



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

Organisation  
des Nations Unies  
pour l'éducation,  
la science et la culture

# World Heritage

# 33 COM

**Distribution Limited**

**WHC-09/33.COM/13**  
**Paris, 11 May 2009**  
**Original: English/French**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF  
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Thirty-third session**

**Seville, Spain**  
**22-30 June 2009**

**Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the *Operational Guidelines***

## **SUMMARY**

Before printing a new version in 2009 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Committee is invited to review the following text related to all proposed amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* as requested at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) and which are presented in this working document.

**Draft Decision: 33 COM 13**, see Point IV

## I. BACKGROUND

1. The World Heritage Committee discussed at its 31st and 32nd sessions (Christchurch, 2007 and Quebec City, 2008) the procedure for periodically updating the *Operational Guidelines* and adopted subsequently Decision **31 COM 16** and Decision 32 COM 13 which state:
  - Paragraph 4: Requests the World Heritage Centre, in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to draft the amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* proposed in Document *WHC-08/32.COM/13* taking account of the debate at the 32nd session and the Committee's reflections, and in cooperation with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, to develop a screening process for the *Operational Guidelines* to ensure consistent references between the different proposals for submission to the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
  - Paragraph 5: Establishes an informal working group to review and propose revisions to Chapter VIII of the *Operational Guidelines*, as well as clear procedures and tools to promote consistent and appropriate use of the World Heritage emblem, for the consideration of the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
  - Paragraph 6: Requests the World Heritage Centre, notwithstanding Decision **31 COM 16**, to publish the updated English and French versions of the *Basic Texts of the Convention* following the 33rd session of the Committee in 2009.
2. One of the recommendations expressed during the "Future of the World Heritage Convention Workshop" (UNESCO Headquarters, February 2009) was to refrain from revising the *Operational Guidelines* every year, because this creates difficulties for the States Parties and other stakeholders, and to release a paper publication every two years for the General Assembly of States Parties, based on the model of the UNESCO Basic Texts.
3. Before printing a new paper version in 2009 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Committee is invited to review all adjustments and amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* formulated during the 32nd session. The next amended version will be printed after the 33rd session of the Committee.
4. As requested, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have drafted these suggested amendments and made a screening process of the *Operational Guidelines* to ensure consistent references between the different proposals for submission to the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009. As far as possible, it is proposed to avoid changing the present numbering of the *Operational Guidelines*.

## **II. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

5. The proposed amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* are organized according to the topic and paragraphs concerned. The first part of each paragraph gives an explanation of the proposed amendment followed by the text of the paragraph of the *Operational Guidelines* as recommended for amendment.

### **A. Protection and Management (paragraph 96)**

6. **Explanation:** As per Decision **31 COM 7.3**, it was decided by the Committee to integrate the monitoring framework into the next revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and to ensure cross referencing for all World Heritage processes.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 96 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 96:** Protection and management of World Heritage properties should ensure that their outstanding universal value, **including** integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription, is sustained or **enhanced in the future** over time. A regular review of the general state of conservation of properties, and thus also their outstanding universal value, is done within a framework of monitoring processes for World Heritage properties, as specified within the *Operational Guidelines* (1).

*Footnote (1): the processes of monitoring specified in the Operational Guidelines are Reactive Monitoring (see paragraphs 169-176) and Periodic Reporting (199-210).*

### **B. Process for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List (paragraphs 120-168)**

7. **Explanation:** In order to be consistent within the *Operational Guidelines*, it is proposed to repeat the text used in paragraph 168 (as noted alongside the date of 1 February – Year 1) each time the 1 February deadline is mentioned within Section III of the *Operational Guidelines*. The text to be added in brackets after “1 February” would be: **(or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)**. The relevant paragraphs for this correction are 128, 159,160, 164, 165 and 166.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraphs 128, 159, 160, 164, 165, and 166 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 128:** Nominations may be submitted **at any time during the year**, but only those nominations that are "complete" (see paragraph 132) and received by the Secretariat on or before **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** will be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee during the following year. Only nominations of properties included in the State Party's Tentative List will be examined by the Committee (see paragraph 63).

