

Distribution limited

WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9A

Paris, 27 May 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

**INF.9A:** Background paper prepared by the World Heritage Centre on the occasion of the *Expert meeting on the concept of outstanding universal value*

## SUMMARY

This document contains the Background paper prepared by the World Heritage Centre as requested by Decision **7EXT.COM.4B.2**, paragraph 3 on the occasion of the Expert meeting on the concept of outstanding universal value which took place in Kazan, Russian Federation, from 6 to 9 April 2005.



## Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention: The concept of Outstanding Universal Value

UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE  
in cooperation with the  
Municipality of Kazan, Republic of Tatarstan, the Russian Federation

6 - 9 April 2005

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENT

#### 1. Introduction

The World Heritage Committee at its 28th session<sup>1</sup> requested the World Heritage Centre to convene a special meeting of experts of all regions on the concept of outstanding universal value as used for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. Subsequently, the World Heritage Committee at its 7th extraordinary session<sup>2</sup> decided that the afore-mentioned special meeting would take place in Kazan, as offered by the Russian Federation, from 6 to 9 April 2005. This document sets out the background to this meeting by providing information relevant to the elements referred to in points a), b), c) and d) of Paragraph 13 of Decision **28 COM 13.1** (Annex 1).

#### 2. The notion of Outstanding Universal Value

##### 2.1 The *World Heritage Convention*

The purpose of the 1972 UNESCO *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, which is currently ratified by 180 States Parties (Annex 2), is to ensure the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of cultural and natural heritage of "outstanding universal value".

The Preamble to the *World Heritage Convention* (Box 1) sets out the *raison d'être* of the *World Heritage Convention*, referring to the existence of heritage of outstanding

---

<sup>1</sup> **28 COM 13.1** Paragraph 13

<sup>2</sup> **7 EXT.COM 4B.2** Paragraphs 3 and 4

universal value that warrants collective responsibility for its preservation in the form of an international convention.

The definition of cultural and natural heritage under the *World Heritage Convention* is given in Articles 1 and 2 respectively. The expression "outstanding universal value" is an integral part of this definition and the identification and assessment of elements of the cultural and natural heritage for inclusion in the World Heritage List consequently depends on whether its value can be considered to be outstanding and universal.

Outstanding universal value itself, however, is not defined within the text of the *World Heritage Convention*<sup>3</sup>. Instead, the *Convention* has provisions for establishing criteria to determine whether a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage is of outstanding universal value. In particular, Articles 11(2) and 11(4) state that cultural and natural properties are included in the World Heritage List or the List of World Heritage in Danger "in terms of such criteria as [the World Heritage Committee] shall have established" and Article 11(5) refers to the role of the Committee in defining "the criteria on the basis of which a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage may be included in either of the lists". Furthermore, Article 12 of the *World Heritage Convention* states that not being inscribed on the World Heritage List or the List of World Heritage in Danger does not mean that a property is not of outstanding universal value.

**Box 1: Extract from the Preamble of the *World Heritage Convention***

[...]

*Considering* that parts of the cultural or natural heritage are of outstanding interest and therefore need to be preserved as part of the world heritage of mankind as a whole,

*Considering* that, in view of the magnitude and gravity of the new dangers threatening them, it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto,

*Considering* that it is essential for this purpose to adopt new provisions in the form of a convention establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods,

[...]

## 2.2 Operational Guidelines

The World Heritage Committee elaborates *the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, the first version of which was adopted

---

<sup>3</sup> Extensive discussions on the legal implications of the *World Heritage Convention* took place during one of the Associated Workshops, "Legal Tools for World Heritage Conservation" (Siena, Italy, 11-12 November 2002) on the occasion of the 30th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention "World Heritage 2002: Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility".

in 1977. While the definitions of cultural and natural heritage<sup>4</sup> in the *Convention*, cannot be easily altered, the criteria elaborated in the *Operational Guidelines* for determining and justifying the use of the principal of outstanding universal value have changed over the years and may continue to be revised in the future (See Annex 3 for a summary of the previous revisions of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The World Heritage Committee developed these criteria in a first set of *Operational Guidelines* in 1977<sup>5</sup>. The most recent revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005) again dealt with the notion of outstanding universal value<sup>6</sup> (see Box 2) and merged the two sets of criteria for the assessment of such value for natural and cultural properties, into one single set running from i) to x) (Box 3). To satisfy the criteria for outstanding universal value, a nominated property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding<sup>7</sup>.

The ability to change and modify the *Operational Guidelines* allows to accommodate pertinent developments on the concept of heritage value or significance for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. In this regard, the notion of outstanding universal value has been constructed and developed through the discussions of the World Heritage Committee, reflected in the repeated revisions of the *Operational Guidelines*.

**Box 2: Extract from the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (2005) concerning outstanding universal value:**

**Outstanding universal value**

**49.** 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.

**50.** States Parties are invited to submit nominations of properties of cultural and/or natural value considered to be of "outstanding universal value" for inscription on the World Heritage List.

**51.** At the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, the Committee adopts a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (see paragraph 154) which will be the key reference for the future effective

<sup>4</sup> Articles 1 and 2 of the *World Heritage Convention*.

<sup>5</sup> Doc CC-77/CONF.001/8 Rev, Paragraphs 7 for cultural and 10 for natural criteria.

It is interesting to note that this version of the *Operational Guidelines* commented on the definition of "universal" in the phrase "outstanding universal value" - "some properties may not be recognized by all people, everywhere, to be of great importance and significance. Opinions may vary from one culture or period to another and the term "universal" must therefore be interpreted as referring to a property which is highly representative of the culture of which it forms part". This comment, however, was not retained after the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* in 1980

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 77 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>7</sup> Paragraphs 78-94 and Annex 4 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

protection and management of the property.

**52.** The *Convention* is not intended to ensure the protection of all properties of great interest, importance or value, but only for a select list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint. It is not to be assumed that a property of national and/or regional importance will automatically be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

**53.** Nominations presented to the Committee shall demonstrate the full commitment of the State Party to preserve the heritage concerned, within its means. Such commitment shall take the form of appropriate policy, legal, scientific, technical, administrative and financial measures adopted and proposed to protect the property and its outstanding universal value.

**Box 3: Extract from the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (2005) concerning criteria for the assessment of outstanding universal value:***

**77.** The Committee considers a property as having outstanding universal value (see paragraphs 49-53) if the property meets one or more of the following criteria. Nominated properties shall therefore :

- (i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;
- (ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
- (iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
- (iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
- (v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
- (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 preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);
- (vii) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
- (viii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;
- (ix) be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;
- (x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

### 2.3 Tentative Lists, World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger

Under the *World Heritage Convention*, three kinds of lists exist for cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value:

**Tentative List:** The World Heritage Committee requests<sup>8</sup> each State Party to submit an inventory of the cultural and natural properties of outstanding universal value situated within its territory, which it considers suitable for inclusion and it intends to nominate for inscription to the World Heritage List during the following years<sup>9</sup>. These inventories, also commonly known as Tentative Lists, are a useful and important planning tool for all involved in World Heritage protection as they provide an indication of future nominations. At its 24th session in 2000, the Committee<sup>10</sup> confirmed the importance of these Lists for planning purposes, for comparative analyses of nominations and for facilitating the undertaking of global and thematic studies. It also decided that nominations to the World Heritage List would not be considered unless the nominated property had already been included on the Tentative List of the State Party concerned.

At the time of the preparation of this document, 144 States Parties have submitted Tentative Lists<sup>11</sup> and the years in which these Tentative Lists have been most recently revised vary between 2005 and 1988 (Annex 4). There are currently 36 States Parties without such List.

