichori form a complete cycle of paintings from the second decade of the 16th century. Through its architecture and its decoration this church forms a whole and completes the set of nine painted churches in the Troodos region already included in the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).
Churches of Peace in Jawor and Swidnica (Poland) No. 1054	C (iii), (iv) and (vi)	The Churches of Peace bear exceptional witness to a particular political and spiritual development in Europe. They represent architectural and artistic evidence of the faith of a religious community and its will to survive. The Churches of Peace are masterpieces of skilled handicraft, demonstrating what men are capable of when the utmost is demanded from them.

New Lanark, United Kingdom) No. 429rev	C (ii), (iv) and (vi)	The creation of the model industrial settlement at New Lanark, in which good quality planning and architecture were integrated with a humane concern on the part of the employers for the well-being and lifestyle of the workers, is a milestone in social and industrial history. The moral and social beliefs that underlay Robert Owen's work there provided the basis for seminal material and intangible developments that have had lasting influences on human society over the past two hundred years.
Tsodilo(Botswana) No. 1021	C (i), (iii), and (vi)	The significance of the place lies in its visual prominence, its geological and archaeological character as scientific resources, its use over tens of thousands of years as an area of settlement and nourishment, its outstanding rock art, and its long-term sanctity. All of those elements individually bear witness to different universal significances; collectively they combine to create a veritable "node of universal significance" on the surface of the earth. Furthermore, the symbiotic relationship between nature and culture, the very essence of Tsodilo, is, in itself, universally significant.
Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Laos) No. 481rev	C (iii), (iv) and (vi)	The outstanding significance of the Champasak cultural landscape lies in the broad scientific perspective of the powerful Khmer culture of the 10th -14th centuries AD as a whole. The resulting perspective of these ideas, not only on the ground but also in architecture and art was a unique fusion of indigenous nature symbols, religious inspiration, and technical prowess.
The Royal Hill of Ambohimanga (Madagascar) No. 950	C (iii), (iv) and (vi)	The Royal Hill of Ambohimanga is of great significance to the people of Madagascar as a place vital in their political development yet at the same time of great religious meaning. As such, the Royal Hill of Ambohimanga is also of global significance as an excellent example of a place where, over centuries, so much of the common human experience comes to be focussed in memory and aspiration, in ritual and prayer.
Tombs of the Bugunda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) No. 1022	C (i), (iii), (iv) and (vi)	The most important value associated with the Kasubi Tombs site are the strong elements of intangible heritage. The built and natural elements of the site, which is an outstanding example of traditional <i>Ganda</i> architecture and palace design, are charged with historical, traditional, and spiritual values. The site is regarded as the major spiritual centre for the Baganda. It also serves as an important historical and cultural symbol for Uganda and East Africa as a whole.
Masada National Park (Israel) No. 1040	C (iii), (iv) and (vi) This site has been nominated as a mixed site. Its evaluation under mixed criteria will be carried out by IUCN.	Masada is a poignant symbol of the continuing human struggle between oppression and liberty.

**Extract of the Report of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee,  
25-30 June 2001, WHC-2001/CONF.205/10, Paris, 17 August 2001**

**THE APPLICATION OF CULTURAL CRITERION (VI)**

**VI.7** The Chairperson welcomed the Bureau to the evening session on the application of cultural criterion (vi). The Chairperson recalled that at the twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Cairns 2000), he had informed the Committee, that given the various issues relating to the application of cultural criterion (vi), a meeting to discuss all cultural criteria would be held during the next Bureau session.

**VI.8** The Chairperson noted that from the discussion in Cairns and at the current session of the Bureau, there was a need for an analysis of the use of all the criteria for World Heritage listing. He stated that, as a first step, it would be useful to start with a discussion on cultural criterion (vi). He referred to the relevant document, WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8.

**VI.9** The Chairperson stated that the purpose of the meeting was to examine the document and if necessary, make recommendations to the twenty-fifth session of the Committee (Helsinki, December 2001). He suggested that the Bureau:

- a) clarify the use of cultural criterion (vi) with reference to the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a Balanced and Representative List*;
- b) obtain agreement as to the final wording of cultural criterion (vi) to be suggested to the Committee for inclusion in the revised *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, and
- c) establish a clear framework for the strict application of cultural criterion (vi).

**VI.10** The Director of the World Heritage Centre noted that the important debate to follow should not be confined only to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, as it is also relevant to the issue of intangible heritage that has been addressed in recent months by the UNESCO Executive Board and in other fora.

