



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

34 COM

Limited Distribution

WHC-10/34.COM/13
Paris, 18 June 2010
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-fourth session

Brasilia, Brazil
25 July – 3 August 2010

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

SUMMARY

Following the latest version of the amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* sent to all States Parties on 1 December 2009, comprising the amendments submitted to the World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) as well as those made by Committee members (Australia, Canada) during the debate on this issue, 20 States Parties have responded by sending their proposed amendments to the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 13, see Point III.

I. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES AS PRESENTED AT SEVILLE

1. Following the latest version of the amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* sent to all States Parties on 1 December 2009, comprising the amendments submitted to the World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) as well as those made by Committee members (Australia, Canada) during the debate on this issue, 20 States Parties have responded by sending their proposed amendments to the *Operational Guidelines*.
2. For easy reference, these **new proposed amendments submitted during 2010 are highlighted in green**. The former amendments proposed by **Australia and Canada remain highlighted in yellow** and those of the Secretariat **in orange**. In the French version of this document, improvements regarding French language have been inserted by the Secretariat in blue.
3. All comments sent by States Parties as well as those provided by the Advisory Bodies, including on the implications of adopting any of these new amendments in relation to the *Operational Guidelines* as a whole, will be available during the Working Group which it is proposed to be established in Brasilia.
4. In the entire text of the *Operational Guidelines*, **Barbados** has proposed to write "**Outstanding Universal Value**" in capital letters. These have been directly inserted in the text to avoid repetition.

A. Protection and Management (paragraphs 96 and 103)

➤ Proposed amendments 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 shall be done (Philippines) / by the World Heritage Committee (Poland)** 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 (see paragraphs 199-210).*

Paragraph 103: Wherever necessary for the proper ~~conservation~~ **protection (Poland)** of the property, an adequate buffer zone should be provided.

B. Process for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List (paragraphs 128, 132, 159, 160, 164, 165, 166 and 167)

➤ Proposed amendments to paragraphs 128, 159, 160, 164, 165, and 166 of the *Operational Guidelines* concerning the deadline of submission

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)** (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by **17h00 GMT the following Monday (Cambodia)**) 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~~ **should be received by (United Kingdom)** the Secretariat by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) **(Cambodia)** 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~~ **should be received by (United Kingdom)** [~~resubmitted to:~~ deleted] the Secretariat by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) **(Cambodia)**. These nominations will then be reevaluated (~~reevaluated~~ **evaluated again/Barbados**) 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~~ **should be received (United Kingdom)** by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) **(Cambodia)** by 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~~ **should be received (United Kingdom)** by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) **(Cambodia)** 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, **fewer (Australia-Canada)** 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 deleted~~ **should be received (United Kingdom)** by **1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday)** (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) **(Cambodia)** 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, **fewer or different**

(Australia-Canada) criteria recognized.

➤ **Proposed amendments 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 to prove (Poland) its effectiveness. / "... in order to demonstrate its effectiveness and to show how the said management plan or system functions. (Philippines)~~

~~Assurances of the effective implementation of the management plan or other management system are also expected.~~

Paragraph 132 (point 6): Monitoring

States Parties shall include the key indicators **proposed in place (Poland)** to measure and assess the state of conservation of the property, the factors affecting it, conservation measures at the property, the periodicity of their examination, and the identity of the responsible authorities.

Paragraph 132 (point 7): Documentation

All necessary documentation **necessary** to substantiate the nomination shall be provided. In addition to what is indicated above, this shall include **a) digital photographs and if possible any other illustrative material including 35 mm slides, film, video or other audio visual material; b) the photograph and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form (see Annex 5, point 7.a).**

The essential images and maps as authorized shall be transmitted in digital format (jpg at 300 dpi minimum).