The *Operational Guidelines* encourage the States Parties to prepare their Tentative Lists with the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, to revise the List periodically and consult the specific thematic studies carried out by the Advisory Bodies. It must be noted that the years of previous revisions of the Tentative Lists by the States Parties indicated in Annex 4 do not necessarily reflect that these revisions took such advice into account. Often a Tentative List is revised only to include a particular property which States Parties wish to nominate in the immediate future. However, revisions of Tentative Lists by certain States Parties may be regarded as best practice. IUCN, for example, noted<sup>12</sup> that Madagascar and Canada<sup>13</sup> have undertaken comprehensive reviews of their natural and mixed World Heritage properties (both inscribed and potential properties) as an input to the preparation of their Tentative Lists. The Tentative List prepared for Canada also proposes areas that may merit nomination as transboundary or transnational World Heritage properties. Both IUCN and ICOMOS<sup>14</sup> concluded that more work is required to

---

<sup>8</sup> Articles 1, 2 and 11(1) of the *World Heritage Convention*

<sup>9</sup> Paragraphs 62 - 76 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005) for Procedure and Format, the role of Tentative Lists as a planning tool and explanation as regard to assistance and capacity building for States Parties in the preparation of Tentative Lists.

<sup>10</sup> Decision **24 COM paragraph VI.2.3.2.**

<sup>11</sup> In compliance with the Committee Decision **27 COM 8A** paragraph 5, the complete Tentative Lists of all States Parties are accessible to the public at the following web address:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists>

<sup>12</sup> *WHC-04/28COM/INF.13B*, p. 4

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/spm-whs/page7\\_e.asp](http://www.pc.gc.ca/progs/spm-whs/page7_e.asp)

<sup>14</sup> *WHC-04/28COM/INF.13A.*

improve the quality of Tentative Lists before they can be effectively used as a tool to assist the further identification of potential natural and mixed World Heritage properties.

States Parties are encouraged to harmonize their Tentative Lists at regional and thematic levels<sup>15</sup>. Harmonization of Tentative Lists is the process whereby States Parties, with the assistance of the Advisory Bodies, collectively assess their respective Tentative List to review gaps and identify common themes.

**World Heritage List:** In accordance with Article 11(2) of the *World Heritage Convention*, the World Heritage Committee has a mandate to establish, keep current, publish and distribute the World Heritage List at least biennially. To date, 788 properties (see Table 1) from a total of 134 countries have been inscribed on the World Heritage List - due to the decisions of the World Heritage Committee that has inscribed new properties at its annual sessions since 1978 (see Table 2 for the annual increase of World Heritage properties). The number of World Heritage properties situated within a State Party ranges from 39 to zero (Annex 5), and no less than 46 States Parties are without World Heritage properties.

According to Article 11 (5), the World Heritage Committee must define criteria that are relevant for its inscription for each property<sup>16</sup>. The evaluation of nominated properties is undertaken by one or both of the Advisory Bodies, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the World Conservation Union (IUCN). At the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee, guided by the Advisory Bodies, discusses and adopts the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for each property<sup>17</sup>. Such Statement constitutes the basis for the future protection and management of the property.

---

<sup>15</sup> Paragraph 73 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005); See also recommendations of the 12th General Assembly of States Parties in 1999 concerning Tentative Lists, which is summarised in page 1 of *WHC-04/28COM/14A*.

<sup>16</sup> In practice, however, the State Party normally proposes the appropriate criteria and the condition of authenticity and/or integrity as part of the nomination dossier

<sup>17</sup> Paragraph 154-155 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005). Before the revised *Operational Guidelines* (2005) came into force, the proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value prepared by the State Party was called *Statement of significance*. (Paragraph 64 of the *Operational Guidelines*, 2002). The procedure of setting out the criteria along with a clearly stated summary of the characteristics which justified the inscription was introduced after 1995 and **therefore 439 properties inscribed before lack a statement justifying the inscription.**

**Table 1: Number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and its regional distribution**

TYPE OF PROPERTY	TOTAL NUMBER	Africa 39 States Parties	Arab States 19 States Parties	Asia-Pacific 41 States Parties	Europe & North America 50 States Parties	Latin America & Caribbean 29 States Parties
Cultural properties	611	30	55	109	342	75
Natural properties	154	31	3	41	48	31
Mixed properties	23	2	1	9	8	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>109</b>

**Table 2: Annual inscription of World Heritage properties (1978-2004)**

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Cultural properties	8	34	2	15	17	19	15	25	23	32
Natural properties	4	9	5	9	5	9	7	4	6	7
Mixed properties	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>41</b>
	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Cultural properties	19	4	11	6	16	29	21	23	30	38
Natural properties	5	2	2	6	4	4	8	6	5	7
Mixed properties	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004			
Cultural properties	27	35	50	25	9	19	29			
Natural properties	3	11	10	6	0	5	5			
Mixed properties	0	2	1	0	0	0	0			
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34</b>			

**List of World Heritage in Danger:** When the outstanding universal value of a property, which justified inscription on the World Heritage List, is threatened by serious and specific dangers, the World Heritage Committee considers placing it on the List of World Heritage in Danger<sup>18</sup>. When the outstanding universal value is destroyed, the Committee may consider deleting the property from the World Heritage List; however no property has so far been deleted.

There are currently 35 properties which are included on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Annex 6). Seven properties were inscribed at the same time on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Between 1978 and 2004, eleven World Heritage properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger were

<sup>18</sup> Article 11(4) of the *World Heritage Convention*.



removed from this List<sup>19</sup>. The number of years that properties have been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger are as follows: 0-4 years (12 properties), 5-9 years (13 properties), 10-14 years (6 properties), 15-20 years (2 properties) and more than 20 years (2 properties). With reference to Decision 28COM 13.1. Paragraph 13 c) (Annex 1), a reduction by 20% of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger by 2007 would mean removal of 7 such properties.

### 3. How to maintain Outstanding Universal Value through sustainable conservation

When deciding to inscribe a property on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee, guided by the Advisory Bodies, adopts a statement of outstanding universal value<sup>20</sup> for the property. This statement should include a summary of the Committee's determination that the property has outstanding universal value, identifying the criteria under which the property was inscribed, including the assessments of the conditions of integrity or authenticity, and also of the requirements for protection and management in force. The statement of outstanding universal value is the basis for the future protection and management of the property<sup>21</sup>.

**Protection and management:** Each nominated property should have an appropriate management plan or an otherwise documented management system which specifies how the integrity of a property and its outstanding universal value are to be preserved<sup>22</sup>. Such a management plan has been a mandatory part of any nomination dossier<sup>23</sup> since 1996 and the *Operational Guidelines* indicates ways in which such a plan may be prepared<sup>24</sup>. Dossiers are often evaluated technically incomplete by the World Heritage Centre, or deferred or referred by the World Heritage Committee. Furthermore, many of the earlier nominations lack management plans and the World Heritage Centre is not always informed of post-inscription establishment or revision of management plans.

The World Heritage Committee in 2003 raised the question as to "whether management of a World Heritage property be based on evaluation and protection of that property as a whole, or be limited to ensuring the protection of certain specifically identified "values"<sup>25</sup>. The discussion focused on the integrity of a property as a component of its outstanding universal value, as is reflected in the most recent version of the *Operational Guidelines*<sup>26</sup>.

**Reactive Monitoring:** Within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*, the UNESCO Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies may carry out Reactive Monitoring in

---

<sup>19</sup> This does not include Djoudi National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) as it was re-inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2000.

<sup>20</sup> Paragraph 154 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>21</sup> Paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>22</sup> Paragraph 108 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>23</sup> Paragraphs 97 and 132 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>24</sup> Paragraphs 96-118 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>25</sup> *WHC-03/6 EXT.COM/INF.4B*

<sup>26</sup> Paragraphs 96 and 108 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

order to evaluate the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat<sup>27</sup>. The World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004) examined the state of conservation of 101 cultural, 47 natural and 4 mixed properties (of which there were 18 cultural and 13 natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger)<sup>28</sup>.

