



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

43 COM

WHC/19/43.COM/9B

Paris, 7 June 2019

Original: English

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Forty-third session

**Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan
30 June - 10 July 2019**

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Global Strategy for a representative,
balanced and credible World Heritage List**

9B. Progress report on the reflection on processes for mixed nominations

SUMMARY

This document is presented in accordance with Decision **41 COM 9B**, which took note of the proposals of IUCN and ICOMOS to improve evaluation processes for mixed sites and which requested them to continue to implement those proposals, subject to available time and resources and in coordination with the World Heritage Centre, and to report back on progress at the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2019.

Draft Decision: 43 COM 9B, see point II.

I. BACKGROUND

1. By Decision **41 COM 9B**, the Committee reiterated that due to the complexity of mixed site nominations, and their evaluation, States Parties should ideally seek prior advice from IUCN and ICOMOS if possible at least two years before a potential nomination is submitted, in accordance with Paragraph 122 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Committee also took note of the proposals of IUCN and ICOMOS to improve evaluation processes for mixed sites, and encouraged them to continue their efforts towards setting up a harmonised evaluation process for mixed nominations, subject to available time and resources, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre. Consequently, this document, prepared by IUCN and ICOMOS in consultation with the World Heritage Centre, presents a progress report concerning options for changes to the criteria and to the Advisory Body evaluation process for mixed nominations.
2. It is to be noted that more and better-conceived nominations for mixed sites have been submitted over the last few years, since there is increasing recognition that both cultural and natural values are inherent to the representation of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of a site and that their attributes should be managed in an integrated way. However, many problems occur when the protection and management implications of nominations of mixed sites are not fully considered, and thus, whilst the Advisory Bodies can play their role in improving the evaluation processes, this is not sufficient to compensate for situations where States Parties present nominations that are not well conceived according to the requirements of a nomination under both natural and cultural criteria.
3. ICOMOS and IUCN are exploring potential approaches for improving the integrated consideration and management of natural and cultural values and attributes through the innovative project entitled “Connecting Practice”, which is in its third phase (since May 2018). The project aims to explore, learn about and create new methods of recognition and support for the interconnected character of the natural, cultural and social values of World Heritage. This phase focuses on biocultural practices, agricultural sites and management of changes. A questionnaire for World Heritage site managers is being launched on the understanding and integration of cultural and natural concepts into the management of World Heritage properties and how to strengthen their resilience. The World Heritage Leadership Programme, led by ICCROM and IUCN, with the cooperation of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, is also building on these needs in the work it has undertaken to develop more integrated management and assessment tools, and in capacity building.
4. Notable progress has been made since the Committee, at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015), identified specific actions as well a series of changes in the approach to be implemented to the extent possible to those actions with low or no resource implications. Actions identified by the Committee at its 41st session (Krakow, 2017) that required financial implications have not progressed significantly due to lack of resources.
5. Further opportunities to develop proposals to improve IUCN and ICOMOS work on mixed nominations, as noted by the Committee at its 41st session, would require amendments to the current evaluation processes and would have operational, timeframe and budgetary implications. It is important to note that the full implementation of integrated approaches to evaluation and management of World Heritage properties will, in due course, necessitate changes to working methods and the *Operational Guidelines*.

6. The table below provides an update regarding the activities implemented since the 41st session:

Action	39 COM status	41 COM status	43 COM status	Resource implications	Comments
Tentative Lists: Where upstream advice is requested on potential mixed nominations, IUCN and ICOMOS should work together to provide coordinated advice.	Not current practice	Not current practice	Current standard practice	Moderate	Workshops organised at national level to update Tentative List are usually attended by ICOMOS and IUCN experts. The reform introduced on the Upstream Process implies upstream coordinated advice from IUCN and ICOMOS for mixed nominations.
Briefings and communication with States Parties: For mixed sites in order to undertake a shared evaluation process, all communication with the nominating States Parties should be coordinated, including letters or other communications.	Mostly current practice	Current standard practice	Current standard practice	Low	ICOMOS and IUCN now coordinate their communication to the States Parties nominating mixed sites throughout the evaluation process, notably for the planning of field mission and with a joint Interim Report or request for additional information.
Joint missions: The current practice that all evaluation field missions to mixed sites should be undertaken jointly by IUCN and ICOMOS should be continued.	Current standard practice	Current standard practice	Current standard practice	None	This remains standard practice. States Parties should identify one single focal point for the joint planning of the mission to facilitate its preparation.
Joint briefing of mission teams: Mission teams should be briefed jointly by IUCN and ICOMOS prior to their field visits to the site.	Mostly current practice	Current standard practice	Current standard practice	Low	ICOMOS and IUCN now organize a joint briefing call for the cultural and natural field experts prior to their departure on the field.