**Paragraph 159:** Nominations which the Committee decides **to refer** back to the State Party for additional information may be resubmitted to the following Committee session for examination. The additional information shall be submitted to the Secretariat by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** of the year in which examination by the Committee is desired.

The Secretariat will immediately transmit it to the relevant Advisory Bodies for evaluation. A referred nomination which is not presented to the Committee within three years of the original Committee decision will be considered as a new nomination when it is resubmitted for examination, following the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168.

**Paragraph 160:** The Committee may decide to **defer** a nomination for more in depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision by the State Party. Should the State Party decide to resubmit the deferred nomination, it shall be resubmitted to the Secretariat by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)**. These nominations will then be reevaluated by the relevant Advisory Bodies during the course of the full year and a half evaluation cycle according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168.

**Paragraph 164:** If a State Party wishes to request a minor modification to the boundaries of a property already on the World Heritage List, it shall submit this by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** to the Committee through the Secretariat, which will seek the advice of the relevant Advisory Bodies. The Committee can approve such modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently important to constitute an extension of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply.

**Paragraph 165:** If a State Party wishes to significantly modify the boundary of a property already on the World Heritage List, the State Party shall submit this proposal as if it were a new nomination. This re-nomination shall be presented by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** and will be evaluated in the full year and a half cycle of evaluation according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168. This provision applies to extensions, as well as reductions.

**Paragraph 166:** Where a State Party wishes to have the property inscribed under additional or different criteria other than those used for the original inscription, it shall submit this request as if it were a new nomination. This re-nomination shall be presented by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** and will be evaluated in the full year and a half cycle of evaluation according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168. Properties recommended will only be evaluated under the new criteria and will remain on the World Heritage List even if unsuccessful in having additional criteria recognized.

8. **Explanation:** In order to supply better guidance to the States Parties preparing nominations, some minor amendments are proposed to paragraph 132.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 132 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 132:** For a nomination to be considered as "**complete**", the following requirements **(along with the requirements detailed in Annex 5)** are to be met:

**Paragraph 132 (point 5):** Management: ~~An appropriate management plan or other management system is essential and~~ **A summary of the key elements of the management plan and/or the documented management system shall also be provided in the nomination, in order to demonstrate how management functions and its effectiveness.** ~~Assurances of the effective implementation of the management plan or other management system are also expected.~~

**Paragraph 132 (point 10):** Number of printed copies required:

- Nominations of cultural properties (excluding cultural landscapes): 2 **identical** copies
- Nominations of natural properties **and cultural landscapes**: 3 **identical** copies
- Nominations of mixed properties ~~and cultural landscapes~~: 4 **identical** copies

**Paragraph 132 (point 11):** Paper and electronic format: Nominations shall be presented on A4-size paper (or "letter"); and also in electronic format (Word and/or PDF format). ~~(diskette or CD-ROM). At least one paper copy shall be presented in a loose-leaf format to facilitate photocopying, rather than in a bound volume.~~

### **C. Serial nominations (paragraphs 137 to 139)**

9. **Explanation:** by Decision **32 COM 10B**, the World Heritage Committee requests the World Heritage Centre, in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to take into account the debate of its 32nd session and, on this basis, to propose amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* and to draft detailed guidelines for the nominations of serial properties for submission to the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009. The international Expert meeting on serial nominations requested by the Decision **32 COM 10B** did not take place prior to the 33rd session (see Document *WHC-09/33.COM/10A*). Therefore no amendment can be proposed at this stage.

### **D. Evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies (paragraphs 148 and 150)**

10. **Explanation:** In paragraph **150** relating to factual errors, it is proposed to better deal with this process to replace the words "at least two working days" by "at least two working weeks" to allow the Advisory Bodies to study properly the factual errors as well as for the Secretariat to translate the text (*Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre Meeting, January 2008*). It is also suggested that the Chairperson, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, should be the arbiter of when a letter is accepted as genuinely comprising a factual error letter;

#### ➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 150:** The concerned States Parties are invited to send, at least two working days ~~weeks~~ before the opening of the session of the Committee, a letter to the Chairperson, with copies to the Advisory Bodies, detailing the factual errors they might have identified in the evaluation of their nomination made by the Advisory Bodies. **When considered appropriate by the Chairperson, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies,** this letter will be distributed in the working languages to the members of the Committee and may be read out by the Chairperson following the presentation of the evaluation.

