



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

35 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-11/35.COM/12C

Paris, 27 May 2011

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-fifth session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters

19-29 June 2011

Item 12 of the Provisional Agenda: Reflection on the Future of the *World Heritage Convention*

12C. Progress report on the reflection concerning the upstream processes

SUMMARY

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee decided to initiate a process of reflection on the future of the *World Heritage Convention*.

In this framework, the Committee, recognising the challenges that exist in the process for nominating a property to the World Heritage List, proposed an indepth reflection on the Upstream Process. The aim of this reflection was to find options for improving and strengthening the current nomination process. The results of the reflection were presented in document *WHC-10/34.COM/12A* on the basis of which the Committee adopted Decision **34 COM 12**.

The present document focuses on the activities undertaken on Upstream Process since the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee to implement Point III of Decision **34 COM 12**. In particular, the document contains the feasibility studies concerning the 10 selected pilot projects prepared by the Advisory Bodies in collaboration with the Secretariat.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 12C, see Point V

I BACKGROUND

1. At its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee, in part III of Decision **34 COM 12**, encouraged the World Heritage Centre to “*follow up on the approaches and recommendations of the Phuket expert meeting*” on ‘Upstream processes for Nominations’. In particular, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre “*in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and other relevant organizations, to invite one or two States Parties from each of the UNESCO regional groups to undertake, on an experimental basis, voluntary pilot projects related to identifying options and preparing dossiers for nomination*”.
2. Following the subsequent briefing that was provided on this subject at the information meeting of the States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* held on 17 November 2010 in Paris and the request by letter addressed to each of the UNESCO Regional Groups to select 2 pilot projects, a selection of 10 pilot projects was made by them.

II PILOT PROJECTS SELECTION

3. The pilot projects that have been proposed by the UNESCO regional groups for this experimental approach to provide upstream support for States Parties during the nomination process are the ones presented in the table below. It is to be noted that, Electoral Group I (Western Europe and North America) refrained from making any proposal.

| State Party(ies) | Selected Pilot Project | Category (indicative) |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| AFRICA (Group Vb) | | |
| Namibia | South Namib Erg | M |
| Nigeria | Kano City Walls | C |
| ARAB STATES (Group Va) | | |
| Jordan | Pella (Tabaqt Fahl) | C |
| Saudi Arabia | Rock Drawings in the region of Hail | C |
| ASIA / PACIFIC (Group IV) | | |
| Philippines | Batanes Protected Landscapes and Seascapes | CL |
| Maldives | Male Hukuru Miskiy | C |
| EASTERN EUROPE (Group II) | | |
| Albania / the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid Region | M |
| Croatia / Slovenia / Bosnia and Herzegovina / Montenegro | Dinaric Karst Serial Nomination | N |
| LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN (Group III) | | |
| Grenada / Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | Grenadine Island Group | N |
| Uruguay | Cultural and Industrial Landscape of Fray Bentos | C |

4. For each of the selected pilot projects, a feasibility study detailing the costs and timeframe for implementation has been prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and is presented to the 35th session of the Committee for approval.

III PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PREPARATION OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDIES

5. In order to better understand the structure and the scope of the feasibility studies included here below, it is necessary to take into account that they have been produced without the benefit of a contact with the States Parties concerned on this specific subject due to lack of time between the period when the Regional Groups submitted their proposals and this session of the Committee. The establishment of dialogue with relevant States Parties is crucial to determine with more accuracy what is needed for the implementation of each pilot project, both in terms of activities and, consequently, also of costs. This is why the feasibility studies are divided into two separate phases in which, the results of the first phase will set the groundwork for the second phase. The first phase will try to assess the potential of the nomination, the main challenges that need to be addressed as well as its overall feasibility. The second phase will begin with a specific training on the preparation of the nomination and the procedures to comply with, which is also meant to address *in situ* capacity building. In the case of those pilot projects that involve transnational cooperation, there may be additional unknown elements which do not enable, at this stage, a great degree of precision concerning the effective costs that will have to be engaged.
6. In all cases, in order to facilitate communications, each of the States Parties concerned are requested to identify a responsible focal point for the pilot project.
7. It may be noted that the timeframe to implement the pilot projects will differ from one to another, depending on various elements, among which the number and scale of issues to deal with during the upstream support, time needed to gather documentation, to undertake research and, eventually, to develop the essential protection and the indispensable management provisions.
8. Finally, it is important to emphasize that the **inclusion of a pilot project in the above list does not imply that the sites concerned would necessarily be inscribed on the World Heritage List**. It may be useful to recall that the main aim of the experimental Upstream Process is to reduce the number of properties that experience significant problems during the nomination process. Therefore, the objective of the pilot projects is to explore creative approaches and new forms of guidance that might be provided to State Parties throughout the nomination process.