<p>Mission team itineraries: The itineraries for missions to mixed sites should be devised jointly by the nominating State Party, IUCN and ICOMOS. The experts should spend the large majority of their time on the mission together, and should not have separate itineraries during the mission.</p>	<p>Mostly current practice</p>	<p>Current standard practice</p>	<p>Current standard practice</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The field mission agenda is now agreed between the nominating State Party, ICOMOS, IUCN and their respective field experts, including one joint itinerary for both experts.</p>
<p>Requests for additional information on nominations: All requests for additional information from States Parties made by IUCN and/or ICOMOS should be agreed jointly between the Advisory Bodies.</p>	<p>Mostly current practice</p>	<p>Current standard practice</p>	<p>Current standard practice</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Requests for additional information are now made in a coordinated process by ICOMOS and IUCN. In some cases, ICOMOS and IUCN will request supplementary information prior to or just after the field mission. All information received is shared between both Advisory Bodies. Requests for additional information after the IUCN and ICOMOS Panels are made by the Interim Report letter that is now jointly prepared by IUCN and ICOMOS.</p>
<p>Desk reviews: Desk reviews should be sought according to a common approach and should be shared between IUCN and ICOMOS.</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Some progress, but not current practice</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Progress has been made in relation to sharing desk reviews which is done now systematically before each ICOMOS and IUCN Panel meetings for mixed nominations. Additional time and resources are needed to make further progress to harmonise the desk review formats and methods.</p>

<p>Harmonisation of approaches to mission reports: To the extent possible, IUCN and ICOMOS should seek to harmonise their mission reports.</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Implementation would need time for reflection and design as well as a harmonised system. There may be some limits to the usefulness of harmonisation due to the diversity of mixed sites.</p>
<p>Interaction of IUCN and ICOMOS World Heritage Panels: All mixed site evaluations should be preceded by a joint briefing of both Panels on the results of the missions and reviews.</p>	<p>Mostly current practice, but could be further elaborated and formalized</p>	<p>Mostly current practice</p>	<p>Mostly current practice</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Full implementation of this interaction requires at least additional dedicated professional time for mixed sites nominations, and ideally an increase in resources to support Panel meetings in both IUCN and ICOMOS. There are also timing issues as both Panels occur at a similar time of year.</p> <p>A phone call between ICOMOS and IUCN officers in charge is held during the time of their respective Panels to share information and input on mixed nominations and some Cultural Landscapes.</p>
<p>Possible joint IUCN / ICOMOS Panel for mixed sites: Ideally for mixed sites (and perhaps also other sites where nature/culture interaction is notable) a joint IUCN / ICOMOS Panel could be envisaged either to address the whole evaluation, or to complete the evaluations after the first IUCN and ICOMOS Panels in December.</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>Not current practice</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>This would likely need more time in the evaluation process to work effectively. Changes to Annex 6 of the Operational Guidelines would be needed if this was to be implemented.</p> <p>Further resources would be required to implement what would be a logistically challenging and time-consuming practice.</p>

<p>Harmonised recommendations / draft decisions: IUCN and ICOMOS should produce jointly agreed recommendations for mixed site evaluations.</p>	<p>Not current practice, except after the end of the evaluation process</p>	<p>Not current practice, except after the end of the evaluation process</p>	<p>Not current practice, except after the end of the evaluation process</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Harmonised recommendations: this should be amended to allow for a discussion of harmonisation between the first and second panel meetings.</p> <p>Harmonised draft decisions: Currently managed by the World Heritage Centre with IUCN and ICOMOS after the release of the evaluations.</p>
---	---	---	---	-----------------	--

7. It should be noted that while progress has been made on actions with low resource implications, little progress has been made for actions with moderate to high resource implications, particularly actions towards a common approach for desk reviews, a joint IUCN/ICOMOS panel and a single jointly agreed decision for mixed site evaluations as no additional resources have been allocated to these actions.
8. At its 38th session (Doha, 2014), the Committee underlined that the lack of consideration by States Parties of the pertinence of mixed site nominations and their specific requirements could be a frequent cause of problems. Consequently, the World Heritage Committee stressed that mixed site nominations should be a priority for seeking advice from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, well before the preparation of the nomination. The recent introduction of the Upstream Process request format could assist in ensuring early and coordinated advice from IUCN and ICOMOS for mixed nominations resulting in more robust nominations. However, the resource implications in relation to this activity need to be fully assessed and recognised.
9. All stakeholders involved in the implementation of the *Convention*, including the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should promote the consistent use of the Upstream Process for mixed sites, whilst recognising that the final decision to seek such advice lies with the State Party concerned.
10. As the nomination process is currently being reviewed and discussed in detail, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the reflection on processes for mixed nominations be included into this wider discussion. For example, the Ad-hoc Working Group is currently discussing the possibility of a two-phase process for the evaluation of nominations, which would formalise the need for both ICOMOS and IUCN to provide earlier advice on mixed nominations. The Advisory Bodies, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre, are committed to sustaining the progress made and to implement further actions, subject to the availability of time and resources in particular with regard to Tentative Lists.

II. DRAFT DECISION

Draft Decision: 43 COM 9B

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/19/43.COM/9B,
2. Recalling Decisions **38 COM 9B**, **39 COM 9B** and **41 COM 9B** adopted at its 38th (Doha, 2014), 39th (Bonn, 2015) and 41th (Krakow, 2017) sessions respectively,
3. Welcomes the report of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on proposals to improve the preparation and evaluation of mixed World Heritage nominations;
4. Reiterates that due to the complexity of mixed site nominations and their evaluation, States Parties should ideally seek prior advice from IUCN and ICOMOS, if possible at least two years before a potential nomination is submitted, in compliance with Paragraph 122 of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Recognises the progress made by the Advisory Bodies over the past two years and encourages them to continue their efforts towards setting up a harmonised evaluation process for mixed nominations;
6. Calls upon States Parties interested to consider providing support to this initiative that requires additional resources;
7. Notes the ongoing reflection on reforming the nomination and evaluation process;
8. Requests ICOMOS and IUCN to continue to consider possibilities for further enhancements of evaluation processes for mixed site nominations within the framework of the ongoing reflection.