**VI.11** A member of the Secretariat presented a power-point presentation, which was an overview of the elements of the debate concerning the application of cultural criterion (vi). She noted that since 1977, there have been many significant changes to the wording of the cultural and natural criteria that have been developed by the Committee to assess “outstanding universal value”. She drew the attention of the Bureau to Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention which define what is natural and cultural heritage and referred to Table A of document WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8 that indicates the evolution in the wording of cultural criterion (vi) over time.

**VI.12** The current wording of cultural criterion (vi) in the *Operational Guidelines* is as follows:

24(a)(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).

**VI.13** She drew the attention to the subtle change in the wording between 1995 and 1999 whereby “**or** in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural ” had been changed to “**and** in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural”. She then referred to a table listing the 146 properties inscribed on the basis of criterion (vi) and other cultural or natural criteria.

**VI.14** Nine of these properties have been inscribed solely on the basis of cultural criterion (vi) and one site has been inscribed solely under cultural criterion (vi) and natural criteria.

**VI.15** The Secretariat recalled that at the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee in Cairns, cultural criterion (vi) was actively discussed in relation to the nomination of a number of properties with, for example, symbolic values and associations with outstanding artistic traditions.

**VI.16** She referred to four key issues that emerged from an analysis of the application of cultural criterion (vi) over time:

1. lack of consistency of application due to different perceptions of its role and application;
2. concern that restrictions to its application create a bias in favour of monumental heritage;
3. a desire to protect against political and nationalistic uses of the criterion; and
4. concern that there will be too many inscriptions using cultural criterion (vi) if restrictive wording is not adopted.

**VI.17** She then referred to the recent proposals for changes to the wording of cultural criterion (vi) discussed at three meetings in 2000 and 2001 as indicated below:

A meeting on “Authenticity and Integrity within an African Context” at the Great Zimbabwe National Monument, Zimbabwe, May 2000	From an African point of view, there is a strong preference to revise the existing criterion (vi) to the form it was before 1996. This would mean that this criterion could be used alone without any other criteria.
The second meeting of the Scientific Committee – "Authenticity and Integrity in an African Context", held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, September 2000	It was suggested that the wording of criterion (vi) be altered as follows: "be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance ( <b>except in the case of living traditions</b> , the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and <b>preferably</b> in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)."
A meeting of the Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM) and the World Heritage Centre in Rome, March 2001	It was agreed that the wording of criterion (vi) should be altered as follows: "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 <b>preferably</b> in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural)."

**VI.18** She concluded by suggesting that five issues needed to be considered by the Bureau:

- a) When the World Heritage criteria were established, it was understood that no criterion was of a higher order than another. However, according to the current wording, cultural criterion (vi) cannot be used by itself. This implied that the values it is assessing are not at the same level or threshold as the other outstanding universal values implied by the application of the other criteria;
- b) The exact meaning of "exceptional circumstances" in cultural criterion (vi) is not defined;
- c) If the application of criterion (vi) is restricted to being used only in conjunction with other cultural or natural criteria, it is not apparent how outstanding "places of memory" will be inscribed on the World Heritage List in the future:
- d) The restricted use of criterion (vi) could continue the bias of the World Heritage List in favour of monumental heritage and restrict the recognition of outstanding intangible values (including spiritual, indigenous and artistic values) associated with a place; and
- e) The implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and in particular the application of cultural criterion (vi) to recognise intangible or associative values, could be examined to ensure complementarity with the new intangible cultural heritage list and possible international instrument.

**VI.19** The Chairperson invited comments from the Bureau and asked that the Bureau focus on the three actions required, as described in his introduction above.

**VI.20** The Delegate of Canada noted that cultural criterion (vi) had been applied to sites before the definition of associative cultural landscapes had been included in paragraph 39(iii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. She then made the following points:

- a) For intangible cultural heritage values to be relevant to the World Heritage List, there needs to be association with a place. In this regard she referred to Article 3 of the Convention, which is how the Bureau and the World Heritage Committee implement the Convention in relation to the "territory" of States Parties.

The change of wording of cultural criterion (vi) in 1996 had introduced a bias that was not intended. She said that to subordinate one criterion to others was not the purpose nor was it appropriate.