The text of the nomination shall be transmitted in printed form as well as in electronic format **(Word and/or PDF format). (Diskette or CD-Rom). (all amendments by Barbados)**

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" (Philippines)** 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.~~

➤ **Proposed amendments to paragraph 167 of the *Operational Guidelines***

Paragraph 167: ~~A State Party~~ **The State Party which has inscribed the property (Cambodia)** 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.

C. Evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies (paragraph 150)

➤ Proposed amendments to paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 150: The concerned States Parties are invited to send, at least ~~two working days~~ ~~weeks~~ 14 days (Australia-Canada) before the opening of the session of the Committee, a letter to the Chairperson, with copies to the relevant (Poland) 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. (Jordan, India)~~ Letters from States Parties regarding factual errors made by Advisory Bodies should be distributed by the Chairperson unconditionally. (India) 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.

Proposed alternative by the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 150: Letters from the concerned State(s) Party(ies) detailing the factual errors they might have identified in the evaluation of their nomination made by the Advisory Bodies must be received by the Chairperson at least 14 days before the opening of the session of the Committee with copies to the relevant Advisory Body(ies). Provided that the Chair, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body, is satisfied that the letter deals only with factual errors and contains no advocacy, the letter shall 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. If a letter contains both notification of factual errors and advocacy, only those parts of it dealing with factual errors shall be distributed.

D. Decision of the World Heritage Committee (paragraph 155)

➤ Proposed amendments to paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 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 (Poland) protection and management in force /or: and the requirements for protection and management/~~. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value shall be the basis for the future protection, management of the property.

E. Modifications to the boundaries (paragraphs 107, 164, 168 and 176)

➤ Proposed amendment to paragraph 107 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 107: Although buffer zones are not normally part of the nominated property, any modifications to the buffer zone subsequent to inscription of a property on the World Heritage List should be approved by the World Heritage Committee as a minor boundary modification (see paragraph 164 and Annex 11) (Switzerland).

➤ **Proposed amendments 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 should be received (United Kingdom) by 1 February by 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 Secretariat shall then submit the Advisory Bodies' opinion and evaluation (Poland) to the Committee (Australia-Canada). The Committee may approve such a modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently significant as to constitute a significant boundary modification (Australia-Canada) an extension of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply. In principle, for creation of buffer zones or modifications to buffer zones following inscription the procedure for minor boundary modifications is applied. (Poland and Switzerland)

See paragraph 107 and Annex 11

➤ **Proposed amendments to paragraph 168 of the *Operational Guidelines***

Timetable / Procedures for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List:

At least two 14 (Poland) working days before the opening of the annual World Heritage Committee session Year 2

Correction of factual errors by States Parties

The concerned States Parties can send, at least two 14 (Poland) working days 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.

➤ **Proposed amendment by the Secretariat to improve the drafting of paragraph 176 of the *Operational Guidelines***

Paragraph 176 e): [...] In case an emergency action is required, the Committee may authorize its financing from the World Heritage Fund of the Emergency Assistance that is required through an emergency assistance request.

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

➤ **Proposed amendments to paragraphs 179, 180 and 181 of the *Operational Guidelines***

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

India prefers the original sentence.

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

v) threatening effects impacts (Philippines) of climatic, geological or other environmental factors.

Paragraph 181: In addition, the factor or factors which are threatening threats and/or their deleterious effects impacts (Philippines) 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 impacts (Philippines) 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 (paragraphs 240, 241, 248, 249, 250 and 252)

➤ **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.