**Periodic Reporting:** The 29th General Conference of UNESCO invited the States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, in accordance with Article 29, to "report on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the *World Heritage Convention*, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on their territories". One of the main purposes of the exercise is to provide an assessment as to whether the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage properties is maintained over time. The World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session in 1998 consequently adopted a general reporting form and decided to examine Periodic Reports on a regional basis every six years, which resulted in regional or sub-regional programmes on World Heritage (Table 3)<sup>29</sup>.

The World Heritage Committee has invited the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to submit at its 29th session in 2005 proposals on ways and means of optimizing the interrelation between the results of the Periodic Reporting cycles and the conclusions derived from the State of Conservation reports - in particular in order to ensure consistency and a better conservation of the properties<sup>30</sup>. A year of reflection before the next cycle of Periodic Reporting is to start in 2008<sup>31</sup> in order to "a) study and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting; b) develop strategic direction on the forms and the format of the Periodic Reports, training priorities and international cooperation priorities; and c) to streamline the Committee's consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting relating to inscribed properties";.

**Sustainable conservation:** The World Heritage Committee has increasingly emphasized the concept of sustainability or sustainable development for World Heritage properties<sup>32</sup>, considering in particular the impact of human activities that take place within the property and the need, at the same time, to maintain the outstanding universal value<sup>33</sup> of the property. It is the responsibility of the States Parties to ensure that such sustainable use does not adversely impact the outstanding universal value, integrity and/or authenticity of the property. To this effect, the World Heritage Centre has been involved, at a site-specific level, in a number of activities related to financial sustainability. This

---

<sup>27</sup> Paragraphs 169-176 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>28</sup> *WHC-04/7EXT.COM/3C*

<sup>29</sup> Periodic Report from Europe and North America will be examined in 2005 and 2006

<sup>30</sup> **7EXT.COM 4B1.** Paragraph 8: *The World Heritage Committee invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to submit at its 29th session proposals on ways and means of optimizing the interrelation between the results of the Periodic Reporting cycles and the conclusions derived from the State of Conservation reports – in particular in order to ensure consistency and a better conservation of the sites.*

<sup>31</sup> **7 EXT.COM 5**

<sup>32</sup> Paragraph 6 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>33</sup> Paragraphs 90 and 119 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

included the organization of sessions on "sustainable financing for Protected Areas" during the 2003 World Parks Congress in Durban and the membership of the Advisory Committee for the Financial Sustainability for National Systems of Protected Areas organized by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF).

**Table 3: Periodic Reports examined by the World Heritage Committee and regional or sub-regional programme resulting from such exercise**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Examination by the World Heritage Committee</b>	<b>Documents</b>	<b>Regional or sub-regional programme on World Heritage</b>
<b>Arab States</b>	24th session (2000)	<i>WHC-00/CONF.209/12</i>  World Heritage reports 11: Periodic Report and Regional Programme: Arab States 2000-2003 (2004)	Regional Programme for the Arab States
<b>Africa</b>	25th/26th sessions (2001-2002)	World Heritage reports 3: Periodic Report Africa (2003)	Africa 2009  Action Plan for Medium-Term Regular reporting/Africa Nature
<b>Asia and Pacific</b>	27th session (2003)	World Heritage reports 12: The State of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region 2003 (2005)	Action Asia 2003-2009 Programme  World Heritage-Pacific 2009 Programme
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>	28th session (2004)	<i>WHC-04/28COM/16</i> <i>WHC-04/28COM/INF16</i>	Action plan for World Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean
<b>North-America</b>	29th session (2005)	-	-
<b>Europe</b>	29th session (2005) for Section I 30th session (2006) for Section II	-	-

#### **4. The Global Strategy for a balanced, representative and credible World Heritage List (1994)**

The World Heritage Committee has extensively discussed ways of ensuring the balance, representiveness and credibility of the World Heritage List. Up till 1994, there was no overall and comparative approach to the evaluation of the outstanding universal value of cultural and natural properties that were under discussion for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

The question of numerical imbalance of cultural and natural nominations to the World Heritage List was raised as early as the second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in 1979<sup>34</sup>. The subsequent and continual discussion between 1979 and 1995<sup>35</sup> on the balanced representation of natural and cultural heritage on the World Heritage List covered the difficulties in defining the concept of "outstanding universal value", the imbalanced representation of natural and cultural heritage on the World Heritage List, the application of the World Heritage cultural landscape categories, as well as the imbalanced representation of different categories of heritage on the World Heritage List and the need to develop the Global Strategy.

The Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 18th session in 1994, is an action programme designed to identify and fill the gaps in the World Heritage List<sup>36</sup>. The Global Strategy relies on regional and thematic definitions and analyses of categories of heritage of outstanding universal value. It encourages States Parties to develop Tentative Lists and nominations of properties from categories and regions currently not well represented on the World Heritage List. The Global Strategy further encourages countries which have remained outside the World Heritage system to ratify the *World Heritage Convention*. In this regard the World Heritage Committee has examined a series of thematic and comparative studies, workshops and expert meetings organized by the World Heritage Centre in different regions. Within the framework of the Global Strategy, the Advisory Bodies have also carried out a number of thematic and comparative studies on different categories of heritage<sup>37</sup>.

It is worthwhile mentioning that the concept of outstanding universal value played an important role during discussion on the Global Strategy. The "Expert Meeting on the evaluation of general principles and criteria for nominations of natural World Heritage sites" (Parc national de la Vanoise, France in 1996) for example noted difficulties in defining "outstanding universal value" and emphasized the need to assess and evaluate World Heritage value in a regional context.

The World Heritage Committee at its 24th session (Cairns, 2000) requested the Advisory Bodies to "proceed with an analysis of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the Tentative Lists on a regional, chronological, geographical and thematic basis" within the framework of the Global Strategy. The resulting reports were examined by the Committee at its 28th session in 2004<sup>38</sup>. The World Heritage Committee at its 7th extraordinary session in 2004 requested<sup>39</sup> the Advisory Bodies to present to the Special Meeting of Experts to be held in Kazan (Russian Federation) a document on the analysis of the Tentative List and thematic studies<sup>40</sup> in order to provide a clear position concerning

---

<sup>34</sup> In accordance with Paragraph 57 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>35</sup> Summarised in *WHC-95/CONF.203/7* and *WHC-98/CONF.203/12*

<sup>36</sup> Paragraphs 54-61 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>37</sup> Annex 3 of the *Operational Guidelines*

<sup>38</sup> *WHC-04/28COM/INF.13A*; *WHC-04/28COM/INF.13B*

<sup>39</sup> **7 EXT.COM4B.2**

<sup>40</sup> **28 COM 13. 1** Paragraph 12

the question of the underrepresented and less represented categories of natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List<sup>41</sup>.

The so-called "Cairns Decision" (2000) and "Cairns-Shuzou Decision" (2004) refer to the number of properties to be examined by the World Heritage Committee. These are aimed at improving the representativity of the World Heritage List and managing the workload of the Committee, Advisory Bodies, and the World Heritage Centre (Table 4).

It must be noted that the *World Heritage Convention* does not set a numerical upper limit for the World Heritage List<sup>42</sup> and that the World Heritage Committee has never defined a number of World Heritage properties that would mark States Parties as less-represented. The legal implications of setting a limit to the number of nominations in relation to the sovereignty of the States Parties was discussed by the World Heritage Committee in December 2004<sup>43</sup>.