### **E. Modifications to the boundaries (paragraph 164)**

11. **Explanation:** In paragraph **164 of the *Operational Guidelines*** relating to minor modification of boundaries, it is proposed to outline more clearly the procedures that should be followed.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 164 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 164:** If a State Party wishes to request a minor modification to the boundaries of a property already on the World Heritage List, it shall submit this by **1 February** to the Committee through the Secretariat, which will seek the **advice opinion** of the relevant Advisory Bodies on whether **this can be considered a minor modification or not**. The Committee may approve such a modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently significant as to constitute an extension of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply.

**F. The List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 179 to 181)**

12. **Explanation:** At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to develop in consultation with States Parties criteria for the inclusion of those properties which are most threatened by climate change on the List of World Heritage in Danger, for use in prioritizing vulnerability assessment, mitigation and adaptation activities (paragraph 14 of Decision **31 COM 7.1**). Climatic factors are currently mentioned as a threat only in paragraph 179(b)(vi) for cultural properties but is equally relevant to natural properties. It is proposed to reflect this through adding the words "threatening effects of climatic, geological or other environmental factors" as a new paragraph 180(b)(v). This encompasses threatening effects that may be gradual, incremental or sudden. For consistency, the same wording should also replace paragraph 179(b)(vi) for cultural properties (see Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7A* "State of conservation of the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger" presented at this session, page 88). The proposed amendments which were already adopted by Decision **32 COM 7A.32** are the following:

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 179, 180, 181 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 179 (b) (vi):** **threatening effects of climatic, geological or other environmental factors**. ~~gradual changes due to geological, climatic or other environmental factors.~~

**Paragraph 180 (b)(v)- New Paragraph:**

**threatening effects of climatic, geological or other environmental factors.**

**Paragraph 181:** In addition, the ~~factor or factors which are threatening~~ **threats and/or their deleterious effects** on the integrity of the property must be those which are amenable to correction by human action. In the case of cultural properties, both natural factors and man-made factors may be threatening, while in the case of natural properties, most threats will be man-made and only very rarely a natural factor (such as an epidemic disease) will threaten the integrity of the property. In some cases, the ~~factor or factors which are threatening~~ **threats and/or their deleterious effects** on the integrity of the property may be corrected by administrative or legislative action, such as the cancelling of a major public works project or the improvement of legal status.

## G. International assistance

13. **Explanation:** as many International Assistance Requests are also approved by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, the latter should also have the possibility to review the balance in the allocation of resources for cultural and natural heritage during the last 3 months of each biennium, in order to optimise the use of remaining funds.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 240 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 240:** A balance will be maintained in the allocation of resources for cultural and natural heritage. This balance is reviewed and decided upon on a regular basis by the Committee **and during the last 3 months of each biennium by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.**

14. **Explanation:** based on past experience and to avoid any confusion, it is proposed in the table of paragraph 241 that the "Budget ceilings" are "per request" and not "per project".

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraphs 241 of the *Operational Guidelines***

## VII.E Summary Table

1.