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

VII.E Summary Table

Type of international assistance	Purpose	Budget ceilings per request	Deadline for submission of request	Authority for approval
Emergency Assistance	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

➤ **Proposed amendments 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.**

➤ **Proposed amendments 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, provided they meet the definition established for Emergency Assistance. (Grenada)**

ANNEXES OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

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

- **ANNEX 3: GUIDELINES ON THE INSCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**
- **ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**
- **ANNEX 10: STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE (NEW ANNEX proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies)**
- **ANNEX 11: CHANGES **MODIFICATIONS (Poland)** TO WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (NEW ANNEX proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies)**
- **ANNEX 3: GUIDELINES ON THE INSCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

(Additional references proposed by ICOMOS and IUCN)

ICOMOS List of thematic studies

Southern African Rock-Art Sites (2002)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/sarockart.htm>

L'Art rupestre (2002)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/rupestre.htm>

The International Collieries Study (2003)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/collieries.htm>

Les Monastères orthodoxes dans les balkans (2003)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/balkan.htm>

Les paysages culturels viticoles (2004)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/viticoles.htm>

Rock Art of Latin America and the Caribbean (2006)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/rock-latinamerica.htm>

Rock Art of Sahara and North Africa (2007)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/rockart-sahara-northafrica.htm>

Cultural landscapes of the Pacific Islands (2007)

<http://www.icomos.org/studies/cultural-landscapes-pacific.htm>

The IUCN List of thematic studies is available at the following address:

http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/wheritage_pub/

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

- Proposed amendment by **United States of America** to Annex 5, Executive Summary

Executive Summary

This information, to be provided by the State Party, will be updated by the Secretariat following the decision by the World Heritage Committee. It will then be returned to the State Party confirming the basis on which the property is inscribed on the World Heritage List.

State Party	
State, Province or Region	
Name of Property	
Geographical coordinates to the nearest second	
Textual description of the boundary(ies) of the nominated property	
A4 (or "letter") size map of the nominated property, showing boundaries and buffer zone (if present)	Attach A4 (or "letter") size map
Criteria under which property is nominated (itemize criteria) (see Paragraph 77 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>)	
Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (text should clarify what is considered to be the outstanding universal value embodied by the nominated property, 1-2 page format)	<p>According to the paragraph 155, the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be composed of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Brief synthesis ii. Criteria iii. Integrity for all properties and authenticity for properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) iv. Management and protection in place and requirements <p>See format in Annex 10</p>
Name and contact information of official local institution/agency	Organization: Address: Tel: Fax: E-mail: Web address:

➤ **Proposed amendments to Annex 5, Point 1.d: Identification of the property**

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

<p>1.d Geographical coordinates to the nearest second</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 property component part, 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: ⁵45670 Northing: ⁴⁵86750</p>
--	--

<p>1.e Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone</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. The maps provided should be of sufficient at the largest available 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.</p> <p>Care is needed with the width of boundary lines on maps, as thick boundary lines may make the actual boundary of the property ambiguous.</p> <p>Maps may be obtained from the addresses shown at the following Web address http://whc.unesco.org/en/mapagencies</p> <p>If topographic maps are not available at the appropriate scale, other maps may be substituted. All maps should be capable of being geo-referenced, 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 also 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 protection conservation of the nominated property.</p>
--	---

<p>➤ Proposed amendments to Annex 5, Point 3: Justification for inscription</p>	
<p>3. Justification for Inscription: 3.1 Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value 3.2 Comparative analysis</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>Based on the criteria used above, 3.1. 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 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 ecosystem. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional ecosystems, 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"> i. Brief synthesis ii. Criteria iii. Integrity for all properties iv. Authenticity for properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) v. Management and protection requirements <p>(Philippines wishes to delete paragraph 3.1)</p> <p>3.2 Comparative analysis (see below)</p>
<p>3.1. Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</p>	<p>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 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 ecosystem. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional ecosystems, 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"> i. Brief synthesis ii. Criteria iii. Integrity for all properties and Authenticity for properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi)

