

Distribution limited

WHC-05/29 COM/9

Paris, 15 June 2005

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-ninth Session

Durban, South Africa

10-17 July 2005

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Assessment of the conclusions and recommendations of the special meeting of experts (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005) established by Decision 28 COM 13.1**

## SUMMARY

This document provides information on the Expert meeting on the concept of outstanding universal value which took place in Kazan, Russian Federation, from 6 to 9 April 2005 and contains the recommendations prepared by the Expert meeting for consideration by the World Heritage Committee

**Draft Decision: 29 COM 9, see point IV**

## **I. Background**

### **A. Preparation of the *Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention: the concept of Outstanding Universal Value***

1. The World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Decision **28 COM 13.1**) requested the World Heritage Centre to convene a special meeting of experts of all regions on the concept of outstanding universal value reflecting its increasing concern that this concept is interpreted and applied differently in different regions and by different stakeholders as well as the Advisory Bodies. The meeting was requested to make specific proposals for better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value, for enabling less-represented and non-represented states to improve the quality of their nominations and thereby the success rate of inscriptions on the World Heritage List, and for enabling States Parties to identify sufficient funding sources for the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties..
2. The World Heritage Committee at its 7th extraordinary session (Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.2**) accepted the generous offer by the Russian Federation to host the meeting in Kazan (Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation) from 6 to 9 April 2005.
3. By Circular Letter of 12 November 2004, the World Heritage Centre requested all States Parties to nominate experts to attend the meeting, which resulted in more than 180 *curricula vitae* of experts from 73 countries. Subsequently, the World Heritage Centre made a selection of 30 experts with a particular attention to ensure a balance between natural and cultural experts, gender, professional backgrounds and geographical representations (for the list of participants see annex 3).
4. The *Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention: the concept of outstanding universal value*, whose mandate was established by points a), b), c) and d) of Paragraph 13 of the afore-mentioned Decision **28 COM 13.1** (see annex I to Document *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9A*), took place from 6 to 9 April 2005 in Kazan.

### **B. Organization of the Expert meeting**

5. As requested by Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.2**, paragraph 3, the World Heritage Centre prepared and distributed a detailed Background Paper (see Document *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9A*) which compiled information on the results of previous meetings, past decisions by the World Heritage Committee and information on the themes indicated in the expert meeting's mandate.
6. Opening session: The Expert meeting was opened by Mr. Iskhakov, Mayor of Kazan, Mr. Rafail Hakimov, State Advisor to the President of Tatarstan on political questions, Mr. Grigory Ordzhonikidze, Secretary-General of the Russian Federation National Commission for UNESCO, Mr. Themba Wakashe, Chairperson of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee and Mr. Kishore Rao, Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre. There were various interventions by the following personalities attending the opening session: Mr. Igor Makovetsky, President of ICOMOS-Russian Federation, Ms. Liubava Moreva of the UNESCO Moscow Office, Mr. Igor Serdukov, Secretary-General of the Russian Union of Historical Towns and Regions, Ms

Gulzada Rudenko, Director of Elabuga State Historical Architectural and Art Museum, Mr Gennady Yemelyanov, Head of Administration of Zelenodolsk, Ms Alina Mitoko, Student of the State University of Kazan.

7. Working sessions: The working sessions of the meeting started with a keynote speech by Ms Christina Cameron, former Chairperson of the 14th session of the World Heritage Committee, and the presentations by the World Heritage Centre and by the Advisory Bodies (see *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9B*).
8. The meeting was divided into three working groups which discussed the item "Understanding the concept of outstanding universal value", the results of which were reported to the plenary immediately thereafter.
9. The three working groups then discussed the following themes, which were also reported to the plenary:
  - i) Towards better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value and preparation of Tentative Lists;
  - ii) Improving nominations of properties of potential outstanding universal value, and
  - iii) Towards sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties

The discussion followed guiding questions prepared by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (see Annex 2), and resulted in lively debates, allowing all participants to share their views and express their opinion, and most importantly their experiences in the regions.

10. The substantive discussions both in the plenary and in the working groups led to the preparation of a number of recommendations to be presented to the 29th session of the Committee (see point II of this document). Furthermore, the participants noted the proposal by the Mayor of Kazan to include the Organization of World Heritage Cities as advisory body under the *Convention* and agreed that such a proposal was outside the mandate of the meeting.
11. In order to facilitate the review of the recommendations and the identification of main lines of action by the Committee, the meeting asked the World Heritage Centre to prepare a synoptic table with estimated budgetary implications as well as timing and priority of the recommendations (see point III of this document).
12. Closing session: In closing the session, the President of the UNESCO General Conference and the Chairperson of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee welcomed the concrete proposals which resulted from the work undertaken by the experts during the meeting and felt confident that the recommendations of the meeting would have an important impact on the ways in which the *Convention* is implemented in different regions. They expressed their appreciations to the Municipality of Kazan and the Tatarstan authorities for having generously hosted the meeting. The Vice-Mayor of Kazan thanked all the experts for having participated to the expert Meeting and contributed to its success.