IV FEASIBILITY STUDIES ON THE SELECTED PILOT PROJECTS

9. Pilot Project on the **South Namib Erg**, Namibia

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | For the natural values there is a strong potential based on existing gaps studies, for criteria (vii) and (viii). Additional comparative analysis support could be provided on biodiversity criteria. No cultural criteria are identified in the Tentative List; the cultural attributes relate to shell middens, burial sites, accumulation of stone tools and hunting 'blinds'; the exceptionality of these sites is not set out, nor their disposition |
| Integrity | Status not known / Evidence has not been provided for disposition of cultural sites |
| Protection and management | Status not known |
| Other | A nomination is already under preparation, perhaps for 2012 submission. The African WHF will hold a two week course in Namibia in August 2011 this will be an occasion to discuss on site. |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Scope need for support with State Party | IUCN | September 2011 | 3,400 | For IUCN the funding of this work can be done within a current project |
| Questions to the State Party related to case for nomination under cultural criteria, research and survey data; disposition of cultural attributes | ICOMOS | September 2011 | 3,000 | Tentative List indicates a mixed property, but no cultural criteria are proposed |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | August 2011 | --- | To be done at the African WHF course |
| Possible comparative analysis support. | WCMC/IUCN | Before November 2011 | 2,000 | May not be required |
| Possible management effectiveness assessment. | WCPA | Before December 2011 | 11,300 | May not be required |
| Other support: not known, to be considered by State Party | TBC | TBC | TBC | May not be required |
| Review of draft nomination | IUCN, ICOMOS and WHC | October 2011 | 4,250 | IUCN and ICOMOS will do this at no external cost |

10. Pilot Project on Kano City Walls, Nigeria

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Criteria (iii), (v), and (vi) suggested but no proposed justification; rationale for choice of sites needed |
| Integrity | Overall status not known but some vulnerability suggested |
| Authenticity | Overall status not known but some vulnerability suggested |
| Protection and Management | Not known: conservation and the mud walls and palace will need careful consideration |
| Boundaries | Not known precisely |
| Other | The serial nomination consists of the Kano Walls, Dala Hill, Emir's Palace and Kurmi Market; the authenticity and integrity of the extensive Kano Walls needs to be addressed at an early stage. Work on this nomination has started and it will be treated at the African WHF two week course in Namibia in August 2011 |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|--|----------------|--------------|---------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Questions to State Party to inform on level of documentation, research on the city walls and palace, and on their conservation and protection, and on boundaries and choice of sites | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | Tentative List indicated criteria (iii)(v)(vi) |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | August 2011 | --- | To be done at the African WHF course |
| Support for comparative analysis | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Effectiveness of management and protection for cultural attributes | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Support for conservation strategy | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS and WHC | --- | 2,000 | ICOMOS will do this at no external cost. |

11. Pilot Project on **Pella (Tabaqt FahI)**, Jordan

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Criteria (i), (iii) and (iv) are suggested |
| Integrity | No evidence provided on this in the Tentative List |
| Authenticity | No evidence provided on this |
| Protection and Management | No evidence provided on this |
| Boundaries | No evidence provided on this |
| Other | No evidence provided on this |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|---|----------------|--------------|---------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Questions to State Party to inform on details of excavation strategy, documentation, boundaries, conservation protection and management | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | Tentative List indicated criteria (i) (iii) (iv) |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | --- | 2,000 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Support for comparative analysis | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Management and protection effectiveness | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS and WHC | --- | 2,000 | ICOMOS will do this at no external cost. |

12. Pilot Project on the **Rock Drawings in the region of Hail**, Saudi Arabia

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Criteria | Not on Tentative List |
| Integrity | Not on Tentative List |
| Authenticity | Not on Tentative List |
| Protection and Management | Not on Tentative List |
| Boundaries | Not on Tentative List |
| Other | As this property is not on the tentative List, no basic details are known about the scope and extent of the proposed property |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Questions to State Party to inform on scope of proposed property, research and documentation on rock art, relationship with archaeological sites, conservation, protection and management, in line with ICOMOS's Pre Nomination Guidance for Rock Art sites | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | No reference on Tentative List |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | --- | 2,000 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Support for comparative analysis | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Effectiveness of management and protection | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----|-------|---|
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS and WHC | --- | 2,000 | ICOMOS will do this at no external cost |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----|-------|---|