<p>3.1. a) Brief synthesis</p>	<p>iv. Management and protection requirements (Australia-Canada)</p> <p>This Section is not subject to any length restriction as in the Executive Summary and Annex 10. (USA)</p> <p>The brief synthesis should be composed of:</p> <p>The brief synthesis should comprise be composed of (Barbados)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Summary of factual information ii) Summary of qualities <p>The summary of factual information sets out the geographical and historical context and the main features.</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>3.1.b) Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)</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>3.1.c) Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar properties)</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>3.1.c) Integrity and/or Authenticity</p>	<p>The statement of integrity and authenticity should demonstrate that the property fulfils the conditions of integrity and 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>	
<p>3.1.d) Protection and management requirements</p>	<p>The protection and management requirements should specify those systems that are necessary to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property</p>	
<p>3.2 Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar properties)</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 explain the importance of the nominated property both in its national and international context (see Paragraph 132).</p>	

➤ **Proposed amendment to Annex 5, Point 5 e) : Property management plan or other management system**

(to add at the end of the paragraph)

A timetable for the implementation of the management plan is recommended (United Kingdom)

➤ **Proposed amendment to Annex 5, Point 7 a): Photographs, slides, image inventory and authorization table and other audiovisual materials**

IMAGE INVENTORY AND PHOTOGRAPH AND AUDIOVISUAL AUTHORIZATION FORM

Title modification: photograph and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form (Barbados) in accordance with the amendments proposed in Paragraph 132, point 7. Documentation.

➤ **Proposed new Annex 10**

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

ANNEX 10: STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

All World Heritage properties must have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, approved by the World Heritage Committee (**Australia-Canada**). Only those properties inscribed since 2007 have had one approved by the World Heritage 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 2007.

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

Paragraph 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 or: and the requirements for protection and management (Poland). 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.

Amendment by United Kingdom:

A retrospective Statement of OUV should be based on the following documentation at the time of inscription:

- The original World Heritage Committee's decision
- The original Advisory Body's evaluation of the property
- The original nomination document and any supplementary information submitted during the nomination process.

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

As a result of the cooperative process of developing a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value such Statements should only be submitted to the World Heritage Committee when they are agreed by the State(s) Party(ies), the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and are ready for adoption by the Committee. ~~can be approved, not approved, deferred or referred by the World~~

Heritage Committee.

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

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

A Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should respect the following format (2 A4 pages 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. Protection and management requirements— Germany
 - 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 (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday) (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday). **(Cambodia)**

ANNEX 11: CHANGES MODIFICATIONS (Poland) TO WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (NEW ANNEX)

Justification: In response to a request by many States Parties concerning the implementation of paragraphs 163-167 of the *Operational Guidelines*, which relate to boundary modifications, criteria or name of a World Heritage property, a new Annex 11 is proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to guide States Parties.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE BOUNDARIES OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Boundary modifications should serve better identification conservation and protection of World Heritage properties and enhance protection of their Outstanding Universal Value (Poland).

The difference 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 should be received (United Kingdom) by 1 February by 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 Secretariat shall then submit the Advisory Bodies' opinion and evaluation (Poland) to the Committee (Australia-Canada). The Committee may approve such a modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently significant as to constitute a significant boundary modification (Australia-Canada) an extension of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply. In principle, for creation of buffer zones or modifications to buffer zones following inscription the procedure for minor boundary modifications is applied (see paragraph 107 and Annex 11). (Poland and Switzerland)

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 (or the area of the proposed buffer zone) (Switzerland). (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 (or a written description of the proposed buffer zone) (Switzerland).
- 3) **Justification for the modification:** please provide a brief summary of the reasons why the boundaries of the property should be modified (or why a buffer zone is needed) (Switzerland), with particular emphasis on how such modification will improve the conservation and/or protection of the property.
- 4) **Contribution to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value:** please indicate how the proposed change (or the proposed buffer zone) (Switzerland) will contribute to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
- 5) **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 of the creation of a buffer zone (Switzerland), please provide information on the legal protection in place for the area to be added and a copy of

relevant laws and regulations.