## **II. Recommendations of the Expert meeting on OUV**

The Expert meeting prepared the following recommendations:

### **Preamble**

1. The experts expressed their sincere gratitude to the Municipality of Kazan, the Republic of Tatarstan and the Russian Federation for organizing the Special Expert Meeting of the *World Heritage Convention: The Concept of Outstanding Universal Value, Kazan* (Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation), 6-10 April 2005.
2. The experts recalled the decision (**28 COM 13.1**) by the Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004) to convene a special meeting of experts of all regions.
3. The meeting was structured in accordance with the decision into the following four themes:
  - a) Understanding of the concept of outstanding universal value under the *World Heritage Convention*;
  - b) Better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value and preparation of Tentative Lists;
  - c) Improvement of nominations of properties of potential outstanding universal value;
  - d) Sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties.
4. Through a keynote address by the former Chairperson, Christina Cameron, and presentations by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, the meeting reviewed previous achievements and recent work on the concept of outstanding universal value and representivity. After this review the four themes were addressed through working groups and plenary sessions. The discussion in each working group was structured around guiding questions.
5. The expert meeting made the following recommendations.

### **Reflections on the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value**

6. The experts agreed with the definition as set out in paragraph 49 of the *Operational Guidelines*: “Outstanding universal value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.”
7. Further the experts recognized that:
  - a) outstanding universal value like all values is attributed by people and through human appreciation;
  - b) the concept of outstanding universal value in the *World Heritage Convention* was widely drawn to allow for evolution over time;
  - c) the concept of outstanding universal value is given substance by applying the criteria set out in the *Operational Guidelines*;
  - d) to maintain outstanding universal value, the criteria and conditions of integrity and authenticity, management and legal or other adequate protection, must be applied rigorously and consistently;
  - e) in order to achieve the effective application of the criteria there is a need for better databases of heritage information and thematic and comparative studies, both regional and global;

- f) the criteria have evolved and will continue to evolve to accommodate changing perceptions and interpretations of heritage;
- g) an understanding of the evolving application of outstanding universal value is demonstrated by past Committee decisions on inscription of World Heritage properties; the corpus of past decisions forms an indispensable corporate memory for the application of outstanding universal value;
- h) the Committee over time has moved towards inscribing properties which reflect the significance of cultural and biogeographical regions important to the whole of humanity;
- i) The concept of outstanding universal value implies a shared concern for the conservation of humanity's heritage;
- j) The concept of outstanding universal value is poorly understood in general and requires major communication efforts, both generally and at site level;
- k) The identification of outstanding universal value of a site needs wide participation by stakeholders including local communities and indigenous people;
- l) It would be helpful to develop monitoring measures to assess the success or otherwise of the rigorous application of the criteria to the concept of outstanding universal value.

8. The experts agreed that the combined set of criteria:

- a) should be a major advance as it would foster closer working arrangements between the natural and cultural fields by giving equal prominence to both as envisaged by the *Convention*;
- b) could add discipline to the evaluation of cultural properties as integrity is now applied to all nominations and could lead to exploration of the application of authenticity to natural properties;
- c) will require proper management arrangements and legal or other adequate protection prior to inscription;
- d) may encourage nominations of mixed properties;
- e) and asked the World Heritage Committee to continue to explore the future effects of the merging of the criteria on the operation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

9. The experts further agreed on the need to disseminate:

- a) the combined set of criteria to raise awareness on the way nature and culture can be considered together;
- b) information on the concept of outstanding universal value could help State Parties to manage better the expectations of World Heritage status.

10. The experts also pointed out that failure to apply properly the concept of outstanding universal value could:

- a) undermine the credibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage Committee;
- b) diminish social and economic benefits;
- c) deny legitimate access to the World Heritage List.

## **Towards better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value and preparation of Tentative Lists**

11. Experiences of States Parties show a wide range of ways in which Tentative Lists are prepared. These include States Parties which have undergone extensive evaluation with participation processes to new-comers having recently ratified the *World Heritage Convention* and with no Tentative Lists whatsoever. Currently there are 37 States Parties with no Tentative Lists.
12. The experts recommended that:
  - a) States Parties should each establish a coordination mechanism with an interdisciplinary composition to undertake and oversee effectively the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and the preparation and review of Tentative Lists in particular;
  - b) Tentative Lists should be seen as part of the effort of conservation of national heritage;
  - c) Properties on Tentative Lists should have national and/or other appropriate recognition;
  - d) Compilation of Tentative Lists should involve local communities and indigenous peoples and should include public consultation where appropriate;
  - e) The compilation of Tentative Lists should take account of the Global Strategy, thematic studies and the Advisory Bodies gap analysis;
  - f) The preparation of Tentative Lists should have due regard to other international conventions and programmes;
  - g) In preparation of their Tentative Lists, States Parties should be rigorous in their local evaluation to ensure that expectations of inscription match reality;
  - h) The size of a Tentative List should take into account the Cairns-Suzhou decision and the 10 years cycle of the Tentative List recommended by the *Operational Guidelines* (paragraph 65);
  - i) The comparative analysis should be developed by regions and themes;
  - j) Regional meetings on harmonization of Tentative Lists should identify types of properties for nomination in a given region, and those for possible inclusion as transnational and transboundary properties;
  - k) The Advisory Bodies should complete their thematic studies as soon as possible and in a time scale to allow States Parties to identify categories and themes of heritage that are relevant for completion of all Tentative Lists in 2007 and the revision of existing Tentative Lists;
  - l) States Parties with no Tentative Lists should be encouraged to request preparatory International Assistance if necessary for preparing Tentative Lists;
  - m) The Advisory Bodies, within their available resources, should comment on the Tentative Lists of all States Parties upon request;
  - n) The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should provide a compilation of best practices and publish a number of training manuals;
  - o) The World Heritage Centre should prepare a handbook to inform property owners and stakeholders about the process and requirements for inscription on the World Heritage List, and to clarify expectations concerning the benefits and commitments that may result from being inscribed as a World Heritage property.

