

Distribution limited

**WHC-06/30.COM/9**

**Paris, 23 June 2006**

**Original: English/French**

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Thirtieth Session**

**Vilnius, Lithuania**

**8-16 July 2006**

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of Outstanding Universal Value**

This document provides background information on the discussion at the Expert meeting on the concept of outstanding universal value held in Kazan (2005) and the debate on the assessment of the recommendations and conclusions of such meeting during the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005). The papers by ICOMOS and IUCN on the application of the concept of outstanding universal value are presented in document *WHC-06/30.COM/INF.9*

**Draft Decision: 30 COM 9, see point III**

## I. Background

1. The World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004) requested by its Decision **28 COM 13.1**, the World Heritage Centre to convene a special meeting of experts of all regions on the concept of outstanding universal value, reflecting its increasing concern that this concept is interpreted and applied differently in different regions and by different stakeholders as well as the Advisory Bodies. The meeting was requested to make specific proposals for better identification of properties of potential outstanding universal value, for enabling less-represented and non-represented states to improve the quality of their nominations and thereby the success rate of inscriptions on the World Heritage List, and for enabling States Parties to identify sufficient funding sources for the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties.
2. By its Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.2**, the World Heritage Committee at its 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004) accepted the generous offer by the Russian Federation to host the meeting in Kazan (Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation) from 6 to 9 April 2005.
3. The *Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention: the concept of outstanding universal value*, whose mandate was established by the aforementioned Decision **28 COM 13.1**, took place from 6 to 9 April 2005 in Kazan (Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation).
4. Four papers prepared on the occasion of the Expert meeting by Mme Christina Cameron, former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, by the World Heritage Centre and by the Advisory Bodies were also presented at the meeting to guide the discussion of the experts.
5. Led by these presentations, the substantive discussions both in the plenary and in the working groups emphasized that the definition of outstanding universal value given by the *Operational Guidelines* (paragraphs 49-53) is based on the application of **criteria** defined by the Committee, which may change and have indeed changed over time.
6. Ms Cameron recalled the evolution in the application of the outstanding universal value over the first decades of the *World Heritage Convention*, from the original tendency to inscribe on the World Heritage List those properties which – for their uniqueness and wide recognition – could be perceived as iconic and whose value was unanimously acknowledged as *best of the best* to the gradual shift towards the *representative of the best*, which requested the inclusion within the nomination of a **comparative evaluation** of the property being nominated (see table presented below in point II).
7. Reflecting the results of the working group discussions and the plenary sessions, the experts adopted an elaborate set of recommendations, arising from a concern with maintaining rigor in the application of outstanding universal value, and which was subsequently reduced to a synoptic table indicating priorities and budgetary

implications and presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) in Document *WHC-05/29.COM/9*.

8. During the 29th session, a thorough debate took place during which 18 Committee members, 7 observers, and the Advisory Bodies intervened in acknowledging that the recommendations of the meeting included useful practical measures that needed to be implemented.
9. However, most of the interventions agreed that the Expert meeting had not fully addressed the concerns of the Committee regarding the different ways in which the concept of outstanding universal value had been assessed by ICOMOS and IUCN and also emphasized that even the Committee decisions had not always been consistent in assessing the proposed outstanding universal value of a property nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List.
10. In this regard, different delegations highlighted the consequent need to develop a *corpus* of past Committee decisions regarding the concept and the application of outstanding universal value so to define a case-law approach.
11. The majority of speakers also stressed the importance of wide participation by all stakeholders, local communities and indigenous people as one of the major outcomes of the above-mentioned recommendations.
12. Finally, also in consideration of the broad mandate given to the Special Expert Meeting and in view of the complexity of the concept to be discussed, it was unanimously agreed that the debate had not solved all the questions concerning the nature of outstanding universal value and that there was a consequent need to deepen the discussion.
13. The World Heritage Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) – in taking note of the recommendations resulting from the expert meeting and after having requested the Director of the World Heritage Centre to start implementing paragraphs 11 to 25 of the above-mentioned recommendations (see synoptic table and status of implementation in Annex 1 of the present document) – decided to further explore the concept of outstanding universal value at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), using as a guide paragraphs 6 to 9 of recommendations (Decision **29 COM 9.7**).
14. As concrete results of the “Kazan Recommendations”, two project proposals are submitted for funding from the World Heritage Fund for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee:
  - a) **A Series of World Heritage Resource Manuals** in line with the Recommendations 12.n) and 12.o);
  - b) **A pilot project to study the economic, social and environmental benefits of World Heritage Listing** in line with Recommendation 19.m;

Both proposals are presented in Annex 2 to the present document.