**Table 4: Summary of recent decisions by the World Heritage Committee on the number of nominations to be examined**<sup>44</sup>

24th session in 2000	<p>The Cairns Decision established two separate limits on the number of nominations to be examined each year:</p> <p>a) A limit of one new nomination per State Party (with exceptions for States Parties without properties on the World Heritage List) was established in an attempt to improve the geographic distribution of new nominations;</p> <p>b) A limit on the number of new nominations it would review annually (provisionally set at 30 nominations per year) was established on an interim basis to manage the workload of the Committee, Advisory Bodies, and the World Heritage Centre.</p> <p>The Committee exempted nominations deferred or referred from previous sessions, changes to the boundaries of already inscribed properties, as well as, on an emergency basis, situations falling under paragraph 67 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (July 2002).</p>
25th session in 2001	The Committee exempted transboundary nominations from the limits established at its 24th session.
27th session in 2003 (27COM14)	The Committee decided "to set at 40 the annual limit on the number of new nominations it will review, exclusive of nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions of the Committee, changes to the boundaries of properties already inscribed, transboundary nominations and nominations submitted on an emergency basis"
28th session in 2004 (28COM)	<p>On an experimental and transitory basis, to apply the following mechanism at its 30th session (2006):</p> <p>a) examine up to two complete nominations per State Party, provided that at least one</p>

<sup>41</sup> WHC-04/28COM/INF.13A and WHC/04/28COM/INF.13B

<sup>42</sup> Paragraph 58 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>43</sup> Annex III of WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B

<sup>44</sup> WHC-04/28COM/INF.13

<b>13.1)</b>	<p>of such nominations concerns a natural property: and</p> <p>b) set at 45 the annual limit on the number of nominations it will review, inclusive of nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions of the Committee, extensions (except minor modifications of limits of the property, transboundary nominations, serial nominations and nominations submitted on an emergency basis,</p> <p>c) the order of priorities for the examination of new nominations shall remain as decided by the Committee at its 24th session (2000): [...]</p>
--------------	--

## 5. Application of the notion of outstanding universal value by the Advisory Bodies

The *Operational Guidelines* stipulate that decisions about the outstanding universal value of a property result from the input of (1) nominating State Party, (2) the Advisory Bodies that evaluate the property and make specific recommendations to the World Heritage Committee, and (3) the World Heritage Committee that formally decides about the inclusion in the World Heritage List. The Advisory Bodies are requested<sup>45</sup> to be objective, rigorous and scientific in their evaluations, which should be based on a consistent standard of professionalism.

There exists a significant difference in the ways in which the notion of outstanding universal value is applied by the Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS and IUCN (Box 4). The World Heritage Committee, as early as in 1979, noted that universal value was difficult to define and that it was more difficult to select cultural places than natural places for inclusion in the World Heritage List. The Bureau further remarked that IUCN interpreted universal value strictly, deeming that only "the best property of its kind should be included in the List"<sup>46</sup>. There are usually more nominations of cultural properties than of natural properties, and ICOMOS recommends less often than IUCN to defer an inscription or not to inscribe at all (Table 5). In addition, the World Heritage Committee does not necessarily follows the recommendations presented by the Advisory Bodies.

<b>Box 4: Statements by the Advisory Bodies on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention</b>
<p><b>ICOMOS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Balance:</b> "The idea of 'balance' in relation to the World Heritage List should not be seen to refer to a balance between countries, or types of properties, but rather to how well a particular type of heritage of outstanding universal value is represented on the List. There will probably always remain a certain 'imbalance' between various regions and countries of the world, considering the incredible diversity of cultural heritage, the way it is distributed and how it is now represented around the world" (<i>WHC-04/28COM/INF.13A</i>, p7).</li> <li>• <b>Value:</b> "Unlike natural heritage, cultural heritage is fragmented and diverse and not predisposed to clear classification systems. One of the main reasons for this is the need to take account of qualities, which are subjective, and of the value that society may give to those qualities" (<i>WHC-04/28COM/INF.13A</i>, p.3);</li> </ul>

<sup>45</sup> Paragraph 148 (b) and (c) of *the Operational Guidelines* (2005)

<sup>46</sup> Report of the 3rd session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, Paris, 1979

- **No limit to the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:** "It is clear that improving the representivity on the List and "filling the gaps" will require further research. The definition of potential heritage properties to be nominated to the List will necessarily remain an open question, subject to evolving concepts, policies, strategies and available resources" and "...discussion of issues of 'balance' or 'representativity' and the perception of whether or not there are gaps, cannot be simply based on numerical analysis";

#### IUCN

- **Outstanding Universal Value:** "The key test for inscription on the World Heritage List is that World Heritage sites are sites of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the *World Heritage Convention*". (WHC-04/28COM.INF13B p.1)
- **Limit to the World Heritage List:** "...there must be a finite number of existing and potential properties for inclusion on the World Heritage List...IUCN considers that a number in the range of 250-300 natural and mixed World Heritage properties should be sufficient...." (WHC-04/28COM13, p.10);
- **Other international instruments:** "...it was never intended that the [World Heritage] List should ensure complete "representivity" of all the earth's numerous ecosystems and habitats" (WHC-04/28COMINF13B p.1) and "full use should be made of other international instruments and agreements to complement properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. These include UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and Ramsar Sites, as well as regional level designation. In relation to geological sites, the Geopark Initiative of UNESCO could be useful" (WHC-04/28COM13, p11);

**Table 5: Number of properties presented to the World Heritage Committee, Recommendations by the Advisory Bodies and the Decisions of the World Heritage Committee**

	Number of nominations presented to the World Heritage Committee*	Recommendation by ICOMOS				Recommendation by IUCN				Decisions of the World Heritage Committee			
		I	D	R	N	I	D	R	N	I	D	R	N
<b>1985</b>	Cultural: 30 Natural: 6 Mixed: 1	24	3		3	5			1	26	1		3
						4	1			1			1
<b>1990</b>	Cultural: 13 Natural: 5 Mixed: 1	11	2			5				12	1		
		1				1				5			
										1			
<b>1995</b>	Cultural: 23 Natural: 9 Mixed: 0	21	1	1		6	1		2	23			
						6				6	2		1
<b>2000</b>	Cultural: 56 Natural: 14	53	1		2	12	1		1	53	2		1
						13				13			1

	Mixed: 1	1				1				1			
<b>2003</b>	Cultural: 27	17	7		3					21	4		2
	Natural: 10					3	4		3	5	2	1	2
	Mixed: 4		4			1			3	1	1	1	1
<b>2004</b>	Cultural: 36	31	4		1					32	2	1	1
	Natural: 11					6	4		1	8	3		1
	Mixed: 1	1				1					1		

\* The numbers include previously deferred nominations, extension of cultural and natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List as well as nominations previously presented but withdrawn by the State Party.

I = Inscribed, D = Deferred, R = Referred, N = Not inscribed

## 6. Broadening the notion of World Heritage

Categories of heritage within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention* have been broadened over the decades to include cultural landscapes, industrial remains, and heritage routes, which are all now valued as part of our cultural heritage. The World Heritage Committee has also reflected upon such subjects as the need for community involvement, social benefits, heritage as part of sustainable development and the engagement of young people in the World Heritage process.

The preparation and adoption of recent UNESCO international legal instruments and certain expert meetings also have had relevance to the discussion on outstanding universal value. UNESCO endeavours to stimulate intellectual debate and reflection in order to ensure appropriate and coordinated safeguarding of heritage in all its forms, while taking into account changing approaches and new modalities for protection and safeguarding.

**2003 Convention:** *The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO on 17 October 2003<sup>47</sup>. One of the characteristics of this 2003 Convention is that it deliberately does not refer to exceptional or outstanding value and instead identifies the value of intangible cultural heritage, amongst other things, on the basis of its representative character for the community concerned<sup>48</sup>.