- 6) **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 of the creation of a buffer zone (Switzerland)**, please provide information on the management arrangements in place for the area to be added.
- 7) **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. **In the case of the creation of a buffer zone, please submit a map showing both the inscribed property and the proposed buffer zone (Switzerland)**. 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 **practical scale (Australia-Canada)**);
 - 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.
- 8) **Additional information:** In the case of a proposed addition, please submit some **pictures photographs (Australia-Canada)** 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 **identical (Australia-Canada)** 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 (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday) **(or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday). (Cambodia)**

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 should be received (**United Kingdom**) by 1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday) (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) (**Cambodia**) 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.

Nevertheless, in all these cases the property will remain on the World Heritage List (**Jordan**).

Documentation requested

The dossier for a significant boundary modification is the same as the one in use for new nominations (see Annex 5 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

Deadline

1 February of the year preceding the one in which the approval of the Committee is requested (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday) (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) (**Cambodia**)

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

Paragraph 166 of the *Operational Guidelines* states:

166. Paragraph 166: Where a State Party wishes to have the property inscribed under additional, fewer (**Australia-Canada**) 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 deleted should be received (**United Kingdom**) by 1 February (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday) (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) (**Cambodia**) 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, fewer or different (**Australia-Canada**) 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 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 (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday) (or, if the date falls on a weekend, by 17h00 GMT the following Monday) **(Cambodia)**

MODIFICATION TO THE NAME OF A WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY

Names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List may be modified by the Committee after inscription **(Australia-Canada)** 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.

II. NEW AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES PROPOSED BY THE EXPERT MEETINGS

Some amendments were proposed by the following expert meetings:

- **Expert Workshop on “Science and Technology”**, 21-23 January 2008, London, United Kingdom
- **Workshop on Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites**, September 2009, Mogao Caves, China
- **Expert meeting on the Inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape**, 7-11 December 2009, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- **International Expert Meeting on serial nominations and properties**, 25-27 February 2010, Ittingen, Switzerland
- **International Expert Meeting on Upstream process of nominations: creative solutions during the nomination process**, 27-29 April 2010, Phuket, Thailand

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 110 of the *Operational Guidelines***

Paragraph 110: An effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the nominated property and its cultural and natural context. Management systems may vary according to different cultural perspectives, the resources available and other factors. They may incorporate traditional practices, existing urban or regional planning instruments, and other planning control mechanisms, both formal and informal. **Assessment of impacts will also be useful for all World Heritage properties and in particular for properties in urban areas (*Expert Meeting on the Inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape*).**

➤ **Proposed amendment to paragraph 111 of the *Operational Guidelines***

Paragraph 111: In recognizing the diversity mentioned above, common elements of an effective management system could include:

- a) a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders;
- b) a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;
- NEW c) an assessment of the impacts of trends and changes, and in particular of projected developments; (*Expert meeting on the inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape*).**
- d) the involvement of partners and stakeholders;
- e) the allocation of necessary resources;
- f) capacity-building; and
- g) an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.

- **Proposed new paragraph, to be included after current Paragraph 112 of the *Operational Guidelines***

New Paragraph: Particularly for properties which are located in urban areas or have components which include urban settlements, an integrated approach to planning and management will be useful to ensure that the evolution of the landscape maintains all aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property including its authenticity and integrity. This Historic Urban Landscape approach deals with the property and its buffer zone in its wider context, and goes beyond the notions of historic centre and ensemble, to include its surroundings and its broader geographical setting. It extends the meaning to include land use patterns, spatial organization, social and cultural values, visual relationships, topography and other natural features, geomorphology, vegetation and all elements of the urban infrastructure. It also includes dynamic processes, economic aspects, intangible dimensions of heritage and aspects of cultural diversity and identity (*Expert Meeting on the Inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape*).

- **Proposed amendment to paragraph 119 of the *Operational Guidelines***

Paragraph 119: World Heritage properties may support a variety of ongoing and proposed uses that are ecologically and culturally sustainable and contribute to the social and economic development and the quality of life of our communities. The State Party and partners must ensure that such sustainable use [or change] does not adversely impact the outstanding universal value, integrity and/or authenticity of the property. Furthermore, any uses should be ecologically and culturally sustainable. For some properties, human use would not be appropriate. (*Expert Meeting on the Inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape*).