15. With the aim to steer the discussion and to appreciate the way the World Heritage Committee has evolved in terms of applying the notion of outstanding universal value in inscribing properties on the World Heritage List, a table is presented below (see point II), summarizing the evolution of the requirements set out to assess the justification for inscription over the years of implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, since the first properties were inscribed in 1978.
16. Also to ease the discussion, ICOMOS and IUCN prepared a paper which consolidates their technical advice to the World Heritage Committee and States Parties on the application of the concept of outstanding universal value with respect to the nomination of World Heritage properties (see Document *WHC-09/30.COM/INF.9*).

**II. Evolution in the requirements to justify the outstanding universal value according to the different versions of the Operational Guidelines**

17. The table aims to briefly illustrate the evolution in the World Heritage Committee's requirements to assess the outstanding universal value of a nominated property, from the very simple notification of criteria requested in the first years of implementation of the *Convention*, in conformity with the first version of the *Operational Guidelines* (1977), up to the **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value** now requested by the latest revised text of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005).

<b>Operational Guidelines version and relevant paragraph</b>	<b>Justification for Inscription within the Nomination Format according to the Operational Guidelines</b>	<b>Sample of a relevant Decision of the WH Committee</b>
1977 version, par. 13, (v) (unmodified in 1978)	<u>Justification for inclusion in the World Heritage List</u>  For cultural property: The justification should be based on the <b>criteria</b> listed in paragraph 7	<b>2 COM 38</b>  <i>The Committee, upon finding itself in full agreement with the list proposed by the Bureau, decided to enter the following 12 properties in the World Heritage List</i>
1980 version, par. 33, (v) (unmodified in 1983 and 1986)	<u>Justification for inclusion in the World Heritage List</u>  "All relevant information to be provided to demonstrate that the property nominated is of " <b>outstanding universal value</b> " in terms of the criteria adopted by the Committee. Statement is to include a <b>comparative evaluation</b> of properties of the same type or having similar features which are found in other countries".	<b>6 COM VIII.20</b>  <i>The Committee decided to enter in the World Heritage List the twenty-four cultural and natural properties which had been re-commended by the Bureau</i>

<p>1988 version, par. <b>52</b>, (e), unmodified in 1992, 1994 and 1996)</p>	<p><u>Justification for inclusion in the World Heritage List</u></p> <p>“Information should be provided under three separate headings as follows: i) the reasons for which the property is considered to meet one or more of the <b>criteria</b> set out under paragraphs 24 and 36 above [which became paragraphs 24 and 44 in the 1994, 1995 and 1996 versions of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>], ii) an evaluation of the property’s present <b>state of preservation as compared with similar properties elsewhere</b>; iii) indications as to the <b>authenticity</b> of the property”</p>	<p><b>14 COM A</b></p> <p>Palaces and Parks C (i)(ii)(iv) of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany) Mount Huangshan N (iii)(iv) C (ii) (China);</p>
<p>1997 version, par. <b>64</b>, 2, (unmodified in 2002)</p>	<p><u>Justification for inscription</u></p> <p><b>Statement of significance</b> Possible <b>comparative analysis</b> (including state of conservation of similar sites) <b>Authenticity/Integrity</b> <b>Criteria</b> under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)</p>	<p><b>29 COM 8B.49</b></p> <p>The World Heritage Committee inscribes the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (vi): Criterion (vi): With the “renaissance” of the Old Bridge and its surroundings, the symbolic power and meaning of the City of Mostar - as an exceptional and universal symbol of coexistence of communities from diverse cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds - has been reinforced and strengthened, underlining the unlimited efforts of human solidarity for peace and powerful co-operation in the face of overwhelming catastrophes.</p>
<p>2005 version, par. <b>132</b>, 3<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><u>Justification for inscription</u></p> <p>This section shall indicate the World Heritage <b>criteria</b> (see Paragraph 77) under which the property is proposed, together with a clearly stated argument for the use of each criterion. Based on the criteria, a proposed <b>Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</b> (see paragraphs 49-53 and 155) of the property prepared by the State Party shall make clear why the property is considered to merit inscription on the World Heritage List. A <b>comparative analysis</b> of the property in relation to similar properties, whether or not on the World Heritage List, both at the national and international levels, shall also be provided. The comparative analysis shall explain the importance of the nominated property in its national and international context. <b>Statements of integrity and/or authenticity</b> shall be included and shall demonstrate how the property satisfies the conditions outlined in paragraphs 78-95.</p>	<p><b>The properties to be inscribed in conformity with the revised Nomination Format as set up by the 2005 version of the Operational Guidelines will be considered by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (2007)</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> The **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value** should include a summary of the Committee's determination that the property has outstanding universal value, identifying the criteria under which the property was inscribed, including the assessments of the conditions of integrity or authenticity, and of the requirements for protection and management in force. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value shall be the basis for the future protection and management of the property (paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines* (2005)).

