

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.9 (SPE)

Paris, 7 September 2000

Original : English

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

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

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Special Session

Budapest, Hungary

2 - 4 October 2000

IUCN Comments on the "Extract of the Report of the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Item VI)" (WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.4 (SPE) and the Collated recommendations of the Task Force and Working Groups (WHC-2000/CONF.202/16)

IUCN Comments on the “Extract of the Report of the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Item VI)” (WHC-2000/CONF/INF.4 (SPE) and the Collated recommendatinos of the Task Force and Working Groups (WHC-2000/CONF.202/16)

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
1. STATUTORY MEETINGS	
1.1 General Assembly of States Parties	
<p>The Bureau recommended that the Committee hold its regular meeting at the usual dates at UNESCO Headquarters in the year when the General Assembly meets (ITF 1.1.2.B and 1.3.4.B)</p> <p>Task Force Recommendations :</p> <p><i>The Committee hold its regular meeting immediately <u>before</u> the General Assembly (see ITF 1.1.2 B) (OG Para 130)</i></p> <p><i>The Committee meet immediately <u>after</u> the General Assembly to elect office bearers (see ITF 1.1.3 B) (OG Para 130)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>
<p><i>The following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strategic policy issues and report on performance;</i> • <i>Implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions</i> <p><i>Report on international assistance (ITF 1.1.1 B)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><u>Rec. changes to General Assembly Rules of Procedure:</u></p> <p><i>To save time during voting in the General Assembly, Secretariat and scrutineers collect ballots instead of inviting participants to come forward and vote.</i></p> <p><i>Rotational/regional voting could be introduced (ITF 1.1.4 B) (RP Rule 12)</i></p>	<p>No comment.</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
1.2 Bureau Meetings	
<p>The Bureau recommended to the Committee that an assessment be made, with the Secretariat, as to the cost implications of the creation of the sub-committees.</p>	<p>IUCN welcomes the principle of setting up sub-committees to facilitate the work of the Bureau and Committee and looks forward to the Secretariat's assessment. However, if it is the intention of the Committee to retain an annual cycle for the consideration of new nominations while setting up sub-committees then the capacity of IUCN (and presumably ICOMOS) to service sub-committee meetings could be limited. IUCN's ability to service meetings would be made even more difficult if they meet other than immediately prior to, or during, Bureau/Committee sessions.</p> <p>It would be desirable if any sub-committees formed would normally operate by electronic communication especially to deal with urgent issues revealed by monitoring.</p>
<p>It was agreed that during the next extraordinary session of the Bureau there will be no presentation or discussion on nominations which have been deferred or referred back. Instead, the Bureau will send the nominations to be discussed there directly to the World Heritage Committee (ITF 1.2.3).</p>	<p>IUCN suggests on careful consideration that a better outcome would be achieved if, rather than a full presentation of each nomination, the ABs brief the extraordinary Bureau on new information received from State Parties which was requested by the ordinary session of the Bureau. Only where the new information received is not deemed satisfactory should a nomination be presented more fully.</p> <p>This decision should not prevent the presentation to the extraordinary Bureau of nominations that have not been reviewed by the ordinary session of the Bureau, due to climatic conditions delaying evaluation missions.</p>
<p>The Bureau recommended to the Committee that Rule 22 of the Committee's Rules of Procedures, defining the order and time-limit of speeches be firmly applied by the Chair (see ITF 1.2.3) (RP Rule 7).</p>	<p>To ensure that Rule 22 is applied, a mechanism for its implementation should be considered. This might include the appointment of a timekeeper at Bureau/Committee meetings and the use of appropriate technology allowing the chair to focus on the discussion.</p>
<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p> <p><i>“On a trial basis (pending any Committee discussion of a sub-Committee structure): the Bureau meeting in November 2000 should .</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Enable a working party, prefiguration of a subcommittee for the budget, to prepare the discussion of the budget by the Committee in November 2000 (ITF 1.2.2)”</i> 	<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p> <p>Agree.</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
1.3 Committee Meetings	
The Bureau agreed that the agenda of the Committee should have as a permanent item (with the allocation of sufficient time for discussion) general strategic policy matters, including the Strategic Plan and its implementation (ITF 1.3.1 and 1.3.3).	Agree. IUCN would like priority meetings for the implementation of the Global Strategy to be identified under this agenda item. A list of expert meetings for the next two-year period could be drafted by the WHC and reviewed by the Advisory Bodies. Once meetings had been identified, and approved by the Committee, State Parties could be given the option to volunteer to support and/or finance these meetings. Where no State Party is willing to support a meeting, priority should be given to be funded through International Assistance.
The Bureau agreed that the working documents for the Committee should be distributed 6 weeks prior to the meetings and should not be read aloud during the meetings (ITF 1.3.2). It was agreed that the documents for the meetings should, to the extent possible, be made available electronically.	Agree.