The scope of the *World Heritage Convention* may occasionally include associated values attached to monuments and sites, particularly with regard to properties inscribed under criteria v) and vi), while the 2003 Convention deal with cultural space that are associated

<sup>47</sup> At the time of the preparation of this document, 12 States have ratified this Convention and the procedures for further ratifications are progressing rapidly in many other Member States. The 2003 Convention will enter into force three months after the deposit with the Director-General of UNESCO of the 30th instrument of ratification, and if the process continues at its current pace, the first General Assembly and Intergovernmental Committee of the 2003 Convention might be convened in 2006.

<sup>48</sup> Definition of the Intangible Cultural Heritage as provided in Article 2 of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.



with manifestations of intangible heritage<sup>49</sup>. In this regard, UNESCO participated in the International Conference on “The Safeguarding of Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Towards an Integrated Approach” (Nara, 19-23 October 2004) which resulted in the Yamato Declaration and the World Heritage Committee also discussed ways towards the cooperation and coordination between the UNESCO Conventions concerning heritage<sup>50</sup>.

Once the 2003 Convention enters into force, the elements proclaimed Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, in so far as they are located in States Parties to that Convention, will be incorporated into the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity<sup>51</sup>. This point will require special attention from the Intergovernmental Committee that will implement the 2003 Convention, since the selection criteria for the Masterpieces include a criterion of outstanding value. The experiences obtained with this programme (Proclamations in 2001 and 2003), however, have led the governmental experts who prepared the draft of the 2003 Convention, to reject such a criterion as being incompatible with fundamental characteristics of the intangible cultural heritage. The Intangible Heritage Committee is subsequently required to develop new criteria that will guide the future inscription of elements of the intangible cultural heritage on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity; the incorporation of Masterpieces into that List “shall in no way prejudice the criteria for future inscriptions”<sup>52</sup>.

**Linking Universal and Local Values:** The participants of the Conference "Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage" (Amsterdam, 22-24 May 2003) recognized that "the World Heritage Convention aims to protect cultural and natural heritage of "outstanding universal value", but underscored that the whole range of values - including local values, intangible and spiritual values, and traditional management systems - should be fully understood, respected, and taken into account in the process of identification and sustainable management of World Heritage....". It was also emphasized that "universal and local values are part of a continuum, not a hierarchy, and should not be separated. Indeed, it is not viable to identify or manage universal value without acknowledging and maintaining value of place to the local peoples".

**Cultural diversity:** The UNESCO Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity, adopted in November 2001, states "Culture takes diverse forms across time and space. This diversity is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the groups and societies making up humankind. As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the

---

<sup>49</sup> WHC-04/7EXT.COM.9

<sup>50</sup> WHC-04/7EXT.COM/9 and WHC-04/EXT.COM/INF.9. The full text of the “Yamato Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage” is available in Annex I of document WHC-04/EXT.COM/INF.9.

<sup>51</sup> Article 16 of the 2003 Convention

<sup>52</sup> Article 31.2 of the 2003 Convention

benefit of present and future generations". This stance strikes a chord with the spirit of the World Heritage Convention since the World Heritage List is a clear "international instrument of reference, which if properly interpreted and used, could be seen as both a challenge and an opportunity to recognize the diversity and specificity of different cultures, past and present"<sup>53</sup>.

**Cooperation with other Conventions in the field of natural heritage:** At the 7th Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) decided to promote a liaison group among the Secretariats of the Conventions related to biodiversity conservation to enhance synergies amongst such instruments in a manner consistent with their respective mandates.). The relevant conventions include the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), the Convention on Wetlands of International importance especially on Waterfowl Habitat (RAMSAR) and the *World Heritage Convention*. Among these international legal instruments, the Ramsar Convention<sup>54</sup> resembles the *World Heritage Convention* in providing a listing system of specific wetlands, which so far included as many as 1421 wetlands, of international importance<sup>55</sup> and a provision for a Danger Listing process.

## **7. Specific tasks of the Special Expert Meeting as requested by the World Heritage Committee**

The World Heritage Committee at its 28th session has decided that the Special Expert Meeting should undertake tasks as outlined in Decision **28 COM 13.1**. Paragraph 13 a), b), c) and d). In order to further facilitate the work of the experts, the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies has developed the programme of the Meeting with the following themes and key guiding questions (annexed to the Agenda of the meeting):

Theme 1: Understanding of the concept of outstanding universal value under the World Heritage Convention

Theme 2: Towards a better identification of World Heritage properties of potential outstanding universal value and a better preparation of Tentative Lists

Theme 3: Improving nominations of properties of potential outstanding universal value to the World Heritage List

---

<sup>53</sup> *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A*, page 8

<sup>54</sup> The Ramsar Convention is an inter-government treaty which provides the framework for national action and international cooperation for the conservation and wise use of wetlands and their resources. There are presently 144 Contracting Parties to the Convention, with 1421 wetland sites, totalling 123.9 million hectares.

<sup>55</sup> Article 2 of the Ramsar Convention

Theme 4: Towards Sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties of outstanding universal value

**6. Final remarks**

The World Heritage List includes 788 properties of great diversity in terms of types, location, size and age. What unites them all is that they are of outstanding universal value. The concept of outstanding universal value is elusive, yet it is crucial for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention as it touches upon each and every aspect of the conservation cycle - identification, nomination, evaluation, inscription, safeguarding, monitoring, and transmission - thus affecting the States Parties, the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and other stakeholders.

After more than three decades of implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, it is important and timely to evaluate the ways in which the concept of outstanding universal value has been perceived and applied in different regions and for different categories of heritage. The Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention is to result in concrete proposals and practical recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. The expected results include (1) proposals for a generally acceptable understanding of the concept of outstanding universal value and its application within the context of the *World Heritage Convention*, (2) identification and analysis of best practices related to the preparation of Tentative Lists and recommendations on ways to enhance the capacity of States Parties in preparing and reviewing Tentative Lists, (3) identification and analysis of best practices in the preparation of nominations and recommendations on ways to enhance the capacity of States Parties in preparing quality nominations, (4) identification and analysis of best practices for sustainable conservation and recommendations on ways to enhance the capacity of States Parties in achieving sustainable financing for the management of World Heritage properties.

In accordance with the Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.2** Paragraph 7, the World Heritage Centre will prepare a document on the outcome of the meeting to be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session in July 2005 (Durban, South Africa).

March 2005

**Annex 1: Extract from the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (28COM13.1)**

**28 COM 13.1** The World Heritage Committee,

1. Recalling the conclusions on the "Evaluation of the Cairns Decision" by the 27th session (Decision **27 COM 14**), the Decision adopted on the Representivity of the World Heritage List at its 24th session ("Cairns Decision", 2000), subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly of State Parties at its 13th session (2001); and the Resolution on ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List adopted by the General Assembly at its 12th session (1999),
2. Further recalling that the *World Heritage Convention* establishes a system of international co-operation and assistance for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,
3. Recognising the need to increase the technical and administrative capacity of the World Heritage systems, to encourage growth of under-represented categories and geographical coverage, and acknowledge the work constraints of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre and States Parties to achieve this objective,
4. Noting with interest the results of the ICOMOS and IUCN analyses, as well as additional analyses undertaken by the World Heritage Centre as presented in document *WHC-04/28.COM/13*,
5. Concerned in particular with the conclusion that constraints and gaps in the World Heritage List primarily relate to lack of technical capacity to prepare adequate assessments and inventories of heritage properties, to promote and prepare nominations and relate to the lack of an appropriate legal and management framework;
6. Emphasizing that Tentative Lists are an effective and indispensable tool in the identification of potential World Heritage properties at national and (sub)regional level, and thereby contributing to the representativity of the World Heritage List,
7. Considering that these concerns are already essential elements of the "Cairns Decision" that have, however, not been fully implemented,
8. Further emphasizing that all issues addressed by the "Cairns Decision" need full and adequate implementation and that the World Heritage Centre and States Parties in the coming years should focus on those elements that have

not been sufficiently addressed such as the development of balanced Tentative Lists and capacity building,