### III. Draft Decision

#### Draft Decision: 30 COM 9

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/9,*
2. *Takes note with satisfaction of the outcomes reflected in the papers presented by IUCN and ICOMOS contained in Document WHC-06/30.COM/INF.9;*
3. *Acknowledges the debate which took place at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006);*
4. *Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre in close co-operation with the Advisory Bodies to undertake a careful review of past Committee decisions – both concerning the inscription or not of properties on the World Heritage List and how they relate to the recommendation from the Advisory Bodies – with the objective to define a case-law approach to the question of applying the concept of outstanding universal value through the World Heritage criteria and to set up a searchable database of past decisions of the World Heritage Committee concerning nominations;*
5. *Requests the Advisory Bodies to undertake a joint study on the application of the World Heritage criteria as to develop practical guidance for the process of identifying and evaluating different types of properties of potential Outstanding Universal Value;*
6. *Approves the budget of USD 40,000 to start preparing the **Series of World Heritage Resource Manuals** from the World Heritage Fund as proposed in the Annex 2 of Document WHC-06/30.COM/9;*
7. *Welcomes the proposal for the **Pilot Project to study the economic, social and environmental benefits of World Heritage Listing** and encourages the World Heritage Centre to seek extrabudgetary funds for its implementation.*

**Synoptic table of recommendations and status of implementation**

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications	Status of implementation	Status of implementation	Status of implementation
						World Heritage Centre	ICOMOS	IUCN
<b><i>OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE</i></b>								
Development of corpus of past Committee decisions and discussions on outstanding universal value	7.g	High	2006	WHCentre	Regular programme	WHC/IMS has implemented an online decisions database to allow advanced searching		IUCN: commenced a study examining case law of decisions regarding natural WH properties.
Dissemination of information concerning the effects of merging criteria and definition of outstanding universal value <sup>2</sup>	9.a and b	High	2006	WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	Regular programme	WHC/SIDS in collaboration with Havana and Kingston Offices organized Sub-regional Conference “Outstanding Universal Value, Authenticity & Integrity in a Caribbean Context” (Barbados, May 2006).  Marine Programme is working with IUCN and WCPA Marine to	ICOMOS is planning guidance for cultural landscape nominations, in collaboration with the WHCentre and IUCN, which will address the potential for merging criteria.	IUCN: has revised and updated its strategic advice in relation to OUV and this has been submitted to the WH Centre (May, 2006) for distribution to the WH Committee.

<sup>2</sup> Also see column under *Operational Guidelines* below.

Annex 1

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications	Status of implementation World Heritage Centre	Status of implementation ICOMOS	Status of implementation IUCN
						develop guidance on application of OUV to new marine site nominations		
Application of authenticity to natural properties (study)	8.b	Low	Long term	IUCN	US\$ 10,000 Extrabudget.			IUCN: no work has commenced on this as it depends on additional funding.
<b>TENTATIVE LISTS</b>								
34 States Parties with no Tentative Lists to request preparatory assistance to prepare Tentative Lists	12.i	High	2006-2007	WHCentre and States Parties	WH Fund (preparatory assistance and participation programme)	6 States Parties which had no TL submitted Tentative Lists (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea)		
Two regional meetings per year on harmonization of Tentative Lists	12.j	High	2006-2007	States Parties, WHCentre, Regional offices, Advisory Bodies	US\$ 30,000 (per meeting / two meetings proposed per year) States Parties and WH Fund (Regional programmes and Action Plans follow-up to Periodic Reporting)	Three Sub-regional meetings in North and South East Asia, Central Asia and South Asia included a component on the harmonization of TL  Follow-up to regional harmonization meetings in the Baltic Region, Caucasus and Central Europe under way	ICOMOS participated in a meeting to address the coordination of Tentative Lists in Central Asia in late 2005 and will also participate in a follow-up meeting in October, 2006 to progress a possible Silk Road serial nomination for Central Asia	