Type of international assistance	Purpose	Budget ceilings per request	Deadline for submission of request	Authority for approval
<b>Emergency Assistance</b>	This assistance may be requested to address ascertained or potential threats facing properties included on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List which have suffered severe damage or are in imminent danger of severe damage due to sudden, unexpected phenomena. Such phenomena may include land subsidence, extensive fires, explosions, flooding or man-made disasters including war. This assistance does not concern cases of damage or deterioration caused by gradual processes of decay, pollution or erosion. It addresses emergency situations strictly relating to the conservation of a World Heritage property (see Decision 28 COM 10B 2.c). It may be made available, if necessary, to more than one World Heritage property in a single State Party (see Decision 6 EXT. COM 15.2). The budget ceilings relate to a single World Heritage property.  The assistance may be requested to :  (i) undertake emergency measures for the safeguarding of the property;  (ii) draw up an emergency plan for the property.	Up to US\$ 5.000	At any time	Director of the World Heritage Centre
		Between US\$ 5.001 and 75.000	At any time	Chairperson of the Committee
		Over US\$ 75.000	1 February	Committee

15. **Explanation:** according to paragraph 241, all requests for international assistance are evaluated by the Advisory Bodies except requests up to and including US\$ 5,000. This should be reflected in the paragraphs 248, 249, 250.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraphs 248, 249, 250 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 248:** All requests for international assistance for cultural heritage are evaluated by ICOMOS and ICCROM, except requests **up to and including US\$ 5,000.**

**Paragraph 249:** All requests for international assistance for mixed heritage are evaluated by ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN, except requests **up to and including US\$ 5,000.**

**Paragraph 250:** All requests for international assistance for natural heritage are evaluated by IUCN, except requests **up to and including US\$ 5,000.**

16. **Explanation:** according to Decision **31 COM 18B** “The World Heritage Committee,

Further decides that requests for **Emergency Assistance** of up to USD 75,000 will be submitted for approval by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee after comments by the Advisory Bodies and **without examination by the panel**, provided they meet the definition established for Emergency Assistance”. This mention expressing that the panel is not required for Emergency Assistance is not mentioned in the *Operational Guidelines*.

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 252 of the *Operational Guidelines***

**Paragraph 252:** All requests for International Assistance of more than US\$ 5,000, **except those of Emergency Assistance up to and including US\$ 75,000**, are evaluated by a panel composed of representatives of the World Heritage Centre Regional Desks and the Advisory Bodies, and if possible the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee or one vice-chairperson, meeting at least twice a year before action by the Chairperson and/or Committee. Requests for the approval of the Chairperson can be submitted at anytime to the Secretariat and approved by the Chairperson after appropriate evaluation. **Emergency Assistance of up to and including USD 75,000 will be submitted for approval by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee after comments by the Advisory Bodies and without examination by the panel.**

**H. The World Heritage Emblem (paragraphs 258 to 279)**

17. **Explanation:** As requested by the Decision **32 COM 13**, the Committee “establishes an informal working group to review and propose revisions to Chapter VIII of the *Operational Guidelines*, as well as clear procedures and tools to promote consistent and appropriate use of the World Heritage emblem, for the consideration of the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009”. An informal Working group meeting was convened on 24 February 2009 to consider the first draft of amendments being proposed by the World Heritage Centre. The Working group on the emblem will go reviewing and proposing amendments to the Chapter VII of the *Operational guidelines* through a consultative process. Therefore no amendment can be proposed at this stage.

### III. ANNEXES OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

It is proposed to amend the following annexes of the *Operational Guidelines*:

- **ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**
- **ANNEX 10: STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE (NEW ANNEX)**
- **ANNEX 11: CHANGES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (NEW ANNEX)**

#### **ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**18. Explanation:** In order to simplify States Parties' tasks when preparing a serial property nomination, it is proposed to introduce a serial nomination table in point 1.d of the nomination format. The serial nomination table is already mentioned in point 1.c, 1.d and 1.f. For the sake of consistency in terminology, it is proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to align the text of section 1.d of Annex 5 with paragraph 137 of the *Operational Guidelines* related to Serial properties.