### **Improving nominations of properties of potential outstanding universal value**

13. The experts highlighted a number of challenges in the preparation of high-quality nominations including assembling information from various sources and the level of information required, adequate mapping, the standards and sources of these maps, and the quality of their precision. They addressed the issue of what constitutes a satisfactory comparative analysis that was not simply biased according to national perspectives, but rather took into account similar features, both in the regional and global context carried out by a competent scientist. They furthermore noted the need for clarifying the assessment of the conditions of integrity and authenticity,

required to be based on sound analysis of the current physical status and completeness of the nominated properties and the analysis of outstanding universal value. They questioned what were the tools to assess a property and what would be regarded as an acceptable assessment of integrity/authenticity for the Advisory Bodies.

### **Comparative analyses for nominations**

14. The experts recommended:
- a) Those preparing nominations to be creative in the process of preparing the comparative analyses using such studies by the Advisory Bodies as are available and relevant;
  - b) The World Heritage Centre to produce clarification on requirements for the maps (including details, scale, level of precision, quantity and quality);
  - c) The World Heritage Centre to disseminate the information guidelines on how best to prepare serial nominations;
  - d) that comparative analyses should be presented in a comprehensive and well argued review and not simply assembled in the nomination dossier;
  - e) the development of guidelines to assist in the completion of the comparative analysis and also best practice examples.

### **Preparation of nominations**

15. The experts recommended that
- a) the preparation of nominations should be a comprehensive process which should include all stakeholders in a participatory way, including local communities and site managers; and possibly public consultation and broad dissemination of knowledge gained through the process;
  - b) ideally the preparation of nominations should be led by a coordinator who has acquired the necessary knowledge of the *World Heritage Convention* and its procedures to guide a group of stakeholders through the whole process;
  - c) the preparation of nominations should have substantive support and political commitment from Governmental and scientific institutions;
  - d) those preparing nominations should have access to international support for sharing available information and databases.

### **Capacity-building**

16. The experts recommended that:
- a) work continues on training kits and best practice manuals currently being developed by IUCN and ICCROM and recommended that samples or models be made available both for nominations and management plans;
  - b) substantive international support and cooperation for Capacity-building;
  - c) stakeholders in the nomination process should be able to participate in expert groups and World Heritage Committee sessions, and that audiovisual information on these processes should be produced to provide insights into the total process and procedures for nominations to the World Heritage List.

## Evaluations

17. The experts recommended that:
- a) the evaluation process could be strengthened within existing deadlines by improved communication between the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the Centre, which could enhance a partnership approach while fully preserving the integrity of each of the partners in the system;
  - b) that time constraints placed on the States Parties and Advisory Bodies for provision and review of additional information for nominations be addressed;
  - c) evaluators from the Advisory Bodies should be carefully selected with the best expertise and should come from the region as far as possible but not from the State Party concerned; and that these evaluators should also – as far as possible – have the necessary language capabilities in particular to exchange information with local communities (*Operational Guidelines*, Annex 6);
  - d) States Parties should prepare better for organizing and welcoming evaluation missions and should also facilitate contacts between evaluators, local communities and other stakeholders;
  - e) in acknowledging the immense work carried out by the Advisory Bodies, cooperation among them should be strengthened to harmonize their procedures as far as possible;
  - f) training of potential evaluators should be provided particularly at regional level to ensure best performance of evaluations.

## Regional and sub-regional coordination

18. The experts recommended that:
- a) improved national inventories could facilitate a coordinated approach for regional levels;
  - b) World Heritage education for local communities, especially for transboundary and serial properties should be encouraged;
  - c) regional thematic studies should be carried out as necessary frameworks to identify and foster nominations (this may be well achieved through using existing intergovernmental structures in the region as well as regional educational, scientific and training institutions);
  - d) best practice examples of successful nominations should be shared within each region and be made available by the World Heritage Centre through web-pages, CDs and through appropriate training and briefing workshops in regions;
  - e) States Parties should be encouraged to make best use of the wealth of information readily available by disseminating it to all national organizations as well as to site managers;
  - f) at sub-regional meetings presentations should be included on how to prepare nominations with concrete examples of successful nominations including experiences gained through the process;
  - g) mentoring programmes should be developed so that States Parties can assist each other, as a useful tool for sharing information on a regional basis and to address themes relevant for the region.

## Sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties

19. Noting that conservation of heritage is a condition for and one of the key components of sustainable development,
- the experts recommended that the World Heritage Committee should:
- a) draft a separate chapter in the *Operational Guidelines*, when next revised, on management of World Heritage properties;

- b) consider the conservation actions necessary for removal of properties from the World Heritage List in Danger to be a priority for international assistance and cooperation;
- c) encourage the reinforcement of Capacity-building by creating national, regional and international networks of (1) site managers of World Heritage properties, (2) local communities, (3) scientific researchers and (4) regional experts of Advisory Bodies including World Heritage focal points;
- d) request the organization of workshops on conservation issues at the regional level involving the already existing regional expertise;
- e) promote the preventative conservation of World Heritage properties at regional and national levels and develop mechanisms and tools for preventing threats within a sustainable development;
- f) promote scientific research as a driving force for sustainable conservation;
- g) set up measures better to involve all stakeholders in the management of the property, such as establishing a prize for the best site manager;
- h) reinforce the role of Periodic Reporting as one of the key elements for the monitoring of the state of conservation and identify clear benchmarks to improve the effectiveness of such reports;
- i) encourage the use of regional cooperation in sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties to make the best use of regional and local knowledge;
- j) promote and disseminate the concept of “foundations” as an innovative element for mobilizing and institutionalizing the sustainable financing of World Heritage properties;
- k) ensure the autonomy of such foundations so as to promote the effectiveness and sustainability of site management while respecting the State Party’s sovereignty;
- l) develop vis-à-vis fundraisers and development partners a set of arguments showing that investment in heritage protection is profitable and socially valuable;
- m) develop a pilot project which is regionally representative to study scientifically the economic, social and environmental benefits of conservation of natural and cultural heritage, which could be used to make necessary arguments to funding agencies as to why they should fund heritage conservation as part of the sustainable development process so that the resulting methodology could then be used in other countries to allow them develop the same arguments for their own national situations.

20. The experts recommended that States Parties should:

- a) present budgetary provisions within the nomination dossier to ensure human and financial resources on a long term basis as well as to reinforce States Parties’ commitment in the implementation of the *Convention*;
- b) draw up, jointly with all stakeholders, an assessment and a detailed description of the property, highlighting the assets, the constraints and especially the obligations resulting from the inscription and the management of a World Heritage property. A co-management agreement could serve to give these obligations concrete form;
- c) integrate the concept of shared management, and in particular the equitable sharing of benefits into the site management;
- d) develop an integrated approach which puts the property in the context of existing management plans for territorial development and for land use at the local and national levels, in order to ensure well planned and appropriately supported management in the long term;
- e) encourage coordination among international fundraisers to avoid overlap and to foster the effectiveness of their contributions for site management of World Heritage properties.

21. The experts recommended that the World Heritage Centre should:

- a) develop greater synergy between the various existing instruments and programmes of UNESCO (such as Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage properties) and to disseminate resulting good practices;

- b) develop and disseminate models of good governance and management of World Heritage properties;
- c) encourage the development of a network of regional experts in cooperation with Advisory Bodies;
- d) develop training workshops on the inscription procedures and mechanisms on protection, management and on state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties.

22. The experts recommended that the Advisory Bodies:

- a) when evaluating nominations, respect existing national protection legislation and management arrangements and propose improvements only if necessary to protect the integrity and the outstanding universal value of the proposed World Heritage property and to do so in harmony with national systems;
- b) work with States Parties to develop networks of World Heritage experts in each country.

Other issues raised

**Awareness-raising**

23. The experts recommended that the Committee should encourage awareness raising of World Heritage at all levels and target political decision makers, including World Heritage in *curricula* in schools and universities, and foster the capacity of local experts to develop specific skills in the preparation of Tentative Lists and nominations.

**Budgetary implications**

24. The experts were aware that their recommendations have budgetary implications and strongly recommended that the Committee should:

- a) allocate adequate resources, financial and human, to implement the recommendations of the Expert Meeting, recognizing that there are short, medium and long-term objectives requiring a continued commitment over time;
- b) consider giving priority for funds in 2005-2007 for assisting those States Parties with no Tentative Lists through preparatory assistance or existing regional programmes;
- c) in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*, consider giving priority funding for the preparation of nominations of properties from countries which are un-represented or under-represented on the World Heritage List;
- d) enhance the work of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre by providing appropriate funding to allow them to:
  - (i) complete, facilitate and broadly disseminate global, regional and thematic studies in collaboration with States Parties and other institutions as appropriate;
  - (ii) enhance the evaluation process while supporting up-stream work with States Parties to support preparation of Tentative Lists (including comments on draft Tentative Lists) and high-quality nominations;
  - (iii) develop and broadly disseminate best practice guidance on key issues linked to the effective implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*;
  - (iv) develop and implementing training and capacity development programmes to be implemented at national, regional and global levels;
  - (v) better communicate and raise awareness on the World Heritage concepts and their application.

e) develop and implement a pilot project on the social and economic benefits of World Heritage status;

25. The experts recommended that progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the Special Expert Meeting should be reviewed in the year of reflection in 2007 in conjunction with the review of Periodic Reporting.