- **Proposed new paragraph, to be included after current Paragraph 119 of the *Operational Guidelines***

New Paragraph: Particularly in regard to the historic urban landscape approach, there is a need to consider the environmental, economic, social, and cultural aspects of sustainability in managing evolution and change, in order to ensure the continuity of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its safeguarding for future generations. This approach also entails the need for policies and strategies for sustainable development, sensitive to the need for heritage conservation, with a close participation of the communities and groups of people concerned. (*Expert Meeting on the Inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape*)

ANNEXES OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

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

- **ANNEX 2B: TENTATIVE LIST SUBMISSION FORMAT FOR SERIAL TRANSNATIONAL AND TRANSBOUNDARY SITES**
- **ANNEX 3: GUIDELINES ON THE INSCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**
- **ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

- NEW ANNEX PROPOSED BY SWITZERLAND BASED ON THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERT MEETING ON SERIAL NOMINATIONS AND PROPERTIES

Annex 2B



**TENTATIVE LIST SUBMISSION FORMAT
FOR SERIAL TRANSNATIONAL AND TRANSBOUNDARY
SITES**

STATE PARTY: _____ **DATE OF SUBMISSION:** _____

Submission¹ prepared by:

Name: _____ E-mail: _____

Address: _____ Fax: _____

Institution: _____ Telephone: _____

1.a Name of the serial transnational / transboundary site²:

1.b Other States Parties participating:

1.c Name(s) of the national component part(s):

1.d State, Province or Region:

1.e Latitude and Longitude, or UTM coordinates:

2.a Brief Description of the serial transnational / transboundary site²:

2.b Description of the component part(s):

3. JUSTIFICATION FOR OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE²

(Preliminary identification of the values of the property which merit inscription on the World Heritage List)

3.a Criteria met² [see Paragraph 77 of the *Operational Guidelines*]:

(Please tick the box corresponding to the proposed criteria and justify the use of each below)

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

3.b Statements of authenticity and/or integrity [see Paragraphs 79-95 of the *Operational Guidelines*]:

3.c.1 Justification of the selection of the component part(s):

3.c.2 Comparison with other similar properties²:

(The comparison should outline the similarities with other properties inscribed or not on the World Heritage List, and the reasons for the exceptional character of the property.)

1 = This submission will be valid only when all the States Parties indicated in Section 1.b have sent their submissions

2 = The text provided in this section should be identical in all submissions of the States Parties involved in the presentation of the same serial transnational / transboundary site

➤ **ANNEX 3: GUIDELINES ON THE INSCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

- Amendments proposed by the **Expert Meeting on the Inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape**.

I. CULTURAL LANDSCAPES, TOWNS, CANALS AND ROUTES

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

- **Proposed amendment to current sub-heading “Definition” within Annex 3**

Definition and Categories [...]

- **Proposed amendment to paragraph 8 of Annex 3**

8. The term "cultural landscape" embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment, **including urban areas as intensive forms of this interaction.**

- **Proposed amendments to paragraph 10 of Annex 3**

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

- (i) The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man. This embraces **urban spaces**, garden and parkland landscapes which are often associated with religious or other buildings and ensembles.
- (ii) The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

[...]

