



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

# World Heritage

# 16 GA

Distribution Limited

**WHC-07/16.GA/9**  
Paris, 15 October 2007  
Original: English/French

## UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

### SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters  
24 – 25 October 2007  
Room XI

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Progress in the implementation of the  
Global strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage  
List**

#### SUMMARY

This document contains:

- I. Background
- II. Implementation of the Global Strategy, 2003-2007
- III. Statistical analysis of the current Tentative Lists and the World Heritage List over the period 1994-2007
- IV. Draft Resolution

**Draft Resolution: 16 GA 9, see Point IV**

## I. Background

1. The Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1994 (<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/global94.htm>), provides a broad framework for an analysis and action programme designed to identify and fill the major gaps in the World Heritage List. The Global Strategy relies on regional and thematic reviews and analyses of categories of heritage of outstanding universal value, encourages more countries to become States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* and to develop good Tentative Lists and suitable nominations of properties for inscription on the List.
2. The Global Strategy proposed specifically to “move away from a purely architectural view of the cultural heritage of humanity towards one which was much more anthropological, multi-functional and universal”.
3. It is important to recall that the Global Strategy first focused on cultural heritage in 1994 and was then in 1996 enlarged to encompass natural heritage with the Expert Meeting on Evaluation of general principles and Criteria for Nominations of Natural World Heritage sites (Parc de la Vanoise, France, 22-24 March 1996; WHC.96/CONF.201/INF.08, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/vanoise.htm>). This meeting was “understood to be a first step in the process of developing an overall Global Strategy”.
4. As the main goal of the 1994 Global Strategy has been to ensure a more representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, this document will focus only on those aspects of the Global Strategy directly relevant to improving those three characteristics attributed to the List. As such, it is important to recall that:

**Representativity** refers to: *ensuring representation on the World Heritage List of properties of outstanding universal value from all regions* (2000 Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List);

**Balance** refers to: *ensuring that key bio-geographical regions or events in the history of life are reflected in the World Heritage List* (Expert Meeting Parc de La Vanoise, 1996; WHC.96/CONF.201/INF.08);

**Credibility** refers to: *ensuring a rigorous application of the criteria established by the Committee for both inscription and management, and ensuring representativity and balance of sites, in order that the World Heritage List as a whole is not undermined* (Expert Meeting Parc de La Vanoise, 1996; WHC.96/CONF.201/INF.08; and as reviewed during the development of the 1992 ICOMOS Global Study).

5. The origins of the Global Strategy and an overview of Global Strategy activities conducted between 1994 and 1998 can be found in Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12.3.

## II. Implementation of the Global Strategy from 2003 to 2007

6. At its 14th session (UNESCO, 2003), the General Assembly of States Parties considered a progress Report on the implementation of the Global Strategy from 1998 to 2003 (Document WHC-03/14.GA/8). The General Assembly by its Resolution **14 GA 8** took note of the progress made for the implementation of the Global Strategy and recommended that additional financial resources be allocated to the World

Heritage Centre for programmes to strengthen capacity in the regions under-represented on the World Heritage List.

A. Main studies and Expert Meetings related to the Global Strategy since 2003

**a) Analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists by ICOMOS and IUCN**

7. At its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), the World Heritage Committee examined the Analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative List by ICOMOS and IUCN (Documents WHC-04/28.COM/13, WHC-04/28.COM/INF13.A and WHC-04/28.COM/INF13.B)
8. The ICOMOS and IUCN's studies are analyses of the World Heritage List as well as of the Tentative Lists with a multi-faceted approach and some indicative future priorities. ICOMOS' study found that the reasons for the gaps in the World Heritage List fall into two main categories: structural – relating to the World Heritage nomination process, and to managing and protecting cultural properties; and qualitative – relating to the way properties are identified, assessed and evaluated. ICOMOS's report proposed an Action Plan.
9. IUCN's study pointed out that the natural and mixed sites currently inscribed on the World Heritage List cover almost all regions and habitats of the world with a relatively balanced distribution. However, there are still some major gaps in the World Heritage List for natural areas such as: tropical/temperate grasslands, savannas, lake systems, tundra and polar systems, and cold winter deserts. IUCN also proposed a set of recommendations.

**b) Expert Meeting on Outstanding Universal Value, Kazan, Russian Federation, 2005**

10. The World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Decision **28 COM 13.1**) requested the World Heritage Centre to convene a **special meeting of experts from all regions on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)** reflecting its increasing concern that this concept is interpreted and applied differently in different regions and by different stakeholders as well as by the Advisory Bodies. This meeting (Kazan, April 2005) developed recommendations 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 (see Document WHC-05/29.COM/9).