- **Proposed amendment to Annex 5, Point 1.d: Identification of the property**

<b>Id n°</b>	<b>Name of the component part</b>	<b>Region(s) / District(s)</b>	<b>Coordinates of the Central Point</b>	<b>Area of Nominated component of the Property (ha)</b>	<b>Area of the Buffer Zone (ha)</b>	<b>Map N°</b>
001						
002						
003						
004						
005						
006						
007						
008						
009						
Etc.						
<b>Total area (in hectares)</b>				ha	ha	

<p><b>1.d Geographical coordinates to the nearest second</b></p>	<p>In this space provide the latitude and longitude coordinates (to the nearest second) or UTM coordinates (to the nearest 10 metres) of a point at the approximate centre of the nominated property. Do not use other coordinate systems. If in doubt, please consult the Secretariat.</p> <p>In the case of serial nominations, provide a table showing the name of each <b>property component part</b>, its region (or nearest town as appropriate), and the coordinates of its centre point. Coordinate format examples:</p> <p>N 45° 06' 05" W 15° 37' 56" or  UTM Zone 18 Easting: <sup>5</sup>45670  Northing: <sup>45</sup>86750</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**19. Explanation:** In order to clarify requirements already presented in the *Operational Guidelines*, it is proposed to add some text to point 1.e of Annex 5.

<p><b>1.e Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone</b></p>	<p>Annex to the nomination, and list below with scales and dates:</p> <p>(i) An original copy of a topographic map showing the property nominated, at the largest scale available which shows the entire property. The boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone should be clearly marked. Either on this map, or on an accompanying one, there should also be a record of the boundaries of zones of special legal protection from which the property benefits. Multiple maps may be necessary for serial nominations. <b>The maps provided should be of sufficient scale to allow the identification of topographic elements such as adjacent settlements, buildings, routes, etc., in order to allow the clear assessment of the impact of any proposed development within, adjacent to, or on the boundary line.</b></p> <p><b>Care is needed with the width of boundary lines on maps, as thick boundary lines may make the actual boundary of the property ambiguous.</b></p> <p>Maps may be obtained from the addresses shown at the following Web address <a href="http://whc.unesco.org/en/mapagencies">http://whc.unesco.org/en/mapagencies</a></p> <p>If topographic maps are not available at the appropriate scale, other maps may be substituted. All maps should be capable of being georeferenced, with a minimum of three points on opposite sides of the maps with complete sets of coordinates. The maps, untrimmed, should show scale, orientation, projection, datum, property name and date. If possible, maps should be sent rolled and not folded.</p> <p>Geographic Information in digital form is encouraged if possible, suitable for incorporation into a GIS (Geographic Information System). In this case the delineation of the boundaries (nominated property and buffer zone) should be presented in vector form, prepared at the largest scale possible. The State Party is invited to contact the Secretariat for further information concerning this option.</p> <p>(ii) A Location Map showing the location of the property within the State Party,</p> <p>(iii) Plans and specially prepared maps of the property showing individual features are helpful and may also be annexed.</p> <p>To facilitate copying and presentation to the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee A4 (or "letter") size reduction and a digital image file of the principal maps should <b>also</b> be included in the nomination text if possible.</p> <p>Where no buffer zone is proposed, the nomination must include a statement as to why a buffer zone is not required for the proper <b>protection</b> <del>conservation</del> of the nominated property.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**20. Explanation:** This amendment confirms the recommended format for Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, following the agreement of a standard organisation of the material requested in paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines*. This format is also a confirmation of the structure of the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value based on the statements adopted by the Committee at its 31st and 32nd sessions. The amendments suggest that the order of Annex 5, and in particular Point 3: "Justification for inscription" should be re-organized to be consistent with paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