- a continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society **which could be** closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

- **Proposed amendment to current heading “HISTORIC TOWNS AND TOWN CENTRES” and to paragraph 14 of Annex 3**

URBAN AREAS AND SETTLEMENTS

Definitions and categories

~~14. Groups of urban buildings eligible for inscription on the World Heritage List fall into three main~~

categories, namely: **Urban areas and settlements, including groups of buildings, urban ensembles and sites** eligible for inscription on the World Heritage List fall into **two** main categories, namely:

(i) ~~towns which those that~~ are no longer inhabited but which provide unchanged archaeological evidence of the past; ~~these generally satisfy the criterion of authenticity and their state of conservation can be relatively easily controlled;~~

(ii) ~~historic towns which are still inhabited and which, by their very nature, have developed and will continue to develop under the influence of socio-economic and cultural change, a situation that renders the assessment of their authenticity more difficult and any conservation policy more problematical;~~

(iii) ~~new towns of the twentieth century which paradoxically have something in common with both the aforementioned categories: while their original urban organization is clearly recognizable and their authenticity is undeniable, their future is unclear because their development is largely uncontrollable.~~

(ii) those that are inhabited and that generally continue to develop under socio-economic and cultural influences, including "new towns" as modern heritage.

➤ **Proposed amendment to current sub-heading "Inscription of Historic Towns and Town Centres on the World Heritage List" and to paragraph 15 of Annex 3**

Inscription of ~~Historic Towns and Town Centres~~ **Urban Areas and Settlements on the World Heritage List**

15. The significance of ~~Historic Towns and Town Centres~~ **Urban Areas and Settlements** can be examined under the factors outlined below:

(i) **Towns **Urban Areas and Settlements** no longer inhabited**

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

(ii) **Inhabited historic towns **Urban Areas and Settlements****

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

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

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

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

~~(iii) **New towns of the twentieth century**~~

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

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

~~In view of the effects which the inscription of a town on the World Heritage List could have on its future, such entries should be exceptional. Inscription in the List implies~~

Inhabited urban areas and settlements are living entities that need to be viewed in their entirety as complex formal and spatial organizations with multiple social, economic, cultural and environmental processes that may also include a religious or symbolic component, as well as a relationship and associations with the natural environment.

When planning for the inscription of the urban areas and settlements, States Parties should take into account not only the physical aspects of the buildings and spaces, but also the multiple layers related to values, relationships, rituals, building practices, local knowledge systems, and other forms of intangible heritage. Consideration should also be given to the economic, environmental, social, and cultural aspects of sustainable development.

Nomination files should also demonstrate that legislative and administrative measures have already

been taken to ensure the protection of the urban area or settlement. Informed awareness on the part of the **communities** concerned, without whose active participation any conservation scheme would be impractical, is also essential.

When preparing nominations for urban areas and settlements, it will likely be useful to adopt the Historic Urban Landscape approach to management (see Chapter IIF, paragraphs, 112bis and 120.) This approach looks at the urban area or settlement in its wider geographical context in order to ensure that it is well integrated into its larger setting.

➤ Amendment proposed by **United Kingdom** on the basis of the conclusions and recommendations of the Expert Workshop on “Science and Technology”. This amendment should be inserted in Annex 3 after the Heritage Routes as a new typology of heritage.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The *World Heritage Convention* refers to science in its definitions of heritage. Article 1 defines ‘cultural heritage’ as monuments, groups of buildings and/or sites which are of ‘Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of history, art or **science**’. Article 2 defines ‘natural heritage’ as features, geological and physiographical formations and sites which are of ‘Outstanding Universal Value from the ... **scientific** point of view’

Definitions of Science and Technology

‘Science’ is understood as including systems of knowledge which may be historical, traditional, indigenous and/or contemporary. These typically include predictive ideas, and modes of explanation based on observations of nature or deductive discoveries that are logical and rational in their own terms, can be validated, and are open to change and refutation through further observations.

‘Technology’ may be considered the practical application of scientific knowledge which results in the production of material artifacts and technological ensembles.

Inscription of heritage linked to science and technology on the World Heritage List

In the context of the *World Heritage Convention*, which focuses on values embodied in specific places, developments in science and technology are expressed through surviving physical evidence found on the sites. For inscription on the World Heritage List, such evidence needs to meet one or more of the criteria for Outstanding Universal Value as well as the conditions of authenticity and/or integrity.