**c) Compendia on the interpretation and application of Outstanding Universal Value**

11. At its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the Committee requested the Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to undertake a careful review of past Committee decisions and to create two Compendia of relevant material (including case studies) and decisions, in the form of guidance manuals on how to interpret and apply discussions of OUV in terms of nominations and inscriptions on the List of World Heritage in Danger. At its 31st session in 2007, the Committee examined the drafts of the first Compendium made by IUCN and ICOMOS and requested them to include a reflection on integrity, authenticity and management practices. The final draft will be presented to the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.

## B. Actions undertaken within the framework of the Regional Programmes

12. Since 2004, Regional Programmes, which were developed to follow-up on the recommendations of the first-cycle of the periodic reporting exercise, have helped in improving the implementation of the Global Strategy in particular in the most under-represented regions such as Africa and the sub-region of the Pacific.
13. **The Africa Regional programme:** The Africa Regional Programme was developed in response to the challenges identified by the *Africa Periodic Report*, presented at the Committee's 26th session (Budapest, 2002). This exercise clearly showed that Africa's cultural and natural diversity was (and remains) under-represented in the World Heritage List, with only 7% of the total number of properties, whereas 43% of the properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger were in Africa. The Programme consists of two main modules: 'Africa 2009', a partnership programme for capacity relating to cultural World Heritage in Africa in cooperation with ICCROM, CRATERRENSAG, EPA, CHDA, and African Heritage Institutions, as well as the 'Africa Nature' Programme, covering training for both natural heritage site managers and Protected Area decision makers. Since 2003, 170 professionals have been trained in conservation and management of cultural and natural heritage as well as 15 professionals in preparation of nomination dossiers for cultural properties. Four more African States have ratified the *Convention*, 17 States Parties have now submitted their Tentative Lists representing 104 properties in total and 13 properties were inscribed successfully on the World Heritage List. The newly established African World Heritage Fund (WHC-06/30.COM/INF.11) constitutes an important opportunity to strengthen the programme emphasis on the sustainability of World Heritage property management through education, participation and their contribution to socio-economic development.
14. **Pacific 2009:** The Pacific is one of the most under-represented regions on the World Heritage List. In 2003, based on the needs expressed by the Pacific States Parties in their Periodic report, a programme for the Pacific called Pacific 2009, was developed and approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003). The main objectives of this Programme are to ensure the ratification of the *Convention* by all the Pacific countries, improve the representation of the region on the World Heritage List and build capacity in implementing the *Convention* and conserving heritage properties. Eleven Pacific Islands Countries (PICs) out of thirteen have now ratified the *Convention*, compared to only two in the year 2000. Only two remaining Pacific Island countries have not yet ratified the *Convention*, i.e. Nauru and Tuvalu. Seven PICs have now submitted their Tentative Lists while three more are under preparation (against only one in 2004). Two new nominations have been submitted for examination by the Committee in 2008 and six more are being prepared, two of which are for transboundary sites. Several regional workshops were organized to identify sites having potential Outstanding Universal Value as well as for building capacity in the implementation of the *Convention* targeting staff of national heritage Organizations (see Document WHC-07/16.GA/INF.9).

## C. Other actions undertaken by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies

15. Numerous regional meetings and thematic workshops related to the preparation of Nominations and the harmonization of Tentative Lists were organized since 2003 by the World Heritage Centre in close co-operation with the Advisory Bodies (see Document WHC-07/16.GA/INF.9).

16. As requested by the Committee (Decision **27 COM 8A**) in 2005, the World Heritage Centre made available all Tentative Lists on the World Heritage website (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelist>).