Annex 1

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications	Status of implementation World Heritage Centre	Status of implementation ICOMOS	Status of implementation IUCN
						Marine Programme organized a regional meeting for the Caribbean which recommended organization of a regional meeting of harmonizing tentative lists for the Caribbean focusing on natural heritage		
Upon request from States Parties, Advisory Bodies to provide comments on Tentative Lists	12.m	High	2006-2007	Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$ 5,000 per request</i> (assuming only provision of technical comments and not involvement in Tentative Lists process)		ICOMOS has so far not received requests to comment on Tentative Lists	IUCN has provided input, particularly through the suggestion of technical expertise to assist some countries, such as Canada and countries in the Pacific in the preparation of their tentative lists.
Advisory Bodies to carry out and complete thematic studies	12.k	High	Long term	Advisory Bodies	Advisory Bodies budget	WHC/LAC organized with FIT/Spain the 1st Expert Meeting on Rock Art in the Caribbean (Guadeloupe, May 2006).	ICOMOS is completing a Thematic Study for Rock Art in Latin America and the Caribbean, the first of a global series; the second of the series on North Africa is now being commissioned. ICOMOS is working	IUCN has continued its work on thematic studies and has completed its framework study on geology.

## Annex 1

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications	Status of implementation	Status of implementation	Status of implementation
						World Heritage Centre	ICOMOS	IUCN
							with the WHC on planning a Thematic Study of Pacific Cultural Landscapes	
Establishment of a coordination mechanism in the preparation and review of Tentative Lists	12.a	Medium	2006-2007	States Parties, WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	No financial implications	WHC/IMS has implemented an online Tentative Lists database to allow easier viewing and querying of tentative lists		
<b>NOMINATIONS</b>								
Access to information readily available including databases	15.d	High	Long term	States Parties WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	No financial implications  Additional \$50,000 being requested	WHC/IMS has put several databases online (Tentative Lists, Decisions) and is working on more (nominations)  The Retrospective Inventory is gathering baseline data which will be suitable for sharing with the Advisory Bodies and the 2nd cycle of periodic reporting through an online database. This information is already being shared with the Advisory Bodies.	ICOMOS is collaborating with the WHC to optimise the resources of its Documentation Centre	IUCN thematic studies are a valuable source of information in preparing new nominations. They are available at <a href="http://www.iucn.org/wcpa">www.iucn.org/wcpa</a>
Training manual with best	12.n,	Medium	2007	WHCentre	<i>Additional</i>	Examples of good	ICOMOS has prepared	IUCN has completed a

**Annex 1**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Execution</b>	<b>Budgetary implications</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>World Heritage Centre</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>ICOMOS</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>IUCN</b>
practices of TL/nominations/comparative analysis/management plans/ explanations for property owners and stakeholders on benefits and obligations of nominations	12.o, 14.e and 16.a			and Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$15,000 per year</i> are required under the training contract for Advisory Bodies.	nominations, Tentative Lists and management Plans widely disseminated across Asia and the Pacific  Extrabudgetary Funding for the Publication of the Management Guidelines for Cultural Landscapes provided with FIT/Netherlands  Marine Programme developed guidance for marine nomination preparation – to be included in IUCN training manual	a brief for projects to develop guidance manuals on Nominations for Cultural Properties and on Sustainable Conservation and Management for Cultural Properties, for which it is seeking funding; it considers this work to be high priority.	draft manual on preparing nominations on natural sites which will be available at the Committee Meeting for SPs to test and use as required.
Audiovisual information for all stakeholders on the process of preparation of nominations	16.c	Medium	Long term	WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$40,000</i> Extrabudget.	Resource materials including power-point presentations on the process for the preparation of Nomination presented and disseminated to Pacific States Parties		
Harmonization, as far as possible, of procedures amongst Advisory Bodies	17.e	Medium	Long term	Advisory Bodies	No financial implications		ICOMOS and IUCN both follow the revised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	