9. Recalls that the Committee had previously decided:
- a) to make available to all stakeholders all appropriate statutory World Heritage documentation, including documentation on the pre-, during and post-inscription process of World Heritage properties,
  - b) to encourage the increased participation of local authorities, civil society organizations and populations in the identification of the cultural and natural heritage of States Parties,
  - c) to implement regional, and, as appropriate, sub-regional programmes based on results of Periodic Reporting to increase the State Parties' capacity for the identification, nomination, and conservation of World Heritage properties,
  - d) to encourage States Parties to initiate and complete national inventories for cultural and natural heritage,
  - e) to review the effectiveness and appropriateness of national legal and institutional frameworks and policies and to provide advice to States Parties, upon their request, on reform of national, legal and institutional frameworks and policies,
  - f) to identify national, regional and international existing institutions, facilities and networks that offer training in heritage conservation and management and that can participate in the implementation of capacity building strategies and programmes;
10. Considers that capacity-building should be strategic, comprehensive, sustainable and institutionalised, and that it should focus, in particular on the identification of potential properties, preparation of representative Tentative Lists, preparation of nominations, conservation action and management of properties;
11. Calls upon
- a) States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and other partners to significantly increase their support to States Parties, in particular those less represented in the List, in the identification of cultural, natural and mixed properties of potential outstanding universal value, as well as in the preparation of nomination dossiers ;
  - b) the Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN) to increase their support to States Parties, in particular those less represented in the List, in the identification of cultural, natural and mixed properties of potential outstanding universal value;

12. Requests IUCN and ICOMOS to complete their analyses of the Tentative Lists, work on the gaps in the World Heritage List with due consideration to all States Parties and regions of the world and continue their thematic studies;
13. Further requests the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with States Parties, ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM, appropriate scientific institutions, selected governmental and non-governmental experts, appropriate intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other relevant partners, to convene, as soon as possible and not later than March 2005, a special meeting of experts of all regions with the following aims:
  - a) make specific proposals to enable States Parties to better identify natural, cultural and mixed properties of potential outstanding universal value. Such proposals should include a reflection on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value as defined by the *World Heritage Convention* and in the context of regions, including cultural and biogeographical regions – and, as appropriate, sub regions -, with a view to compiling representative Tentative Lists, as well as the elaboration of a comparative analysis and evaluation of the Tentative Lists, and a compilation of best practices in the preparation of such lists. At a minimum, the proposals should generate the conditions to ensure that by 2007 all States Parties have submitted Tentative Lists, which are substantially in accordance with Article 11 of the *World Heritage Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines*,
  - b) in the framework of Article 7 of the *World Heritage Convention*, make specific proposals to enable less-represented and non-represented States Parties to improve the quality of nominations and, consequently, the success rate of inscriptions on the World Heritage List of properties from such States Parties. At a minimum, by 2007 the proposals should lead to a decrease of at least 30% in the number of such less-represented and non-represented States Parties,
  - c) in the framework of Article 7 of the *World Heritage Convention*, make specific proposals to enable States Parties - in particular those less-represented and non-represented - to identify sufficient funding sources for the sustainable conservation of the properties thus inscribed. Such proposals could include the creation of inter-institutional and inter-sectoral site commissions and the networking of properties in order to ensure their adequate monitoring, management, including traditional management mechanisms, involvement of local populations and sustainable conservation. At a minimum, by 2007 the proposals should lead to the removal from the World Heritage List in Danger of at least 20% of the properties inscribed on that List,

- d) on the basis of the refinement of the analysis referred to in paragraph 4 make specific proposals for the follow-up of such analysis. At a minimum, by 2007 such proposals should lead to the elaboration of regional – and, as appropriate, sub regional- programs, as well as to the adoption and harmonization of regional – and, as appropriate, sub regional- action plans fully consistent with the pertinent periodic reports;
14. Takes note of the offer by the Russian Federation to host the special meeting of experts of all regions referred to in paragraph 13 above;
15. Further requests the World Heritage Centre to report on the proposals and conclusions of the special meeting of experts of all regions referred to in paragraph 13, for consideration by the Committee at its 29th session (2005);
16. Decides to apply at its 29th session (2005) the mechanism set out in paragraphs 1 to 5 of Decision **27 COM 14**, and requests the World Heritage Centre to distribute as soon as possible the full list of nominations admissible for examination by such session;
17. Also decides, on an experimental and transitory basis, to apply the following mechanism at its 30th session (2006):
- a) examine up to two complete nominations per State Party, provided that at least one of such nominations concerns a natural property; and,
  - b) set at 45 the annual limit on the number of nominations it will review , inclusive of nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions of the Committee, extensions (except minor modifications of limits of the property), transboundary nominations, serial nominations and nominations submitted on an emergency basis,
  - c) the order of priorities for the examination of new nominations shall remain as decided by the Committee at its 24th session (2000):
    - (i) nominations of properties submitted by States Parties with no properties inscribed on the List,
    - (ii) nominations of properties from any State Party that illustrate un-represented or less represented categories of natural and cultural categories,
    - (iii) other nominations,
    - (iv) when applying this priority system, date of receipt of full and complete nominations by the World Heritage Centre shall be used as secondary determining factor within the category where the number of nomination fixed by the Committee has been reached;

18. Further decides to examine the transitory mechanism set out in paragraph 17 at its 31st session (2007), on the basis of:
- a) the results of the process set out in paragraphs 13 and 15 above,
  - b) the extent to which the nominations presented at its 30th session (2006) contribute to the aim of a representative World Heritage List.

**Annex 2: List of States parties to the *World Heritage Convention* and the UNESCO Member States which have not ratified the *World Heritage Convention***

<b>States parties to the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> (Year of ratification)</b>	<b>UNESCO member states which have not ratified the <i>World Heritage Convention</i></b>
<p><b>Africa (42 States Parties):</b>            Angola (1991), Benin (1982), Botswana (1998), Burkina Faso (1987), Burundi (1982), Cameroon (1982), Cape Verde (1988), Central African Republic (1980), Chad (1999), Comoros (2000), Congo (1987), Côte d'Ivoire (1981), Democratic Republic of the Congo (1974), Eritrea (2001), Ethiopia (1977), Gabon (1986), Gambia (1987), Ghana (1975), Guinea (1979), Kenya (1991), Lesotho (2003), Liberia (2002), Madagascar (1983), Malawi (1982), Mali (1977), Mauritania (1981), Mauritius (1995), Mozambique (1982), Namibia (2000), Niger (1974), Nigeria (1974), Rwanda (2000), Senegal (1976), Seychelles (1980), Sierra Leone (2005), South Africa (1997), Sudan (1974), Togo (1998), Uganda (1987), United Republic of Tanzania (1977), Zambia (1984), Zimbabwe (1982)</p>	<p>Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, Swaziland</p>
<p><b>Arab States (16 States Parties):</b>            Algeria (1974), Bahrain (1991), Egypt (1974), Iraq (1974), Jordan (1975), Kuwait (2002), Lebanon (1983), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (1978), Morocco (1975), Oman (1981), Qatar (1984), Saudi Arabia (1978), Syrian Arab Republic (1975), Tunisia (1975), United Arab Emirates (2001), Yemen (1980)</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>Asia-Pacific (40 States Parties):</b>            Afghanistan (1989), Australia (1974), Bangladesh (1983), Bhutan (2001), Cambodia (1991), China (1985), Democratic People's Republic of Korea (1998), Federated States of Micronesia (2002), Fiji (1990), India (1977), Indonesia (1989), Islamic Republic of Iran (1975), Japan (1992), Kazakhstan (1994), Kiribati (2000), Kyrgyzstan (1995), Lao People's Democratic Republic (1987), Malaysia (1988), Maldives (1986), Marshall Islands (2002), Mongolia (1990), Myanmar (1994), Nepal (1978), New Zealand (1984), Niue (2001), Pakistan (1976), Palau (2002), Papua New Guinea (1997), Philippines (1985), Republic of Korea (1988), Samoa (2001), Solomon Islands (1992), Sri Lanka (1980), Tajikistan (1992), Thailand (1987), Tonga (2004), Turkmenistan (1994), Uzbekistan (1993), Vanuatu (2002), Viet Nam (1987)</p>	<p>Cook Island, Nauru, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu</p>
<p><b>Europe and North America (50 States Parties):</b>            Albania (1989), Andorra (1991), Armenia (1993), Austria (1992), Azerbaijan (1993), Belarus (1988), Belgium (1996), Bosnia and Herzegovina (1993), Bulgaria (1974), Canada (1976), Croatia (1992), Cyprus (1975), Czech Republic (1993), Denmark (1979), Estonia (1995), Finland (1987), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (1997), France (1975), Georgia (1992), Germany (1976), Greece (1981), Holy See (1982), Hungary (1985), Iceland (1995), Ireland (1991), Israel (1999), Italy (1978),</p>	<p>-</p>