### **III. Statistical analysis of the current Tentative Lists and the World Heritage List over the period 1994-2007**

#### **A. Some statistical analyses**

17. There are **851** properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and **1,378** properties included on the Tentative Lists. Table 1 presents the figures and percentages of properties by region and by category:

<b>Geographical Regions</b>	Cultural properties				Natural properties				Mixed properties			
	<b>W.H.List 2007</b>		<b>Tentative Lists 2007</b>		<b>W.H.List 2007</b>		<b>Tentative Lists 2007</b>		<b>W.H.List 2007</b>		<b>Tentative Lists 2007</b>	
Africa	<b>38</b>	4.46%	<b>113</b>	8.20%	<b>33</b>	3.87%	<b>52</b>	3.77%	<b>3</b>	0.35%	<b>33</b>	2.39%
Arab States	<b>59</b>	6.93%	<b>101</b>	7.32%	<b>3</b>	0.35%	<b>19</b>	1.37%	<b>1</b>	0.11%	<b>9</b>	0.65%
Asia and the Pacific	<b>119</b>	13.98%	<b>217</b>	15.74%	<b>45</b>	5.28%	<b>67</b>	4.86%	<b>9</b>	1.05%	<b>38</b>	2.75%
Europe and North America	<b>364</b>	42.77%	<b>369</b>	26.77%	<b>51</b>	5.99%	<b>121</b>	8.78%	<b>9</b>	1.05%	<b>60</b>	4.35%
Latin America and the Caribbean	<b>80</b>	9.40%	<b>102</b>	7.40%	<b>34</b>	3.99%	<b>40</b>	2.90%	<b>3</b>	0.35%	<b>37</b>	2.68%
Total	<b>660</b>	77.55%	<b>902</b>	65.45%	<b>166</b>	19.50%	<b>299</b>	21.69%	<b>25</b>	2.93%	<b>177</b>	12.84%

Table 1 : The current situation on the World Heritage List and on the Tentative Lists.

18. If we compare the figures of the regional breakdown and distribution per category of the current World Heritage List and of the Tentative Lists (see table below), it can be observed that the Global Strategy probably had a major impact on the latter.

<b>Geographical Regions</b>	Cultural properties	Natural properties	Mixed properties
Africa	+ 3.74%	- 0.10%	+ 2.04%
Arab States	+ 0.93%	+ 1.02%	+ 0.54%
Asia and the Pacific	+ 1.76%	- 0.42%	+ 1.70%
Europe and North America	- 16%	+ 2.79%	+ 3.30%
Latin America and the Caribbean	- 2%	- 0.91%	+ 2.33%
Total	- 12.1%	+ 2.19%	+ 9.91%

Table 2: The comparison between the situation of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and those included on the Tentative Lists.

19. In principle, the reading of this table, comparing the present situation (the World Heritage List) with the potential future (the Tentative Lists) could give an indication of

the trends that could characterise submission of nominations in future years. The most significant potential trends that result from this comparison for future inscription are the following:

- A big overall decrease of cultural properties along with the subsequent increase of natural and especially of mixed properties;
- The considerable drop of cultural properties in Europe and North America;
- The important increase of cultural and mixed properties in Africa, which for years was the only region with more natural than cultural properties.

20. However, the key to read through the trends that characterised the submissions, deletion and changes in the Tentative Lists over the last years, has to be found in the limits imposed by the Cairns-Suzhou decision and, at the same time, on the over representation of some categories of properties that forced States Parties to find alternative solutions.

21. The distribution of natural, cultural and mixed properties in the five, broad geographical regions recognized by UNESCO, in 1994 and 2007, is as follows:

Geographical Regions	Cultural properties				Natural properties				Mixed properties			
	1994		2007		1994		2007		1994		2007	
Africa	<b>14</b>	3.41%	<b>38</b>	4.46%	<b>18</b>	4.39%	<b>33</b>	3.87%	<b>1</b>	0.24%	<b>3</b>	0.35%
Arab States	<b>42</b>	10.24%	<b>59</b>	6.93%	<b>2</b>	0.48%	<b>3</b>	0.35%	<b>1</b>	0.24%	<b>1</b>	0.11%
Asia and the Pacific	<b>49</b>	11.95%	<b>119</b>	13.98%	<b>24</b>	5.85%	<b>45</b>	5.28%	<b>7</b>	1.70%	<b>9</b>	1.05%
Europe and North America	<b>160</b>	39.02%	<b>364</b>	42.77%	<b>31</b>	7.56%	<b>51</b>	5.99%	<b>5</b>	1.21%	<b>9</b>	1.05%
Latin America and the Caribbean	<b>40</b>	9.75%	<b>80</b>	9.40%	<b>13</b>	3.17%	<b>34</b>	3.99%	<b>3</b>	0.73%	<b>3</b>	0.35%
Total	<b>305</b>	74.40%	<b>660</b>	77.55%	<b>88</b>	21.45%	<b>166</b>	19.50%	<b>17</b>	4.15%	<b>25</b>	2.93%

Table 3: The situation on the World Heritage List in 1994 and in 2007.