13. Pilot Project on the **Batanes Protected Landscapes and Seascapes**, Philippines

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Originally nominated for criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) |
| Integrity | Issues related to choice of sites |
| Authenticity | Authenticity of cultural landscape unclear |
| Protection and Management | Needs to be linked more clearly to attributes of the cultural landscape |
| Boundaries | Need to be re-appraised |
| Other | This property was referred back by the Committee at its 31st session (31 COM 8B.28) |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|--|----------------|--------------|---------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Questions to inform on progress made on survey and research and other recommendations required by the 31 st session | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | Mixed property. Nomination referred back to State Party at 31 st session |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | --- | 2,500 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for comparative analysis | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for survey and documentation | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Effectiveness of management and protection | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS and WHC | --- | 2,000 | ICOMOS will do this at no external cost |

14. Pilot Project on **Male Hukuru Miskiy**, Maldives

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Criteria | (i), (iv) and (vi) |
| Integrity | The setting of the monument needs careful consideration |
| Authenticity | There have been some changes to roof covering and gateway |
| Protection and Management | It is understood that these needs strengthening |
| Boundaries | These are not known |
| Other | It is unclear whether the Male Hukuru Miskiy is being considered for nomination as a single property or as part of a serial nomination – as suggested in an International Assistance Requests |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------------|---|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Questions to the State Party on scope of nomination – whether serial or not; status of development of activities related to the IAR to inform on survey work and comparative analysis | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | Tentative List indicated criteria (i) (iv) (vi) International Assistance Request (IAR) 2011 for a serial nomination of coral stone buildings |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--|-----|-------|---|
| Phase 2 | | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | | --- | 2,500 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for comparative analysis | ICOMOS | | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for survey and documentation | ICOMOS | | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Effectiveness of management and protection | ICOMOS | | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS and WHC | | --- | 2,000 | ICOMOS will do this at no external cost |

15. Pilot Project on the **Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid Region**, Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Inscribed in 1979 and extended in 1980 and 2009, as a mixed property under criteria: (i), (iii), (iv) and (vii). Comparative analysis not a key requirement. |
| Integrity | To check |
| Authenticity | To check |
| Protection and management | To check |
| Other | At its 33rd session, the Committee recommended a transboundary extension of the property to include the Albanian part of Lake Ohrid and its watershed, in order to strengthen the values and integrity of the property. In terms of cultural attributes, the key issues to be addressed in any extension is how far property on the shore can support the existing cultural criteria. |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Phase 1 | | | | | |
| Scope need for support with States Parties, following appointment of focal point(s) for the nomination | IUCN | Autumn 2011 | 3,400 | Cost depends on venue for required meeting, and does not include State Party costs if a joint meeting is required | |
| Question to State Party on the proposed scope of the extension and details of documentation on cultural attributes, vulnerabilities, in terms of development | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | --- | |
| Phase 2 | | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | | --- | 1,500 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for detailed analysis of boundary and buffer zone | ICOMOS | | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible management effectiveness assessment | WCPA | Before March 2012 | 11,300 | Likely to be required | |
| Other support: will require transboundary process | States Parties with support from IUCN and other actors (Ramsar?) | TBC, likely to be late 2011, or in 2012 | ~33,900 | Costs need to be defined by State Party. Difficult to define, depends on number of meetings | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS, IUCN and WHC | October 2012, at the earliest. | 4,250 | ICOMOS and IUCN will do this at no external cost |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------|--|