- b) The revised wording of cultural criterion (vi) proposed at the Zimbabwe meeting in May 2000 and the March 2001 meeting of the Advisory Bodies, which would add the word "**preferably**" and allow criterion (vi) to be used on its own was useful.
- c) The meaning of "exceptional circumstances" was a judgement to be made by the World Heritage Committee for each individual case. There could be no "rule book": "outstanding universal significance" was an appropriate and adequate benchmark.
- d) By limiting the application of cultural criterion (vi) and making it adjunct to other criteria, a prejudice towards monumental heritage has developed. In light of the Global Strategy and proposals for the formulation of a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE), she said that the current wording is inappropriate.

**VI.21** The Rapporteur noted that the observations made at the meeting in Zimbabwe in May 2000, which he had attended, were made with practical considerations in mind. He also referred to the limited number of nominations from Africa in the last three years and the imbalance of the World Heritage List. He noted that most African properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in recent years had relied on an application of cultural criterion (vi). He cited the Sukur Cultural Landscape, Robben Island, Zanzibar Stone Town and the just recommended sites of the Royal Hill of Ambohinga, Tsodilo and Buganda Tombs as evidence of positive inscriptions in the context of redressing the imbalances on the World Heritage List.

**VI.22** The Rapporteur noted that the tangible and intangible were inseparable in relation to African cultural traditions and by devaluing the spiritual aspects of cultural criterion (vi), the heritage of a good part of the globe was being reduced.

**VI.23** He noted that at the Zimbabwe meeting, it was decided that the fear of “opening the flood gates” if cultural criterion (vi) was applied on its own was not justifiable, as other cultural criterion could be abused in the same way.

**VI.24** He said that he favoured retaining much of the current wording of the criterion, but supported the removal of the discriminative clause. He noted that the addition of “**preferably**” is a good compromise and that cultural criterion (vi) should stand on its own. These changes, it was added, would reflect the intention of the Global Strategy.

**VI.25** The Delegate of Australia recalled the Committee meeting in Kyoto in relation to discussions on the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi) and the emotion of the inscription of Robben Island at the Committee meeting in Marrakesh. He suggested that the wording in parenthesis in cultural criterion (vi) be deleted to allow it to be used on its own.

**VI.26** He raised the need for a definition of “outstanding universal value” to avoid an excessive number of inscriptions. Furthermore, he noted that cultural criterion (vi) is the best way that World Heritage indigenous values could be satisfactorily recognised.

**VI.27** Ms Jo Wilmott of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park addressed the Bureau saying that the mechanisms of cultural heritage assessment must identify the values of indigenous culture and that it is necessary to monitor those values and find ways to ensure culture is protected knowing that it does not remain unchanged.

**VI.28** The Observer of the United States of America noted that to date, the current criteria contain unintended but inherent bias in favour of western culture and this needed to be redressed. He supported the comments of the Rapporteur and cautioned the reliance on the decision of the Committee to determine what are “exceptional circumstances”. He stated that openness needs to be based on an expectation that each of us agrees and commits to the most thoughtful consideration and openness to the ideas and ideals of other people. He supported the deletion of the words in parentheses in the criterion. To address the question of opening “floodgates”, he stressed that it was the responsibility of the Committee to apply the relevant provisions because strict definitions in themselves could not be the answer.

**VI.29** The Observer of Israel asked the Chairperson if during the period between now and the next session of the Bureau, States Parties could be asked to propose ideas on the role of cultural criterion

(vi) and that the World Heritage Centre could make an analysis on the findings. He agreed with the proposal to delete the words in parenthesis, stressing the point that it was people who sanctify space and space sanctifying people. A judicious use of tentative lists as a tool would ensure that floodgates were not opened.

**VI.30** The Observer of Belgium congratulated the World Heritage Centre for preparing the document, however she requested that it be translated into French for the Committee meeting in Helsinki. She advised that the document should be considered as a reference document and should be regularly updated.

**VI.31** The Director of the World Heritage Centre confirmed that the document would be translated for the Committee session in Helsinki.

**VI.32** The Observer of Belgium questioned why some sites listed to date with intangible values had not been inscribed on the basis of cultural criterion (vi). She also asked for an analysis of sites inscribed according to cultural criteria (iv) and (vi).

**VI.33** Noting that his could be a minority view, the Delegate of Thailand stated that the Convention is not biased and does not discriminate against other cultures. To apply cultural criterion (vi) as a stand-alone clause, would be to disregard the provision of Article 1 of the Convention. He expressed the view that intangible cultural heritage should not come under the World Heritage Convention. He said that criterion (vi) should continue to be applied with other criteria.