Number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994: **410**

Number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2007: **851**

22. The table below shows the changes in percentage within each region and category of property between 1994 and 2007.

Geographical Regions	Cultural properties	Natural properties	Mixed properties
	1994 → 2007	1994 → 2007	1994 → 2007
Africa	+ 1.05%	- 0.52%	+ 0.11%
Arab States	- 3.31%	- 0.13%	- 0.13%
Asia and the Pacific	+ 2.03%	- 0.57%	- 0.65%
Europe and North America	+ 3.75%	- 1.57%	- 0.16%
Latin America and the Caribbean	- 0.35%	+ 0.82%	- 0.38%
Total	+ 3.15%	- 1.95%	- 1.22%

Table 4: The comparison between the situation on the World Heritage List in 1994 and in 2007.

23. The following trends can be deduced from these figures:

- Since 1994, the significant overall growth in the number of cultural properties made the gap between the number of natural and mixed properties even bigger. The Cairns-Suzhou decision (imposing the nomination of a natural property to those States Parties that wanted to submit 2 nominations for the same cycle) had an immediate and positive effect<sup>1</sup> in terms of growth of nominations of natural properties. However, the amendment made to that decision at the last session of the Committee in Christchurch (which now allows States Parties to submit two nominations of cultural properties for the same cycle) most likely will widen again the difference between cultural properties and natural properties;
- Between 1994 and 2007, the most important increase in the number of new properties was for cultural properties in Europe and North America, followed by a significant rise of cultural properties in Asia and the Pacific. The same period of time registered a considerable drop of cultural properties in the Arab States.

24. Some other important trends, also in relation to the number of States Parties that ratified the *World Heritage Convention*, have to be taken into consideration:

- Percentage of States Parties **not** having any World Heritage properties **significantly decreased** from 30.9% in 1994 (36 out of 139 States Parties) to 23.3% in 2007 (43 out of 184 States Parties);
- Percentage of States Parties having submitted Tentative Lists **considerably rose** from 53% in 1994 (74 of 139 States Parties) to 85% in 2007 (157 of 184 States Parties);
- In 1994, 56 (40.2%) States Parties had 1-3 properties, 30 (21.5%) 4-10 properties and 7 (5%) 11 properties or more; the corresponding figures for 2007 are: 71 (38.5%), 51 (27.7%) and 19 (10.3%), respectively;
- In 2007, the 19 States Parties with 11 or more properties account for 434 properties, or more than 50% of the total number of inscribed properties.

## B. Future challenges for the Global Strategy

25. The future challenges for the Global Strategy are the following:

- a) The lack of institutional memory which was noted in the Periodic Reporting exercise in all the regions was the main reason for not using existing studies on harmonization of Tentative Lists and reports from sub-regional meetings;
- b) For the World Heritage Centre, to compile all reports from sub-regional meetings and thematic studies and make them available on a specific web page which can be easily found;

---

<sup>1</sup> See document "Global Strategy: Evaluation of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision", WHC-07/31.COM/10

- c) National authorities to share the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis) of their national exercises with other countries, in particular in processes of harmonizing tentative lists;
- d) To recognize that biodiversity may be increasingly created through sustainable land-use, to enhance collaboration between IUCN and ICOMOS especially on nature/culture interaction, including the field of agricultural heritage and agrobiodiversity;
- e) Serial and Transboundary nominations to be promoted through regional and/or sub-regional workshops;
- f) Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to develop additional technical and policy guidance for Serial and Transboundary nominations and in particular for their identification and management;
- g) To acknowledge intangible aspects of heritage with linkages to World Heritage and to encourage co-operation between the two Conventions.

#### **IV. Draft Resolution**

*The General Assembly,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-07/16.GA/9,*
2. *Notes the progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List from 2003 to 2007 presented in this document;*
3. *Calls upon the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and other partners to significantly increase their support to States Parties, particularly in less developed countries, in the identification of cultural, natural and mixed properties as well as the harmonization of their Tentative List taking into account the existing studies;*
4. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to compile all reports from sub-regional meetings and thematic studies and to make them available on a specific web page of the World Heritage Centre's website;*
5. *Invites the States Parties to share their national exercises of preparation of Tentative Lists with other countries, in particular in the harmonization of Tentative Lists;*
6. *Requests the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to develop additional technical and policy guidance for Serial and Transboundary nominations and in particular for their identification and management;*
7. *Requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to provide to the next session of the General Assembly in 2009 an evaluation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2009.*