16. Pilot Project on the **Dinaric Karst Serial Nomination**, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Strong case in general, but detail should be confirmed in an early part of the process regarding the approach to site selection |
| Integrity | Status not known, and site selection needs to be done first. |
| Protection and management | Status not known, and site selection needs to be done first. |
| Other | Transboundary dialogue has already begun. The work required will need a significant process of transboundary cooperation to define the approach, select sites and develop the nomination. IUCN can provide technical support to that process. |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|--|---|---|---------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Scope need for support with States Parties, following appointment of focal point(s) for the nomination. | IUCN | Autumn 2011 | 3,400 | Cost depends on venue for required meeting, and does not include State Party costs if a joint meeting is required |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | --- | 1,500 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Technical support to mentor site selection and development of nomination, with appropriate technical support on comparative analysis | WCPA Cave and Karst Task force | 2011-2013 | ~ 22,500 | Difficult to judge at this stage. Assumes 10 000 a year for two years. Could be less if there is a willing WCPA volunteer, might be more |
| Possible management effectiveness assessment | WCPA | Before March 2012 | ~11,000 - 22,000 | Likely to be required, but costs depend on number of sites selected |
| Other support: transboundary process | States Parties with support from IUCN and other actors. | TBC, might be feasible in late 2011, or in 2012 | 34,000 | Costs need to be defined by State Party, and depends on number of meetings, phasing, site selection |
| Review of draft nomination | IUCN and WHC | October 2012, at the earliest. | 2,250 | IUCN will do this at no external cost. |

17. Pilot Project on the **Grenadine Island Group**, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Criteria | Requires comparative analysis at early stage to confirm basis for nomination focused on biodiversity criteria. Not known if ICOMOS input to be considered. |
| Integrity | Status not known. |
| Protection and management | Status not known. |
| Other | Status of transboundary dialogue not known; critical requirement. Understood to be an NGO that may be a good focus for technical support. Possible support from IUCN Caribbean programme. |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Scope need for support with States Parties, following appointment of focal point(s) for the nomination | IUCN and States Parties | Autumn 2011 at earliest | 3,400 | Cost depends on venue for required meeting, and does not include State Party costs if a joint meeting is required |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | --- | 2,500 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible comparative analysis support | WCMC/IUCN | Autumn 2011. | 4,000 | IUCN recommends this as an essential early requirement, an early screening might also be considered to inform stage 1 |
| Technical support to mentor site selection and development of nomination, with appropriate technical support on comparative analysis | WCPA | 2011-2013 | ~ 22,500 | Difficult to judge at this stage. Assumes 10 000 a year for two years. Could be less if there is a willing WCPA volunteer, might be more |
| Possible management effectiveness assessment | WCPA | Before March 2012 | 11,250 | Likely to be required |
| Other support: will require transboundary process | States Parties | TBC. | ~ 33,400 | Costs need to be defined by States Parties |
| Review of draft nomination | IUCN (with WHC) | October 2012, at the earliest. | 2,250 | IUCN will do this at no external cost |

18. Pilot Project on the **Cultural and Industrial Landscape of Fray Bentos**, Uruguay

SUMMARY OF THE BASIC FACTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Criteria | Criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) suggested |
| Integrity | The tentative list provides some details |
| Authenticity | The tentative list provides some details |
| Protection and Management | Full details are not known |
| Boundaries | The precise scope of the proposed nomination in relation to the industrial areas, housing ,port, recreational facilities is not known |

| Action required | Implementer | Timeframe | Estimated cost US\$ | Comment |
|---|-------------|--------------|---------------------|---|
| Phase 1 | | | | |
| Questions to State Party to clarify details of the proposed nomination in terms of scope, research, survey, documentation | ICOMOS | October 2011 | 3,000 | Tentative List indicated criteria (ii) (iv) (v) |
| Phase 2 | | | | |
| Specific training for the preparation of a complete nomination | WHC | --- | 2,500 | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for comparative analysis | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Possible support for conservation and restoration strategy | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome of phase 1 |
| Effectiveness of management | ICOMOS | --- | --- | Subject to outcome |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|-------|-------|---|
| and protection | | | | of phase 1 |
| Review of draft nomination | ICOMOS and WHC | . --- | 2,000 | ICOMOS will do this at no external cost |

V DRAFT DECISION

Draft Decision: 35 COM 12C

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/12C,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 12.III** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);
3. Welcomes all the actions undertaken to improve the processes and practices prior to consideration by the World Heritage Committee of a nomination (the 'upstream processes') and expresses its appreciation to States Parties for their collaboration in the selection of the proposed pilot projects and to the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre that prepared the feasibility studies;
4. Takes note of the pilot projects that have been chosen to implement this experimental approach and requests the States Parties concerned to nominate focal points for this purpose;
5. Also requests the States Parties concerned to fully collaborate providing technical and financial support to implement the required actions and encourages them to seek assistance from the World Heritage Fund, if necessary;
6. Calls upon the international community to provide technical and financial support to assist the States Parties concerned in the implementation of their pilot projects;
7. Further requests the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to report on the progress in implementing the pilot projects for consideration of the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session, in 2012.