*Kazan, 10 April 2005*

### III. Synoptic Table of recommendations and priorities

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications
<b><i>OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE</i></b>					
Development of corpus of past Committee decisions and discussions on outstanding universal value	7.g	High	2006	WHCentre	Regular programme
Dissemination of information concerning the effects of merging criteria and definition of outstanding universal value <sup>1</sup>	9.a and b	High	2006	WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	Regular programme
Application of authenticity to natural properties (study)	8.b	Low	Long term	IUCN	<i>US\$ 10,000</i> Extrabudgetary
<b><i>TENTATIVE LISTS</i></b>					
34 States Parties with no Tentative Lists to request preparatory assistance to prepare Tentative Lists	12.l	High	2006-2007	WHCentre and States Parties	WH Fund (preparatory assistance and participation programme)
Two regional meetings per year on harmonization of Tentative Lists	12.j	High	2006-2007	States Parties, WHCentre, Regional offices, Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$ 30,000 (per meeting / two meetings proposed per year)</i> States Parties and WH Fund (Regional programs follow-up to Periodic Reporting)
Upon request from States Parties, Advisory Bodies to provide comments on Tentative Lists	12.m	High	2006-2007	Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$ 5,000 per request</i> (assuming only provision of technical comments and not involvement in Tentative Lists process)
Advisory Bodies to carry out and complete thematic studies	12.k	High	Long term	Advisory Bodies	Advisory Bodies budget
Establishment of a coordination mechanism in the preparation and review of Tentative Lists	12.a	Medium	2006-2007	States Parties, WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	No financial implications
<b><i>NOMINATIONS</i></b>					
Access to information readily available including databases	15.d	High	Long term	States Parties WHCentre and	No financial implications

<sup>1</sup> Also see column under *Operational Guidelines* below.

				Advisory Bodies	
Training manual with best practices of TL/nominations/comparative analysis/management plans/ explanations for property owners and stakeholders on benefits and obligations of nominations	12.n, 12o, 14e and 16.a	Medium	2007	WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	<i>Additional US\$15,000 per year</i> are required under the training contract for Advisory Bodies.
Audiovisual information for all stakeholders on the process of preparation of nominations	16.c	Medium	Long term	WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$40,000</i> Extrabudgetary
Harmonization, as far as possible, of procedures amongst Advisory Bodies	17.e	Medium	Long term	Advisory Bodies	No financial implications
Training and capacity-building of potential regional evaluators	17. f	Medium	Long term	Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$20,000 per training session</i>
Regional thematic studies to identify and foster nominations	18.c	Medium	Long term	Advisory Bodies	Advisory Bodies budget
Mentoring programmes amongst States Parties as a tool for sharing information on a regional basis	18.g	Medium	Long term	States Parties	States Parties
<b><i>SUSTAINABLE CONSERVATION</i></b>					
Consideration of WH properties in danger as a priority for international co-operation	19.b	High	Long term	WHCommittee and States Parties	Extrabudgetary
To present budgetary provisions within the nomination dossier to ensure human and financial resources on a long term basis for sustainable conservation	20.a	Medium	Long term	States Parties	No financial implications
Promotion of preventative conservation of WH properties and of the importance of respecting existing protection laws and management plans	19.e	Medium	Long term	WHCommittee and WHCentre	Regular programme
Involvement of all stakeholders in management of WH properties and establishment of a prize for the best site manager	19.g	Medium	Long term	WHCommittee and WHCentre	Extrabudgetary
Identification of clear benchmarks to improve Periodic Reports	19.h	Medium	2007 (reflection year)	WHCentre	Regular programme and WHFund (analysis of Periodic Reports)
Develop a pilot project to study the economic, social and environmental benefits of heritage conservation	19.m	Medium	Long term	WHCommittee WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$50,000</i> Extrabudgetary
Coordination of national and international fundraising to avoid overlap; promotion and dissemination of the concept of “heritage foundation”	20.e	Medium	Long term	WHCommittee States Parties and WHCentre	States Parties, Regular programme, Extrabudgetary
Compilation and dissemination of best practices of management of WH properties and other UNESCO programmes	21a	Medium	Long term	WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	Regular programme

Creation of a local, regional and/or international networks of site managers, local communities, scientific researchers and AB's regional experts	19.c	Medium	Long term	States Parties, WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	States Parties
Regional workshops on conservation issues involving the already existing regional expertise	19.d	Medium	Long term	States Parties WHCentre, and Advisory Bodies	US\$25,000 per regional workshop Extrabudgetary
<b><i>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES<sup>2</sup></i></b>					
Broader dissemination of the new OGs and its major changes (merge of criteria, nomination format, serial and transnational properties)		High	2007	WHC	Regular programme
Separate chapter on management in OGs when next revised	19.a	Low	Long term	WHCommittee and WHCentre	No financial implications

#### **IV. Draft Decision**

##### **Draft Decision: 29 COM 9**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Documents **WHC-05/29.COM/9**, **WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9A** and **WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9B**,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM. 13.1** and **7 EXT.COM 4B.2** respectively adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004) and at its 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004) which requested the World Heritage Centre to convene a special meeting of experts of all regions on the concept of outstanding universal value, and invited that meeting to make specific proposals for better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value, for enabling less-represented and non-represented states to improve the quality of their nominations and thereby the success rate of inscriptions on the World Heritage List, and for enabling States Parties to identify sufficient funding sources for the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties;*
3. *Thanks the Russian Federation and the Kazan authorities for having generously hosted the Expert meeting which took place from 6 to 9 April 2005 and the experts having contributed to the meeting;*
4. *Takes note of the Recommendations prepared by the Expert meeting on the concept of outstanding universal value;*
5. *Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to implement the prioritized actions set out in the Synoptic Table in Document **WHC-05/29.COM/9** by making best use of the Regular Programme, Extra-budgetary resources and the specific amounts approved under the World Heritage Fund in **Decision 29 COM 16**.*