Latvia (1995), Lithuania (1992), Luxembourg (1983), Malta (1978), Monaco (1978), Netherlands (1992), Norway (1977), Poland (1976), Portugal (1980), Republic of Moldova (2002), Romania (1990), Russian Federation (1988), San Marino (1991), Serbia and Montenegro (2001), Slovakia (1993), Slovenia (1992), Spain (1982), Sweden (1985), Switzerland (1975), Turkey (1983), Ukraine (1988), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1984), United States of America (1973)	
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean (32 States Parties):</b> Antigua and Barbuda (1983), Argentina (1978), Barbados (2002), Belize (1990), Bolivia (1976), Brazil (1977), Chile (1980), Colombia (1983), Costa Rica (1977), Cuba (1981), Dominica (1995), Dominican Republic (1985), Ecuador (1975), El Salvador (1991), Grenada (1998), Guatemala (1979), Guyana (1977), Haiti (1980), Honduras (1979), Jamaica (1983), Mexico (1984), Nicaragua (1979), Panama (1978), Paraguay (1988), Peru (1982), Saint Kitts and Nevis (1986), Saint Lucia (1991), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (2003), Suriname (1997), Trinidad and Tobago (2005), Uruguay (1989), Venezuela (1990)	Bahamas
<b>Total: 180 States Parties</b>	<b>11 Member States</b>

**Annex 3: Revisions of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention***

Date	English title	French Title	Committee/ Bureau Reference
30 June 1977	Operational Guidelines for the World Heritage Committee [28 paras.]		
20 October 1977	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [27 paras.]		
1978	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (adopted by the Committee at its first session and amended at its second session) [30 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial (adoptées par le Comité lors de sa première session et amendées à sa deuxième session)	
21 April 1980	Revised text of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention		
17 July 1980	Revised text of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention		
October 1980	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [66 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1980 Comm.
November 1983	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [99 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1982 Comm.
January 1984	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la	1983 Bur. 1983 Comm.

	Heritage Convention [99 paras.]	Convention du patrimoine mondial	
January 1987	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [113 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1986 Comm.
December 1988	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [112 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1983 Bur. 1988 Comm.
27 March 1992	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [117 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1991 Bur. 1991 Comm.
February 1994	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [132 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1993 Comm.
February 1995	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [140 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1994 Bur. 1994 Comm.
February 1996	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [139 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1995 Bur. 1995 Comm.
February 1997; reprinted 2/98	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [139 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	1996 Comm.
March 1999	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [139 paras.] Changes to the 1997 Guidelines	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial Changes to the 1997 Orientations	1998 Comm.
July 2002	Provisional Revision: Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [139 paras.]	Révision provisoire: Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	2002 Comm.
February 2005	Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention [290 paras.]	Orientations devant guider la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial	

#### Annex 4: Tentative Lists of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*

	<b>States Parties</b>	<b>Number of States Parties</b>
<b>States Parties without Tentative List</b>	<b>Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Eritrea, Holy See, Honduras, Jamaica, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates</b>	36
<b>Tentative List last updated</b>	<b>States Parties (Years of previous revisions)</b>	<b>Number of States Parties</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>Barbados (-), Guyana (1995, 1985), Indonesia (2004, 2003, 1995), Peru (2002, 1996, 1984), Romania (2004, 1991, 1990), Russian Federation (2004, 2003, 2001, 1998, 1996, 1995, 1993, 1992), Serbia and Montenegro (1993)</b>	7
<b>2004</b>	<b>Afghanistan (2003), Belarus (1991), Bosnia and Herzegovina (1998), Brazil (1998, 1996, 1986, 1982), Bulgaria (1984), Burkina Faso (1996, 1987), Canada (1998, 1994, 1980), Cape Verde (-), Chile (2001, 1998), China (2003, 2002, 2001, 2000, 1999, 1998, 1996, 1994, 1993, 1986), Cyprus (2002, 1998, 1984), Estonia (2003, 2002, 1995, 1992), Finland (1990), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (-), Grenada (-), Haiti (-), India (2003, 2000, 1998, 1987, 1986, 1981), Islamic Republic of Iran (1997), Israel (2002, 2000), Japan (2001, 1995, 1992), Jordan (2004, 2001, 1993, 1984), Malaysia (2001), Mexico (2003), Federated States of Micronesia, Norway (2002, 1984), Pakistan (1993, 1981, 1980), Palau (-), Philippines (1998, 1993, 1987), Portugal (2000, 1996, 1994, 1985, 1983, 1982), Republic of Moldova (-), San Marino (-), South Africa (2003, 1998), Spain (2003, 2002, 2001, 1998, 1997, 1996, 1995, 1994, 1993, 1989, 1986, 1984, 1983), Sudan (2003, 1999, 1994), Sweden (1999, 1997, 1995, 1989), Thailand (1989), Vanuatu (-)</b>	36
<b>2003</b>	<b>Austria (1994), Bolivia (1987), Costa Rica (1995, 1994), Cuba (1996, 1988), Denmark (1993), Ecuador (1998), Egypt (1994, 1993), France (2002, 2000, 1998, 1997, 1996, 1995, 1994, 1994, 1993, 1991, 1988, 1985, 1984, 1980), Gabon (-), Gambia (-), Georgia (-), Germany (2002, 1999, 1998, 1996, 1993, 1992, 1990, 1989, 1984, 1982, 1980), Greece (1999, 1996, 1985), Hungary (2000, 1993, 1985), Iraq (2000, no date), Latvia (1996), Lithuania (1997, 1993), Mauritius (-), Nicaragua (1995, 1994), Paraguay (1993), Ukraine (2000, 1989), Venezuela (1999, 1993)</b>	22
<b>2002</b>	<b>Algeria (1985), Australia (2000, 1998, 1996, 1991), Belgium (1998, 1997), Dominican Republic (1989), Guatemala (2001), Kazakhstan (2002, 1998), Namibia (-), Poland (2000, 2000, 1999, 1997, 1995, 1993), Republic of Korea (1998,</b>	16