➤ **Proposed amendment to Annex 5, Point 3: Justification for inscription**

<p><b>3. Justification for Inscription:</b>  <b>3.1 Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</b>  <b>3.2 Comparative analysis</b></p>	<p>This section must make clear why the property is considered to be of "outstanding universal value".</p> <p>The whole of this section of the nomination should be written with careful reference to the criteria for inscription found in Paragraph 77 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>. It should not include detailed descriptive material about the property or its management, which are addressed in other sections, but should concentrate on why the property is important.</p> <p><del>Based on the criteria used above, 3.1</del> The proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should make clear why the property is considered to merit inscription on the World Heritage List (see Paragraphs 77 and 155 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>). It may be an outstanding <del>unique</del> survival of a particular building form or habitat or designed town. It may be a particularly fine or early or rich survival and it may bear witness to a vanished culture, way of life or eco-system. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional eco-systems, outstanding landscapes or other natural phenomena.</p> <p>According to the paragraph 155, the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be composed of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Brief synthesis</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Criteria</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Integrity for all properties</b></li> <li>v. <b>Authenticity for properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi)</b></li> <li>v. <b>Management and protection requirements</b></li> </ul> <p><b>3.2 Comparative analysis (see below)</b></p>
<p><b>3.1. Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</b>  <b>3.1. a) Brief synthesis</b></p>	<p><del>See Paragraph 77 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>.</del></p> <p>Provide a separate justification for each criterion cited.</p> <p><del>State briefly how the property meets those criteria under which it has been nominated (where necessary, make reference to the "description" and "comparative analysis" sections below, but do not duplicate the text of these sections:-)</del></p> <p><del>The brief synthesis should be composed of :</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) <b>Summary of factual information</b></li> <li>ii) <b>Summary of qualities</b></li> </ul> <p><del>The summary of factual information sets out the geographical and historical context and the main features.</del></p>

	<p>The summary of qualities should present to decision makers and the general public the outstanding universal value that needs to be sustained, and should also set out the attributes that manifest that value and need to be protected, managed and monitored. The summary should relate to all criteria justified.</p>
<p><b>3.1.b) Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)</b></p>	<p>Based on the criteria used above, the proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should make clear why the property is considered to merit inscription on the World Heritage List (see Paragraphs 154-157 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>). It may be a unique survival of a particular building form or habitat or designed town. It may be a particularly fine or early or rich survival and it may bear witness to a vanished culture, way of life or eco system. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional eco systems, outstanding landscapes or other natural phenomena.</p> <p>See Paragraph 77 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Provide a separate justification for each criterion cited</p> <p>State briefly how the property meets those criteria under which it has been nominated (where necessary, make reference to the "description" and "comparative analysis" sections below, but do not duplicate the text of these sections.) and describe for each criteria the relevant attributes.</p>
<p><b>3.1.c) Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar properties)</b></p>	<p>The property should be compared to similar properties, whether on the World Heritage List or not. The comparison should outline the similarities the nominated property has with other properties and the reasons that make the nominated property stand out. The comparative analysis should aim to explain the importance of the nominated property both in its national and international context (see Paragraph 132)</p>
<p><b>3.1.c) Integrity and/or Authenticity</b></p>	<p>The statement of integrity and/or authenticity should demonstrate that the property fulfils the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity set out in Section II.D of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>, which describe these conditions in greater detail.</p> <p>All nominated properties shall fulfil the conditions of integrity.</p> <p>Properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) shall also fulfil the conditions of authenticity.</p> <p>In the case of natural properties, it should record any intrusions from exotic species of fauna or flora and any human activities that could compromise the integrity of the property.</p> <p>In the case of a cultural property it should also record whether repairs have been carried out using materials and methods traditional to the culture, in conformity with the Nara Document (1995) (see Annex 4).</p>

<b>3.1.d) Management and protection requirements</b>	The Management and protection requirements should specify those systems that are necessary to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property
<b>3.2 Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar properties)</b>	The property should be compared to similar properties, whether on the World Heritage List or not. The comparison should outline the similarities the nominated property has with other properties and the reasons that make the nominated property stand out. The comparative analysis should explain the importance of the nominated property both in its national and international context (see Paragraph 132).

## Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

**21. Justification:** To comply with the Committee's Decision **31 COM 7.3** paragraph 9, it is proposed that an annex on the format of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value be drafted by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to provide guidance to States Parties.

### a. Proposed new Annex 10

#### **ANNEX 10: STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE**

All World Heritage properties should have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Only those properties inscribed since 2007 have had one approved by the Committee at the time of inscription. All States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* are encouraged to submit retrospective Statements for their properties inscribed before 2006.

Furthermore, paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines* clarifies:

*155. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value 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 of the requirements for protection and management in force. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value shall be the basis for the future protection and management of the property.*

A retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, submitted by the State Party concerned, is subject to the review of the relevant Advisory Body(ies) and to the approval of the World Heritage Committee.