**VI.34** The Delegate of Ecuador noted the change over time in the definition of Cultural Heritage from monumentalism to anthropological perspectives. He agreed with the proposal to delete the wording in parenthesis.

**VI.35** The Observer of Benin stated that there was an unintentional bias towards monumentalism that should be corrected. He questioned what was “universal value” and raised the need to define it to avoid “opening the flood gates”.

**VI.36** The Observer of Greece expressed the need to analyse all criteria. She noted that the conception of the tangible and intangible will be discussed at the thirteenth General Assembly of ICOMOS in Zimbabwe and noted that steps were being taken for the preparation of a new international instrument for protecting intangible culture.

**VI.37** The Observer of the United Kingdom noted the need to distinguish between intangible culture related to a place and those intangible values not associated with a place. He stated that cultural criterion (vi) should be able to be used on its own. While a place may not have outstanding universal significance, the spirit of the place could have that significance.

**VI.38** The Observer of Italy considered that cultural criterion (vi) has an autonomous function and it fills a gap. She proposed that the words “with universal ethical and symbolic significance” replace “outstanding universal significance” in the wording of cultural criterion (vi).

**VI.39** Ms Josie Weninger from Parks Canada addressed the Bureau. She said that the current definition of culture misses the link between humanity and the earth. The challenge is to recognise a more holistic perspective as expressed in the tradition of indigenous people through language, religion, events, behaviour and spirituality.



**VI.40** The Representative of the Assistant Director-General for Science advised that the project Man and the Biosphere (MAB) addresses cultural biodiversity. He noted that studies demonstrate that places with high biological diversity have high associative values. He also informed the Bureau that he recently attended a meeting in Mexico on the importance of Natural Sacred sites for the protection of biological diversity and noted that a new partnership had evolved from this meeting between IUCN, WWF International and MAB.

**VI.41** The Representative of IUCN noted that there are very few sites listed under cultural criterion (vi) and natural criteria. IUCN considers that there is much greater potential for application of cultural criterion (vi) in association with natural criteria, particularly in relation to under-represented regions such as Oceania where living traditions cannot be separated from nature and natural values. He considered that all sites inscribed on the World Heritage List must be of outstanding universal value. In reaching decisions, the inputs of indigenous people are of high importance and must be heard.

**VI.42** The Chairperson then addressed the three actions required by the Bureau.

- a) Clarify the use of cultural criterion (vi) with reference to the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a Balanced and Representative List*.

**VI.43** The Delegates of Australia, Finland, Zimbabwe and Ecuador responded positively that cultural criterion (vi) has a role to play in ensuring balance and representivity of the World Heritage List.

- b) Obtain agreement as to the final wording of cultural criterion (vi) to be suggested to the Committee for inclusion in the revised *Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Committee*.

**VI.44** Four possible options for the revised wording of cultural criterion (vi) were proposed by the Chairman as follows:

1. delete the words within parentheses after “exceptional circumstances”:

24(a)(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~~).

2. make all the words in parentheses only relevant to “living traditions”:

24(a)(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 (**except in the case of living traditions**, 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).

3. add the word "preferably" after “exceptional circumstances and...” in parentheses:

24(a)(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 **preferably** in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural).

4. delete all the wording within parentheses:

24(a)(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~~).

**VI.45** Most members of the Bureau were in favour of the fourth option. The Delegates of Canada and Thailand expressed their preference for the third option. The Delegate of Australia noted the need to give weight to the views of Canada and Thailand in the Working Document to be prepared for the next Committee session.

c) Establish a clear framework for strict application of cultural criterion (vi).

**VI.46** The Chairperson stressed the importance of applying the standards of “outstanding universal value” when applying cultural criterion (vi).

**VI.47** The Representative of ICOMOS was heartened by the decision of the Bureau, noting that cultural criterion (vi) is of immense importance to recognize non-monumental heritage and values related to place.

**VI.48** The Representative of ICCROM said that he was very heartened by the discussion of the Bureau. He noted that the discussion was in line with the three meetings held in 2000 and 2001.

**VI.49** The Observer of Italy asked whether an observer had the right to propose modifications to a text that the Bureau was in the process of examining and whether these modifications would be taken into account.

**VI.50** The Observer of the United States of America called for a common understanding in the application of the words in the criterion and requested that the discussion of the Bureau be memorialized.

**VI.51** The Chairperson requested that document WHC-2001/CONF.205/INF.8 be updated, to incorporate the observations made by the Bureau for submission to the World Heritage Committee and to be used as a resource document in the future.