



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

41 COM

WHC/17/41.COM/9B

Paris, 19 May 2017

Original: English

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Forty-first session

Krakow, Poland

2-12 July 2017

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

The present document is presented in accordance with Decision **39 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 41st session of the World Heritage Committee in 2017.

Draft Decision: 41 COM 9B, see Point II

I. BACKGROUND

1. By Decision **39 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 compliance 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, requested them to continue to implement those proposals-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 are cases where both cultural and natural values are inherent to the representation of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of a property. However, it is important to note that many problems occur when the implications of nominations of mixed sites are not fully considered, and thus, whilst the Advisory Bodies can take their role in improving the evaluation processes, this will not be sufficient to compensate for situations where States Parties produce nominations that are not well adapted to the requirements of a nomination under both natural and cultural criteria.
3. If there are opportunities to develop proposals to improve IUCN and ICOMOS evaluation processes, as noted by the Committee at its 39th session, some of these would require amendments to the current evaluation processes and would have budgetary implications. These are part of a broader project between IUCN and ICOMOS entitled “Connecting Practice”. The first phase of Connecting Practice was completed and the report is available on the ICOMOS and IUCN websites (http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/connecting_practice_report_iucn_icomos_.pdf). The second phase of this project being scheduled for completion in May 2017, information regarding future approaches were not available at the time of the preparation of this document. However, the outcomes of the second phase of “Connecting Practice” project will be presented at a side event during the 41st session of the Committee session.
4. Notable progress has been made since the Committee, at its 39th session, 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. The table below presents the progress made since the 39th session :

Action	39 COM status	41 COM status	Resource implications	Comments
<p>Tentative Lists: Where upstream advice is requested on potential mixed nominations, IUCN and ICOMOS should work together to provide coordinated advice.</p>	Not current practice	Not current practice	Moderate/High	No progress due to lack of resources. States Parties are encouraged to seek upstream coordinated advice from IUCN and ICOMOS prior to the preparation of mixed nominations to avoid commonly observed problems. This work deserves a significant priority and appropriate planning and resourcing.
<p>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.</p>	Mostly current 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.
<p>Joint missions: The current practice that all evaluation field missions to mixed sites should be undertaken jointly by IUCN and ICOMOS should be continued.</p>	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.
<p>Joint briefing of mission teams: Mission teams should be briefed jointly by IUCN and ICOMOS prior to their field visits to the site.</p>	Mostly current 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 properties 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>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>Low</p>	<p>Requests for additional information are now made in a coordinated process by ICOMOS and IUCN. In some cases, ICOMOS will request supplementary information prior to or just after the field mission, while IUCN usually waits for the IUCN World Heritage Panel to review the documents before asking for additional information. If ICOMOS requests earlier information, this is now done in consultation with IUCN, and any 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>Moderate</p>	<p>Reflection and scoping of work has started but implementation would need time and greater resources than originally foreseen to design and harmonize standardised review forms.</p>

<p>Harmonization of approaches to mission reports: To the extent possible, IUCN and ICOMOS should seek to harmonize their mission reports.</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 harmonization 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>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. 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. Also, in the 2016-2017 evaluation cycle, a staff member of IUCN was invited to observe the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel meeting for a day, and vice versa.</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>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 decisions: IUCN and ICOMOS should produce a single jointly agreed decision for mixed site evaluations.</p>	<p>Not current practice, except at the end of the evaluation process</p>	<p>Not current practice, except at the end of the evaluation process</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Currently managed between IUCN and ICOMOS officers, working with the World Heritage Centre at the end of the two Panel processes. This could be amended to allow for a discussion of harmonisation between the first and second panel meetings.</p>

5. At its 38th session, the Committee underlined that the lack of consideration by States Parties of the pertinence of mixed site nominations and their specific requirements could represent 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. 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 recognizing that the final decision to seek such advice lies with the State Party concerned.

6. It should be noted that the overall exercise has been positive and allowed increased cooperation between IUCN and ICOMOS both at institutional and professional levels. Improvements to IUCN and ICOMOS evaluation processes were made, notably concerning communication with States Parties and coordination of the technical evaluation missions. However, little progress was made for actions with moderate to high resource implications, thus making these actions unlikely to be achieved without additional resources. Furthermore, harmonization of reporting and review formats should be considered as a next step, provided that it is supported by budget provisions. 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: 41 COM 9B

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/9B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **38 COM 9B** and **39 COM 9B** adopted respectively at its 38th (Doha, 2014) and 39th (Bonn, 2015) sessions,*
3. *Welcomes the report of the World Heritage Centre and 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. *Recognizes the progress made by the Advisory Bodies over the past two years and encourages them to continue their efforts towards setting up a harmonized evaluation process for mixed nominations;*
6. *Calls upon States Parties interested to consider providing support to this initiative that requires additional resources.*