Proposals of retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value follow a full year and a half evaluation cycle.

A retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value can be approved, not approved, deferred or referred by the World Heritage Committee.

#### **Format of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value,**

The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be submitted in either in English or in French. An electronic version (pdf or doc format) should also be submitted.

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should respect the following format (2 pages of A4 max):

- a. Brief synthesis
  - i. Summary of factual information
  - ii. Summary of qualities (values, attributes)
- b. Criteria (values and attributes which manifest them)
- c. Integrity (all sites)
- d. Authenticity (criteria i-vi)

- e. Management and protection requirements necessary to sustain Outstanding Universal Value
  - i. Overall framework
  - ii. Specific long-term expectations

**Deadline**

**1 February** of the year preceding the one in which the approval of the Committee is requested.

**22. Justification:** To comply with many States Parties' request on how to implement the paragraphs 163-167 of the *Operational Guidelines* related to the modifications to the boundaries, to the criteria and to the name of a World Heritage property, a new ANNEX 11 is proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to provide guidance to States Parties.

## **ANNEX 11: CHANGES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (NEW ANNEX)**

### **MODIFICATIONS TO THE BOUNDARIES OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

Boundary modifications should serve conservation and protection of World Heritage properties.

The difference in between minor and significant boundary modifications is clarified in paragraph 163 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

*163. A minor modification is one which does not have a significant impact on the extent of the property nor affects its Outstanding Universal Value.*

### **MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS**

Paragraph 164 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

*164. If a State Party wishes to request a minor modification to the boundaries of a property already on the World Heritage List, it shall submit this by **1 February** to the Committee through the Secretariat, which will seek the advice of the relevant Advisory Bodies. The Committee can approve such modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently important to constitute an extension of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply.*

In principle, creation of buffer zones following inscription is normally regarded as a minor boundary modification.

A proposal for a minor boundary modification, submitted by the State Party concerned, is subject to the review of the relevant Advisory Body(ies) and to the approval of the World Heritage Committee.

A proposal for a minor boundary modification can be approved, not approved, deferred or referred by the World Heritage Committee.

### **Documentation requested**

- 1) **Area of the property (in hectares):** please indicate a) the area of the property as inscribed and b) the area of the property as proposed to be modified. (Note that reductions can be considered as minor modifications only under exceptional circumstances).
- 2) **Description of the modification:** please provide a written description of the proposed change to the boundary of the property.

- 3) **Justification for the modification:** please provide a brief summary of the reasons why the boundaries of the property should be modified, with particular emphasis on how such modification will improve the conservation and/or protection of the property.
- 4) **Implications for legal protection:** please indicate the implications of the proposed change for the legal protection of the property. In the case of a proposed addition, or a buffer zone, please provide information on the legal protection in place for the area to be added and a copy of relevant laws and regulations.
- 5) **Implications for management arrangements:** please indicate the implications of the proposed change for the management arrangements of the property. In the case of a proposed addition, or a buffer zone, please provide information on the management arrangements in place for the area to be added.
- 6) **Maps:** please submit two maps, one clearly showing both delimitations of the property (original and proposed revision) and the other showing only the proposed revision. Please make sure that the maps:
  - are either topographic or cadastral;
  - are presented at a scale which is appropriate to the size in hectares of the property and sufficient to clearly show the detail of the current boundary and the proposed changes (and, in any case, the largest available scale);
  - have the title and the legend/key in English or French (if this is not possible, please attach a translation);
  - mark the boundaries of the property (current and proposed revision) through a clearly visible line that can be distinguished from other features on the maps;
  - bear a clearly labeled coordinate grid (or coordinate ticks);
  - clearly refer (in the title and in the legend) to the boundary of the World Heritage property (and to the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, if applicable). Please clearly distinguish the boundary of the World Heritage property from any other protected area boundaries.
- 7) **Additional information:** In the case of a proposed addition, please submit some pictures of the area to be added that provide information on its key values and conditions of authenticity/integrity.