	1994), <b>Saint Lucia</b> (-), <b>Slovakia</b> (1993), <b>Sri Lanka</b> (1987), <b>Switzerland</b> (1998), <b>Togo</b> (2000), <b>Yemen</b> (1989)	
<b>2001</b>	<b>Argentina</b> (1997), <b>Azerbaijan</b> (-), <b>Bahrain</b> (-), <b>Colombia</b> (2001, 1999, 1993, 1988), <b>Czech Republic</b> (1996, 1993, 1991), <b>Ethiopia</b> (1997), <b>Guinea</b> (-), <b>Iceland</b> (-), <b>Kenya</b> (1999, 1993), <b>Kyrgyzstan</b> (-), <b>Mauritania</b> (-)	11
<b>2000</b>	<b>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</b> (-), <b>Ghana</b> (-), <b>Malawi</b> (1996), <b>Slovenia</b> (1994), <b>Tajikistan</b> (1999, 1998), <b>Turkey</b> (1994), <b>United Republic of Tanzania</b> (1997, 1996, 1989)	7
<b>1999</b>	<b>Andorra</b> (-), <b>Bangladesh</b> (1993), <b>Botswana</b> (-), <b>Fiji</b> (-), <b>Mali</b> (1987), <b>Syrian Arab Republic</b> (-), <b>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</b> (1996, 1989, 1985)	7
<b>1998</b>	<b>Benin</b> (1996, 1991, 1987, 1984), <b>Croatia</b> (1994), <b>Malta</b> (-), <b>Morocco</b> (1998, 1985), <b>Saint Kitts and Nevis</b> (-), <b>Senegal</b> (-), <b>Suriname</b> (1998), <b>Turkmenistan</b> (-)	8
<b>1997</b>	<b>Armenia</b> (1995), <b>Democratic Republic of the Congo</b> (-), <b>Madagascar</b> (1985), <b>Mozambique</b> (1990), <b>Uganda</b> (1997), <b>Viet Nam</b> (1991), <b>Zambia</b> (-), <b>Zimbabwe</b> (-)	8
<b>1996</b>	<b>Albania</b> (-), <b>Angola</b> (-), <b>Italy</b> (1998, 1996, 1995, 1994, 1989, 1984, 1981), <b>Lebanon</b> (-), <b>Mongolia</b> (-), <b>Myanmar</b> (-), <b>Nepal</b> (-), <b>Niger</b> (-), <b>Tunisia</b> (1988, 1984), <b>Uzbekistan</b> (1994)	10
<b>1995</b>	<b>Netherlands</b> (1994), <b>Nigeria</b> (1988), <b>Panama</b> (-), <b>Uruguay</b> (1994)	4
<b>1994</b>	-	0
<b>1993</b>	<b>Luxembourg</b> (1988), <b>New Zealand</b> (-)	2
<b>1992</b>	<b>Cambodia</b> (1992), <b>El Salvador</b> (-), <b>Ireland</b> (-), <b>Lao People's Democratic Republic</b> (1988)	4
<b>1991</b>	-	0
<b>1990</b>	<b>United States of America</b> (-)	1
<b>1989</b>	-	0
<b>1988</b>	<b>Oman</b> (-)	1

### Annex 5: Number of World Heritage properties situated within the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention

Number of World Heritage properties	Country	Number of States Parties
States Parties <b>without</b> WH property	Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cap Verde, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Eritrea, Federation States of Micronesia, Fiji, Gabon, Granada, Guyana, Jamaica, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Monaco, Myanmar, Namibia, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Tajikistan, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Vanuatu	46
States Parties with <b>1</b> WH property	Albania, Andorra, Azerbaijan, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Gambia, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sudan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uruguay, Zambia	35

States Parties with <b>2</b> WH properties	Afghanistan, Belarus, Ghana, Holy See, Honduras, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Niger, Seychelles, Suriname, Ukraine	18
States Parties with <b>3</b> WH properties	Armenia, Bangladesh, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Georgia, Guatemala, Israel, Kenya, Lithuania, Malta, New Zealand, Uganda, Venezuela, Yemen	16
States Parties with <b>4</b> WH properties	Denmark, Ecuador, Mali, Nepal, Oman, Panama, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uzbekistan	10
States Parties with <b>5</b> WH properties	Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, Philippines, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe	10
States Parties with <b>6</b> WH properties	Bolivia, Croatia, Egypt, Finland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, South Africa, Switzerland, United Republic of Tanzania	9
States Parties with <b>7</b> WH properties	Algeria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Indonesia, the Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sri Lanka	8
States Parties with <b>8</b> WH properties	Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Hungary, Morocco, Tunisia	6
States Parties with <b>9</b> WH properties	Bulgaria, Turkey	2
States Parties with <b>10</b> WH properties	Peru	1
States Parties with <b>12</b> WH properties	Czech Republic, Japan, Poland	3
States Parties with <b>13</b> WH properties	Canada, Portugal, Sweden	3
States Parties with <b>16</b> WH properties	Australia, Greece,	2
States Parties with <b>17</b> WH properties	Brazil	1
States Parties with <b>20</b> WH properties	United States of America	1
States Parties with <b>21</b> WH properties	Russian Federation	1
States Parties with <b>24</b> WH properties	Mexico	1
States Parties with <b>26</b> WH properties	India, United Kingdom	2
States Parties with <b>28</b> WH properties	France	1
States Parties with <b>30</b> WH properties	China, Germany	2
States Parties with <b>38</b> WH properties	Spain	1
States Parties with <b>39</b> WH properties	Italy	1

\*The numbers in this table includes transboundary or transnational properties.

## Annex 6: List of World Heritage in Danger (2004)

State Party	World Heritage site	Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List	Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger	Year of removal from the World Heritage List in Danger
Afghanistan	Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley	2003	2003	-
	Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam	2002	2002	-
Albania	Butrint	1992,1999	1997	-
Algeria	Tipasa	1982	2002	-
Azerbaijan	Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower	2000	2003	-
Brazil	Iguaçu National Park	1986	1999	2001
Bulgaria	Srebarna Nature Reserve	1983	1992	2003
Benin	Royal Palaces of Abomey	1985	1985	-
Cambodia	Angkor	1992	1992	2004
Central African Republic	Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park	1988	1997	-
Côte d'Ivoire	Comoé National Park	1983	2003	-
Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea	Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve)	1981-1982	1992	-
Croatia	Old City of Dubrovnik	1979, 1994	1991	1998
Croatia	Plitvice Lakes National Park	1979, 2000	1992	1997
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Garamba National Park	1980	1996	-
	Kahuzi-Biega National Park	1980	1997	-
	Okapi Wildlife Reserve	1996	1997	-
	Salonga National Park	1984	1999	-
	Virunga National Park	1979	1994	-
Ecuador	Sangay National Park	1983	1992	-
Egypt	Abu Mena	1979	2001	-
Ethiopia	Simien National Park	1978	1996	-
Germany	Cologne Cathedral	1996	2004	-
Honduras	Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve	1982	1996	-
India	Group of Monuments at Hampi	1986	1999	-
	Manas Wildlife Sanctuary	1985	1992	-

Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Bam and its Cultural Landscape	2004	2004	-
Iraq	Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat)	2003	2003	-
Jerusalem	Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls	1981	1982	-
Mali	Timbuktu	1988	1990	-
Nepal	Kathmandu Valley	1979	2003	-
Niger	Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves	1991	1992	-
Oman	Bahla Fort	1987	1988	2004
Pakistan	Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore	1981	2000	-
Peru	Chan Chan Archaeological Zone	1986	1986	-
Philippines	Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras	1995	2001	-
Poland	Wieliczka Salt Mine	1978	1989	1998
Senegal	Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary	1981	1984	1988
			Re-inscribed on 2000	-
Serbia and Montenegro	Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor	1979	1979	2003
Tunisia	Ichkeul National Park	1980	1996	-
Uganda	Rwenzori Mountains National Park	1994	1999	2004
United Republic of Tanzania	Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara	1981	2004	-
	Ngorongoro Conservation Area	1979	1984	1989
United States of America	Everglades National Park	1979	1993	-
	Yellowstone	1978	1995	2003
Yemen	Historic Town of Zabid	1993	2000	-