<sup>2</sup> This priority action has been added since some of the recommendations referred to here above could be implemented through a broader dissemination and effective enforcement of the *Operational Guidelines*

**Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention:  
The Concept of Outstanding Universal Value,  
Kazan (Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation), 6-9 April 2005**

**AGENDA**

<b>Wednesday 6 April</b>	
6 : 45	Arrival of the participants in Kazan Transfer by shuttle to the hotel « Safar » 420066, Kazan, rue Odnostoronnyaya Grifka, 1 Tel: 007 8432 439743; Fax: 439843; e-mail: hotel@safar-hotel.ru
8 : 00 – 9 : 00	<i>Breakfast at the hotel</i>
10 : 00 – 12 : 00	Guided tour of the « Historic Centre of Kazan City » (ancient Tatar suburb, Mardjani Mosque, Tukaya place, Baumann street, St-Pierre and S-Paul Cathedral, architectural and historic complex of the Kazan Kremlin)
12 : 00 – 13 : 30	<i>Lunch at the hotel</i>
14 : 00 – 14 : 30	Centre national et culturel Kazan: Inscription of participants and badge distribution
14 : 30 – 16 : 00	<p><b>Opening ceremony:</b> <i>Moderator</i> : Mr Kamil ISKHAKOV, Mayor of Kazan, Vice-president of the Organization World Heritage Cities (OWHC)</p> <p>The greeting of the President of Tartastan, Mr Mintimer SHAIMIEV, will be read by Mr Rafail HAKIMOV, State Advisor to the President of Tartastan on political questions</p> <p>Mr Themba WAKASHE, Chairperson, 29th session of the World Heritage Committee Mr Grigory Ordzhonikidze, Secretary-General of the Russian Federation National Commission for UNESCO Mr Kishore RAO, Deputy Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre Mr Igor MAKOVETSKY, President, ICOMOS-Russian Federation Ms Liubava Moreva, UNESCO Moscow Office</p>

	<p>Mr Igor SERDUKOV, Secretary General of the Russian Union of Historical Towns and Regions  Ms Gulzada RUDENKO, Director of Elabuga State Historical Architectural and Art Museum Reserve  Mr Gennady YEMELYANOV, Head of Administration of Zelenodolsk District of Tartastan  Ms Alina MITKO, student of the Kazan State University</p>
16 h 00 – 17 : 00	Case Study on <i>Safeguarding the Historic and Architectural Complex of the Kazan Kremlin</i> by Mr Ildus TARKHANOV, Minister of Culture of the Republic of Tatarstan
17 : 00 – 18 : 30	Cultural Programme : <i>visit of the Kazan University whose 200th Anniversary is mentioned in the list of anniversaries to which UNESCO is associated in 2004-2005</i>
19 : 00 – 22 : 00	Reception organized by Mr. Kamil ISKHAKOV, Mayor of Kazan, at the Pyramid Convention Center
<b>Thursday 7 April</b>	
8 : 00 – 9 : 00	<i>Breakfast at the hotel</i>
<p><i>The working sessions will take place in the “Centre national et culturel Kazan”, 420060, Kazan, rue Pouchkin, 86 (tel: 007 8432 383361; fax: 365563; e-mail: nkckazan@bancorp.ru)</i></p> <p><b>Chairperson:</b> <i>Mr Kishore RAO (Deputy Director, World Heritage Centre)</i></p> <p><b>Rapporteur:</b> <i>Mr Christopher YOUNG (United Kingdom)</i></p>	
9 : 30 – 13 : 00	<p><b><u>First session</u> : Understanding of the concept of outstanding universal value under the World Heritage Convention</b></p> <p>Moderator: Mr Abdelaziz TOURI (Morocco)</p> <p><u>Keynote speech by Ms Christina CAMERON</u> (30 minutes)  <i>Evolution of the application of “outstanding universal value” for cultural and natural heritage</i></p> <p><u>Presentation by the World Heritage Centre by Ms Mechtild RÖSSLER</u> (15 minutes)  <i>Background to the Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention</i></p> <p><u>Position Statements and presentation of the Analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists by the Advisory Bodies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ICOMOS by Mr Michael PETZET (25 minutes)</li> <li>● IUCN by Mr Harald PLACHTER and Pedro ROSABAL (25 minutes)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ICCROM by Mr Joseph KING (15 minutes)</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion and Recommendations</u></p>
13 : 00 – 14 : 30	<i>Lunch</i>
14 : 30 – 18 : 00	<p><b><u>Second session:</u> <i>Understanding of the concept of outstanding universal value under the World Heritage Convention</i></b></p> <p>Creation of three working groups:  <b>Working Group 1 :</b> <i>Moderator: Ms Christina CAMERON (Canada)</i>  <b>Working Group 2 :</b> <i>Moderator: Ms Susan DENYER (ICOMOS)</i>  <b>Working Group 3:</b> <i>Moderator: Mr Tamás FEJÉRDY (Hungary)</i></p> <p><u>Expected result:</u> Better understanding of the concept of outstanding universal value and its application in the context of the <i>Convention</i></p>
18 : 30 – 20 : 00	Visit and show at the Great Concert Room of the Republic of Tatarstan
20 : 30	<i>Dinner at the hotel</i>