## Annex 1

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications	Status of implementation	Status of implementation	Status of implementation
						World Heritage Centre	ICOMOS	IUCN
Training and capacity-building of potential regional evaluators	17.f	Medium	Long term	Advisory Bodies	<i>US\$20,000 per training session</i>		ICOMOS appoints, wherever possible, evaluators from the Region in which the nomination is based. It is actively seeking to extend its pool of evaluators and their capacity building	IUCN implemented a training workshop, funded by the SP of Germany, for evaluators in the Island of Vilm (November 2005) which also involved experts from the WH Centre.
Regional thematic studies to identify and foster nominations	18.c	Medium	Long term	Advisory Bodies	Advisory Bodies budget	Regional workshop held in Vanuatu (Sept. 2005) to identify thematic framework for cultural nominations in the Pacific region  Marine workshop held for Caribbean in March 2005 by WH Marine Programme	See above	
Mentoring programmes amongst States Parties as a tool for sharing information on a regional basis	18.g	Medium	Long term	States Parties	States Parties			
<b><i>SUSTAINABLE CONSERVATION</i></b>								
Consideration of WH properties in danger as a priority for international co-operation	19.b	High	Long term	WH Committee and States Parties	Extrabudget.			
To present budgetary provisions within the nomination dossier to	20.a	Medium	Long term	States Parties	No financial implications			

**Annex 1**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Execution</b>	<b>Budgetary implications</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>World Heritage Centre</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>ICOMOS</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>IUCN</b>
ensure human and financial resources on a long term basis for sustainable conservation								
Promotion of preventative conservation of WH properties and of the importance of respecting existing protection laws and management plans	19.e	Medium	Long term	WH Committee and WHCentre	Regular programme	WHC/LAC organized a workshop on limestone conservation, Tikal, Guatemala, Nov. 2005  All UNF projects for natural sites		
Involvement of all stakeholders in management of WH properties and establishment of a prize for the best site manager	19.g	Medium	Long term	WH Committee and WHCentre	Extrabudget.	Melina Mercouri Prize for the Management of Cultural Landscapes (Greece) was transferred to the WH Centre		
Identification of clear benchmarks to improve Periodic Reports	19.h	Medium	2007 (reflection year)	WHCentre	Regular programme and WHFund (analysis of Periodic Reports)	2 meetings held on Reflection Year		
Develop a pilot project to study the economic, social and environmental benefits of heritage conservation	19.m	Medium	Long term	WH Committee WHCentre and Advisory Bodies	US\$50,000 Extrabudget.		ICOMOS is collaborating in the development of a pilot project which could offer suggestions for a more global assessment	
Coordination of national and international fundraising to avoid overlap; promotion and dissemination of the concept of	20.e	Medium	Long term	WH Committee States Parties and	States Parties, Regular programme, Extrabudget.	Coordination of national and international fundraising to avoid		

**Annex 1**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Execution</b>	<b>Budgetary implications</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>World Heritage Centre</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>ICOMOS</b>	<b>Status of implementation</b> <b>IUCN</b>
“heritage foundation”				WHCentre		overlap is done through the ICC for Angkor		
Compilation and dissemination of best practices of management of WH properties and other UNESCO programmes	21.a	Medium	Long term	WH Centre and Advisory Bodies	Regular programme	Marine programme collaborating on this with NOAA and WCPA Marine in relation to marine sites	ICOMOS considers that this has high priority and can be addressed through the developing of Guidance on Sustainable Management and Conservation of WH Properties. ICOMOS is requesting extra-budgetary funding in order to commission such a Guidance Manual for cultural properties. This would complement the one being produced by IUCN for natural sites.	
Creation of a local, regional and/or international networks of site managers, local communities, scientific researchers and AB’s regional experts	19.c	Medium	Long term	States Parties, WH Centre and Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Marine Programme has promoted networking among site managers and a sub-regional network of managers has been established in the Eastern Pacific (Galapagos, Cocos, Coiba, Malpelo)	ICOMOS supports one of the outcomes of the Periodic Reporting process to foster a network of WH Coordinators in order to share best practice on management.	
Regional workshops on conservation issues involving the already existing regional expertise	19.d	Medium	Long term	States Parties, WH Centre, and	<i>US\$25,000 per regional workshop</i>	Regional workshops scheduled in the framework of follow-up	ICOMOS will be participating in a regional Workshop on	