Two crucial points should be considered when determining whether a heritage linked to science and technology is suitable for inscription on the World Heritage List.

i) Recall absolutely the need to have an Outstanding Universal Value;

ii) Designate areas that demonstrate important scientific and technological achievements.

With regard to possible inscriptions of science and/or technology sites under Criterion (vi), five principles should be observed:

a) Criterion (vi) can be interpreted to cover scientific heritage;

b) Although Criterion (vi) has clear merit in this area, the World Heritage Committee had sought to place restrictions on the utilization of this criterion, as a sole justification, with regard to all forms of heritage. Criterion (vi) should usually, and preferably, be used in conjunction with one or more other criteria;

c) Nominations under Criterion (vi) should refer to strong links to tangible features of sites. For all sites, the emphasis should be upon the ideas in the heritage that are reflected in the features of the site, not simply on the person who developed them;

d) Criterion (vi) may be used in connection to natural sites, so as to reflect the value of the site for science;

e) There might be some exceptional instances where Criterion (vi) has the potential to be used on its own for recognizing the heritage of science and/or technology.

For the *World Heritage Convention*, the focuses should be upon the physical sites, which are the tangible heritage, where great achievements of universal value were manifested, and to an extent, remain. Such tangible evidence needs to survive and this can be in the form of landscape, and natural features, buildings, ensembles and objects.

The tangible context for the original scientific insight is also important. Although each nomination should be examined on a case-by-case basis, the focus should be upon the place, or a collection of places, where the most important fundamental developments, of universal significance, occurred.

Principles of authenticity and integrity are fundamental to the *World Heritage Convention*. In the case of scientific and technological heritage, it is possible to have elements of faithful reconstruction on a site, in exceptional circumstances.

Beyond Nominations

Education and interpretation of World Heritage properties for scientific and/or technological heritage is of particular importance.

Awareness-raising on this topic should be used as a tool to communicate, *inter alia*, the scientific heritage of individual sites, the management and conservation of such sites, the importance of scientific heritage, and more generic concerns such as sustainable development.

Awareness-raising on this topic should, as appropriate, be linked to other international programmes and initiatives which seek to raise the overall profile of science.

- ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
- Amendments proposed by **Australia** on the basis of the recommendations of the Workshop, *Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites*.

Annex 5, Point 4 b): Factors affecting the property

<p>(iv) Responsible visitation at World Heritage sites</p>	<p>Consider how your site's visitation is responsible in view of <i>The Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties</i> (See Recommendations B.II of the Workshop on Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites, September 2009, Mogao Caves, China)</p> <p>Describe the current levels of visitation to the property including available baseline data; patterns of use, including concentrations of activity in parts of the property; and demand for different activities. Describe projected levels of visitation due to inscription or other factors. Describe how the site can absorb or be upgraded to meet the current or expected visitor numbers and related development pressure without adverse effects. Consider possible forms of deterioration due to visitor pressure including those to the physical and intangible fabric of the property.</p>
<p>5.h Visitor facilities and infrastructure</p>	<p>This section should describe the facilities available on site for visitors, for example interpretation/explanation, whether by trails, guides, notices or publications; property museum, visitor or interpretation centre; and/or use of digital technologies; overnight accommodation; restaurant or refreshment facilities; shops; car parking; lavatories; search and rescue. Are the facilities and infrastructure compatible with the heritage values of the property?</p>
<p>5.j Staffing levels and expertise (professional, technical, maintenance)</p>	<p>Indicate the skills and training which are currently available at the property to deal with current and projected demands for appropriate management, including in relation to visitation.</p>

III. DRAFT DECISION

Draft Decision: 34 COM 13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/13,
2. Recalling Decisions **31 COM 16**, **32 COM 13** and **33 COM 13** respectively adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd sessions (Seville, 2009);
3. Decides to create, a Working Group on the revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention as a Consultative Body as per Rule 20, which will report back to the Committee at the end of the 34th session.