### Friday 8 April

8 : 00 – 9 : 00	<i>Breakfast at the hotel</i>
9 : 30 – 11 : 30	<p><b><u>Third session (Plenary):</u> <i>Presentation of conclusions and proposals by the working groups</i></b></p> <p><i>Moderator: Mr Dag MYKLEBUST (Norway)</i></p> <p><b>Working Group 1</b> (15 minutes)  <b>Working Group 2</b> (15 minutes)  <b>Working Group 3</b> (15 minutes)</p> <p><u>Expected result:</u> A common understanding on the outstanding universal value concept and recommendations of key proposals on how to enhance its application</p>
11: 30 – 13:00	<p><b><u>Third session (Working groups):</u> <i>Application of the concept of outstanding universal value</i></b></p> <p><b>Working group 1:</b> <i>Towards better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value and preparation of Tentative Lists</i></p> <p><i>Moderator: Mr Michael TURNER (Israel)</i></p> <p><u>Expected result:</u> Identification of best practices in the preparation of</p>

Tentative Lists and recommendations of key proposals on how to enhance the capacity of State Parties in preparing/reviewing Tentative Lists

**Working group 2:** *Improving nominations of properties of potential outstanding universal value*

*Moderator: Mr Eric EDROMA (Uganda)*

Expected result: Best practices in the preparation of nominations and recommendations of key proposals on how to enhance the capacity of State Parties in preparing high quality nominations

**Working group 3:** *Towards sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties*

*Moderator: Ms Martine TAHOUX TOUAO KAH (Côte d'Ivoire)*

Expected result: Best practices for sustainable conservation and recommendations of key proposals on how to enhance the capacity of State Parties in achieving sustainable financing for the management of World Heritage properties

13 : 00 – 14 : 30

*Lunch*

14 : 30 – 18 : 00

**Fourth session (Working groups):** *continuation*

**Working group 1**  
**Working group 2**  
**Working group 3**

19 : 00 – 21 : 30

Tatar dinner and cultural programme at the House of Tatar Cooking Art

### **Saturday 9 April**

*Breakfast at the hotel for participants leaving for professional reasons*  
*Transfer by shuttle to the airport*

7 : 15

*Departure of the flight Kazan-Frankfurt*

8 : 00 – 9 : 00

*Breakfast at the hotel*

9 : 30 – 13 : 00

**Fifth session (Plenary):** *Presentation of conclusions and proposals by the working groups*

*Moderator: Ms Alissandra CUMMINS (Barbados)*

**Working Group 1** (15 minutes)  
**Working Group 2** (15 minutes)

<b>Working Group 3 (15 minutes)</b>	
<u>Expected result:</u> Adoption of conclusions and proposals	
13 : 00 – 14 : 30	<i>Lunch</i>
14 : 30 – 16 : 00	<b><u>Work of the Drafting Group</u></b> (Chairperson, Rapporteur, Moderators, Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre)
16 : 00 – 18 : 00	<b><u>Final session (Plenary): Adoption of final recommendations and proposals</u></b>  <i>Moderator: Ms Nobuko INABA (Japan)</i>  <b>Closing session</b>
19 : 00 – 21 : 30	<i>Dinner at the hotel</i>
22 h 00	Night floodlights of Kazan: Walk in the City
<b>Sunday 10 April</b>	
7 : 00 – 8 : 00	<i>Breakfast at the hotel</i>
9 : 00 – 18 : 00	Cultural Programme and visit: <i>Ancient Boulga</i>
19 : 00 – 22 : 00	<i>Dinner at the hotel</i>
<b>Monday 11 April</b>	
6 : 00 – 6 : 30	<i>Breakfast at the hotel</i>
6 : 30	<i>Transfer by shuttle to the airport</i>
7 : 15	<i>Departure of the flight Kazan-Frankfurt</i>

## GUIDING QUESTIONS TO THE WORKING GROUPS

### **2nd and 3rd sessions: Understanding of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value under the *World Heritage Convention***

1. Based on the objectives of the *Convention*, what is your understanding of “outstanding universal value” (OUV)?
2. Based on your experience, what are the regional understanding and perception of outstanding universal value in your region?
3. How the unified set of criteria under the new Operational Guidelines (2005) can assist in properly defining outstanding universal value of sites?
4. What are the risks of not properly using the outstanding universal value concept on the credibility of the World Heritage List?
5. Is the concept of outstanding universal value applied differently for natural and cultural properties and amongst different categories of heritage?