Annex 1

Recommendations	Ref	Priority	Deadline	Execution	Budgetary implications	Status of implementation World Heritage Centre	Status of implementation ICOMOS	Status of implementation IUCN
				Advisory Bodies	Extrabudget.	to Periodic Reporting;  Persepolis International workshop on Management of Cultural Landscapes (May-June 2006)  WH marine training workshop for the Caribbean (St Lucia March 2006) involved a number of regional experts and organizations	Rock art in Latin America and the Caribbean; it has contributed to workshops on Cultural Landscapes in South America and Iran. ICOMOS National Committees run conservation workshops and ICOMOS is encouraging collaboration at regional level. ICOMOS is also encouraging its International Scientific Committees to organise regional conservation workshops on WH themes	
<b><i>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES<sup>3</sup></i></b>								
Broader dissemination of the new OGs and its major changes (merge of criteria, nomination format, serial and transnational properties)		High	2007	WHC	Regular programme  Voluntary contribution from Oman	Basic Texts published in English and French  Basic Texts translated and published in Arabic		

<sup>3</sup> This priority action has been added since some of the recommendations referred to here above could be implemented through a broader dissemination and effective enforcement of the *Operational Guidelines*

**Annex 1**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Execution</b>	<b>Budgetary implications</b>	<b>Status of implementation World Heritage Centre</b>	<b>Status of implementation ICOMOS</b>	<b>Status of implementation IUCN</b>
					through the WHFund and Regular Programme	OGs now online and widely disseminated via world wide web  New OGs were presented at three sub-regional meetings in the Asia-Pacific region		
Separate chapter on management in OGs when next revised	19.a	Low	Long term	WH Committee and WHCentre	No financial implications			

## Project proposals arising from the Kazan Recommendations

### 1. A Series of World Heritage Resource Manuals

The Global Training Strategy for World Heritage and various international expert meetings, including that on ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ held in Kazan, Russia (April 2005), recognise a critical need for more guidance to States Parties on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. The results of the periodic reporting process also clearly show the need for more focused training and capacity development, particularly for large and complex cultural landscapes and natural sites. The Advisory Bodies, through their specific roles in monitoring and evaluating sites and arranging training workshops, are increasingly aware of areas where States Parties and World Heritage site managers require greater support.

While the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre have limited resources and capacity to contribute to the enormous global need in this area, there are a multitude of organizations and institutions in all regions specialising in training and capacity building for heritage management and conservation. An emphasis on strategic partnering to engage these institutions in supporting the identified needs of States Parties in the implementation of the *Convention* is therefore required. At the same time, the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre do have a unique role and specialized capacity in providing guidance on certain issues unique to the *Convention*, for example in preparing nominations.

As a result it is proposed that a focused and limited series of World Heritage Resource Manuals should be developed. It is proposed that these Manuals would seek to consolidate guidance on specific issues, link this to the requirements of the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*, and make it available in an accessible manner for practitioners and policy-makers alike. As Resource Manuals, rather than training modules, they would draw together the variety of resources already available (e.g. statutory records, advisory body publications, guidance from other agencies etc.) in written and electronic format, and be designed as tools for:

- Self-guided learning - for practitioners (e.g. site managers, NGO partners) and policy-makers;
- Training workshops - for use by trainers, resource persons and participants; and
- Briefing and educating stakeholders - from communities to decision-makers.

The Manuals would be in the form of a short printed document supplemented by a CD-ROM of key materials, including for trainers, as well as being available on the internet. The original versions of the Manuals would be in French and English, while the translations and the production in other languages would depend on the funding made available.

An Editorial Board consisting of members from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre would be established to deal with questions of both substance and presentation. While the Series should immediately be identifiable as a part of World Heritage publications, it would not be part of the existing World Heritage Papers Series. World Heritage Centre would propose a layout and submit it for decision by the Editorial Board.

Following a meeting of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in January 2006, and based on preliminary outcomes of the Periodic Reporting process, it is proposed that the series of Resource Manuals may include the following titles:

- Guidance on preparing World Heritage Nominations
- Guidance on Conservation and Management of World Heritage properties
- Introduction to the *Convention*, including issues of compliance, understanding the *Convention*, as an ‘induction kit’ for people concerned by a new World Heritage property designation;
- A Guide to Periodic Reporting (following decision on the new process in 2007)
- Guidelines for the presentation / interpretation of World Heritage properties

The Advisory Bodies are already working on the first two in this series providing guidance on preparing World Heritage nominations and management plans for natural and cultural properties, and through broad consultation and field tests, will use the lessons learnt to develop the most appropriate approach, design, and lay-out, and to combine guidance on natural and cultural heritage where appropriate.