Any other relevant document can be submitted such as thematic maps (e.g. vegetation maps), summaries of scientific information concerning the values of the area to be added (e.g. species lists), and supporting bibliographies.

The above-mentioned documentation should be submitted in English or French in two copies (three for mixed properties). An electronic version (the maps in formats such as .jpg, .tif, .pdf) should also be submitted.

### **Deadline**

1 February of the year in which the approval of the Committee is requested.

## **SIGNIFICANT BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS**

Paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines* states:

165. If a State Party wishes to significantly modify the boundary of a property already on the World Heritage List, the State Party shall submit this proposal as if it were a new nomination. This re-nomination shall be presented by **1 February** and will be evaluated in the full year and a half cycle of evaluation according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168. This provision applies to extensions, as well as reductions.

A proposal for a significant boundary modification, submitted by the State Party concerned, is subject to the review of the relevant Advisory Body(ies) and to the approval of the World Heritage Committee.

Significant modifications to the boundaries of World Heritage properties follow a full year and a half evaluation cycle as new Nominations.

Significant modifications should be presented in the format of a new nomination dossier and also are bound by the provisions of paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines* (Suzhou-Cairns Decision)

A proposal for a significant boundary modification can be approved, not approved, deferred or referred by the World Heritage Committee.

### **Documentation requested**

The dossier for a significant boundary modification is the same as the one in use for new Nominations (See Annex 3 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

### **Deadline**

1 February of the year preceding the one in which the approval of the Committee is requested.

## **MODIFICATIONS TO THE CRITERIA USED TO JUSTIFY INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

Paragraph 166 of the *Operational Guidelines* states:

166. Where a State Party wishes to have the property inscribed under additional or different criteria other than those used for the original inscription, it shall submit this request as if it were a new nomination. This re-nomination shall be presented by **1 February** and will be evaluated in the full year and a half cycle of evaluation according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168. Properties recommended will only be evaluated under the new criteria and will remain on the World Heritage List even if unsuccessful in having additional criteria recognized.

Modifications to the criteria used to justify inscription on the World Heritage List follow a full year and a half evaluation cycle in the same way as for a new Nominations.

Modifications to the criteria should be presented in the format of a new nomination dossier and also are bound by the provisions of paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines* (Suzhou-Cairns Decision).

### **Documentation requested**

The dossier for a modification to the criteria used to justify inscription on the World Heritage List is the same as the one in use for new Nominations.

### **Deadline**

1 February of the year preceding the one in which the approval of the Committee is requested.

## **MODIFICATION TO THE NAME OF A WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY**

Names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List may be modified in order to better reflect their Outstanding Universal Value.

Paragraph 167 of the *Operational Guidelines* states that:

*“A State Party may request that the Committee authorize a modification to the name of a property already inscribed on the World Heritage List. A request for a modification to the name shall be received by the Secretariat **at least 3 months prior to the meeting of the Committee**”.*

A proposal for a name change, submitted by the State Party concerned, is subject to the review of the relevant Advisory Body(ies) and to the approval of the World Heritage Committee.

Please note that the procedure for name changes should also be followed when a simple change in the orthography of the words is proposed.

A proposal for a name change can be approved or not approved by the World Heritage Committee.

### **Documentation requested**

A proposal for a modification to the name of a World Heritage property should be composed of the following information:

- 1) proposed new name of the property, in English and French;
- 2) justification of the proposed change, including how the proposed new name would better reflect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The proposal should be submitted either in English or in French. An electronic version (.pdf or .doc format) should also be submitted.

### **Deadline**

Three months prior to the session of the Committee.

#### **IV. DRAFT DECISION**

##### ***Draft Decision: 33 COM 13***

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/13,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 16** and **32 COM 13** respectively adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions;*
3. *Adopts the amendments compiled in paragraphs XXXXX of Document WHC-09/33.COM/13;*
4. *Requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to organize an expert meeting to reflect on the integrity of cultural properties and to seek extrabudgetary funding to support the organization of this meeting.*