### **4th and 5th sessions: Application of the outstanding universal value**

#### Working group 1: *Towards better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value and preparation of Tentative Lists*

6. Based on your experience, what is the current process of preparing Tentative List in your region? Does this process involve experts, communities and facilitators?
7. How are global and thematic studies used in preparing Tentative Lists? What are the main difficulties in using such studies?
8. What kind of capacity-building is needed to enhance the process of preparing Tentative Lists, thus allowing the identification of sites with greater potential to meet OUV criteria?
9. What practical steps should States Parties follow to establish effective Tentative Lists of properties of potential outstanding universal value? What are the roles of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee in this process?
10. What actions should be taken at regional or sub-regional level to improve Tentative Lists? Do you have experiences to share in this field? (e.g. Harmonization of Tentative Lists)

#### Working group 2: *Improving nominations of properties of potential outstanding universal value to the World Heritage List*

11. What are the main difficulties (e.g. information gathering, mapping, comparative analysis, assessment of conditions of integrity and/or authenticity, analysis of outstanding universal

value and justification for inscription) in determining and demonstrating outstanding universal value of a property when preparing a nomination dossier?

12. Who prepares the nominations (e.g. Government agencies responsible for culture or environment, national experts, international experts, civil servants in charge of heritage/environment and NGOs) and what is their understanding of outstanding universal value? What process is used in preparing the nominations?
13. What kind of capacity-building is needed to enhance the process of preparing high-quality nominations?
14. In your view, do the Advisory Bodies appropriately and consistently evaluate the outstanding universal value of properties nominated? How could the evaluation process be strengthened and what input is required from the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties?
15. What actions should be taken at regional or sub-regional level to improve nominations of properties of outstanding universal value to the World Heritage List?

Working group 3: Towards sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties

16. What should be the ideal management requirements in your region to maintain the integrity and/or authenticity of the different categories of World Heritage properties?
17. Based on your experience, what is the gap between the human and financial resources available for managing World Heritage sites and those that are actually required?
18. Based on your experience, what are the best options for achieving sustainable financing of World Heritage properties in your region? (e.g. International or bilateral projects, endowments, debt for nature swaps, partnerships and others).
19. What is needed to improve the capacity of human resources for sustainable conservation of properties?
20. What actions should be taken at regional or sub-regional level to promote sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties? What role could Periodic Reporting and Regional Programmes play in this regard?

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

## SPECIAL GUEST

Mr Themba WAKASHE, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee

## AFRICA

**Benin** Mr Isidore Benjamin A. MONSI  
**Côte d'Ivoire** Ms Martine TAHOUX TOUAO KAH  
**Madagascar** Mr Guy Suzon RAMANGASON  
**Mozambique** Ms Maria Angela KANE  
**South Africa** Mr Vusithemba NDIMA  
**Uganda** Mr Eric EDROMA

## ARAB STATES

**Algeria** Mme Rachida ZADEM  
**Sultanate of Oman** Mr Saif Rashid AL SHAQSI  
**Tunisie** Mme Marie-José ELLOUMI

## ASIA &amp; PACIFIC

**China** Mr Zhan GUO  
**Fiji** Ms Sereima Ramue SAVU  
**India** Mr Shri R.B. LAL  
**Japan** Ms Nobuko INABA  
**New Zealand** Mr Paul GREEN  
**Philippines** Ms Carmen D. PADILLA

## EUROPE &amp; NORTH AMERICA

**Israel** Mr Michael TURNER  
**Netherlands** Mr Peter NIJHOFF  
**Norway** Mr Dag MYKLEBUST  
**Russian Federation** Ms Chulpan KHABIBULLINA  
**UK** Mr Christopher YOUNG  
**USA** Mr Paul HOFFMAN

## **LATIN AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN**

<b>Argentina</b>	Mr Roberto Luis MOLINARI
<b>Barbados</b>	Ms Alissandra CUMMINS
<b>Brazil</b>	Mr José Pedro de OLIVEIRA COSTA
<b>Chile</b>	Mr Angel CABEZA MONTEIRA
<b>Colombia</b>	Ms Maria Claudia LOPEZ SORZANO
<b>Mexico</b>	Ms Maria Pia GALLINA TESSARO

## **FORMER COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS**

<b>Morocco</b>	Mr Abdelaziz TOURI
<b>Canada</b>	Mrs Christina CAMERON
<b>Hungary</b>	Mr Tamas FEJERDY

## **ADVISORY BODIES**

<b>ICOMOS</b>	Mr Michael PETZET Ms Susan DENYER
---------------	--------------------------------------

<b>ICCROM</b>	Mr Joseph KING
---------------	----------------

<b>IUCN</b>	Mr Harald PLACHTER Mr Pedro ROSABAL
-------------	--

## **SECRETARIAT STAFF**

Mr Kishore RAO, Deputy Director, World Heritage Centre  
Ms Mechtild ROSSLER  
Ms Anne LEMAISTRE  
Ms Fumiko OHINATA  
Mr Lodovico FOLIN CALABI

## **UNESCO MOSCOW OFFICE**

Ms Liubava MOREVA  
National Officer for Culture

## **UNESCO INTERPRETERS**

Mme Chantal BRET  
Mme Geneviève LEIBRICH  
Mme Christine MARTEAU  
Mr Jan KROTKI