The series may also include a set of *Resource Briefs* - short guidance (2-5 pages) for different audiences (e.g. for local communities) on key issues (e.g. what World Heritage designation means).

Overall, with its own special ‘niche’ and ‘look’, the series would provide a core set of best practice guidelines for the implementation of the *Convention*. Particular attention would be made, however, to ensure that the series is not used to cover all areas of training and capacity building in heritage management and conservation, and it does not repeat guidance available elsewhere.

The provisional budget for the preparation of one Resource Manual is estimated as follows (but would vary depending on a number of factors):

Drafting and editing of Manual	US\$ 20,000
Field testing and consultation (one workshop)	US\$ 20,000
Lay-out and printing of English and French	US\$ 30,000
Translation (per language)	US\$ 10,000
Mailing and distribution (1000 – 2000 copies)	US\$ 5,000
Project coordination	US\$ 10,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>US\$ 95,000</b>

The amount required to produce each of these manuals could be raised from a variety of sources. For example, the field testing might be supported through international assistance to a specific State Party, while other States Parties may be requested to consider covering translation costs. The preparation of the manuals will need to be the subject of an extra allocation to the relevant Advisory Body(ies).

## **2. Pilot project to study the economic, social and environmental benefits of World Heritage listing**

### **A. Background and justification**

1. At its 29th session, the World Heritage Committee, by its Decision 29 COM 9, Paragraph 6, requested the Director of the World Heritage Centre to start implementing paragraphs 11 to 25 of the recommendations of the *Special Expert Meeting of the World Heritage Convention: the concept of Outstanding Universal Value* (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005).

2. Recommendation 19.m. to develop a pilot project to study scientifically the economic, social and environmental benefits of World Heritage listing and conservation is of crucial importance. Indeed, these findings could be used to make necessary arguments to international, regional and national funding agencies as to why they should fund heritage conservation as part of the sustainable development process. This is also a key project to demonstrate how the *Convention* has helped in the implementation of Goals 1 and 7 of the UN Millennium Development Goals which aim to eradicate extreme poverty and ensure environmental sustainability. This recommendation would furthermore serve to demonstrate clearly the links between World Heritage and biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.

3. Recent thorough analyses of quantitative and qualitative data held at the World Heritage Centre and contacts with key organizations such as ICOMOS, the World Bank and the World Tourism Organisation have highlighted the immense lack of data on the socio-economic and environmental benefits of World Heritage listing and conservation.

### **B. objectives and activities**

4. The objectives of this project are:

- to produce evidences for the social, economic and environmental direct and indirect benefits of World Heritage listing based on at least five pilot sites located in all the UNESCO regions
- to make necessary arguments to international, regional and national funding agencies as to why they should fund heritage conservation as part of the sustainable development process
- to develop a method to identify benchmarks and indicators to assess the social, economic and environmental benefits of World Heritage listing
- to disseminate widely the results of this practical research through publication and
- to provide States Parties with models to help them to optimise beneficial impacts of World Heritage listing and minimise negative costs and impacts.

5. This project will be undertaken in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre's regional desks, the Sustainable Tourism Programme, the Forum UNESCO Universities and Heritage, UNESCO Science Sector (Man and Biosphere programme), the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the three Advisory Bodies and other key organizations such as UNDP or the World Bank.

6. Activities planned include, in the first phase, consultation of States Parties to help in the collection of background data and in the identification of one pilot project per region. During this first phase, extrabudgetary funds will also be actively looked for. Further, in-depth analyses would, in a second phase, be conducted at these sites in close collaboration

with concerned stakeholders. During that phase, benchmarks and indicators would be built based on scientific data collected on each site and provided by States Parties. As far as possible, these benchmarks and indicators should be replicable to other World Heritage sites. The third phase would consist in the preparation of a publication based on the results of this project. This publication would aim to disseminate widely the results of this project and make a series of recommendations for creating necessary conditions for optimising the economic, social and environmental benefits of World Heritage listing and conservation and minimising negative costs and impacts.