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Committee agenda should be structured to ensure adequate time for discussion of strategic policy issues shared by States Parties (eg managing tourism impacts, legislative approaches) etc.(ITF 1.3.3).	IUCN would like clarification prior to meetings on what kind of expertise is needed e.g. legal, tourism etc. to allow selection of relevant IUCN participants.
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic policy issues and report on performance; • Implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions • Report on international assistance (ITF 1.1.1 B) 	Agree.
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
	<p>Duplication of effort by ABs and WHC was raised by the Cameron TF but not addressed in any of its specific recommendations. There is room for closer liaison between the Centre and IUCN especially for State of Conservation Reporting. Clearer procedures for reporting could be identified which would cut down on duplication. For example, WHC might take full responsibility for drafting the State of Conservation reports to the Bureau/Committee. This would allow IUCN to concentrate on information gathering and communication of that information and suggested remedial action to the Centre to take into account in the reports to the Bureau/Committee.</p>
<p><i>The Committee should refrain from creating too many working parties and from approving, by giving them the support of the Center and of the Advisory Bodies, too many groups or experts meetings established by the State Parties. Furthermore, the mandates of the groups or meetings created or approved by the Committee should be very clear and exclude any overlapping (ITF 1.3.6 B).</i></p>	<p>It is not clear what is meant by “groups” and “expert meetings”. There should certainly be a more strategic approach on expert meetings. Some are organised at the last minute with WHC insisting on IUCN participation, even if they have not been considered under the approved workplan and budget. A list of meetings which are necessary for implementation of Global Strategy should be established by Bureau/Committee. SPs should be asked to host & fund these. Where funding is not available SP interested should be asked to submit a proposal/budget (a tender system) for funding from International Assistance.</p>
<p><i>To scale back the workload, the Committee should examine inscriptions and periodic monitoring, following their preparation in subcommittees. The Comm should only examine reports on reactive monitoring on an exceptional basis (see ITF 1.3.7 C Issues and Recommendations) (OG para 131, section II).</i></p>	<p>Agree but there should be a fast track for urgent monitoring issues and not limited numerically but by urgency. Maybe these should be dealt with as they come in by a subcommittee and referred straight to the Chair for a decision (like international assistance requests of less than 30,000 USD) – this will speed up getting missions to sites. Monitoring is key to the spirit of the Convention – this recommendation should be given more priority.</p>
<p><i>Depending on other decisions (on sub-committees and Operational Guidelines Committee may wish to revise the calendar for nominations (see ITF 1.3.8 C Issues and Recommendations for proposal offered for consideration) (OG Para 65, 1. Section III)).</i></p>	<p>Agree with the two year cycle recommended by the Cameron TF.</p>
<p><i>The Committee should change its meeting cycle, with every second meeting in Paris prior to the General Assembly of States Parties (ITF 1.3.4 B) (OG Para 131).</i></p>	<p>Agree but see Bureau decision in 1.1 above.</p>
<p><i>Working groups on implementing the Convention should be made open to all States Parties and those relating to decisions to be made by the Committee should be restricted to Committee members (ITF 1.3.5 B).</i></p>	<p>No comment.</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
2. DECISION MAKING	
Capacity Building The importance of recommendations for strengthening capacities in the under-represented regions on the List has been underlined on numerous occasions. It was recommended to place the Task Force's recommendations on capacity building in bold thus emphasizing their importance and transmitting them to the Committee. The Bureau requested the Committee to strongly encourage the elaboration of strategies aiming at reinforcing and forging cooperation agreements to enable the States having well-developed capacities in the field of conservation to provide to under-represented regions financial and technical support (RL 11 vi-x). Nevertheless, it was emphasized that, these efforts alone would not be sufficient to improve the representativity of the List; and on the other, the Committee should ensure the long-term conservation of the sites and give high priority to training.	IUCN has attended over 30 meetings this year but very few have been relevant to training. Too much emphasis is also given to awareness raising/training for bureaucrats and not enough for field staff/conservation agencies. Meetings don't appear to have much follow-up (except in Asia-Pacific region). There is a need for the evaluation of WH support to training colleges. Most conservation agencies are very short of both human and financial resources even in developed countries so it is hard to see a significant capacity for support to less developed States but encouragement for this should be given. More emphasis should be given to information management and purchasing communications equipment for sites where relevant. For example, more emphasis could be placed on the use of the Internet allowing site managers to access information and the opportunity to network world-wide for help on specific problems as they arise. Where Internet access is not an option alternative systems could be put in place to ensure the distribution of information by mail. Basic documents on improving management (e.g. IUCN guidelines) should be sent systematically to all WH site managers.
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>
<i>WH Centre should promote training at the regional level to under-rep State Parties. Training should give State Parties the opportunity to prepare their tentative lists (see RL 11 vi) (OG Para 98)</i>	Agree but ideally there would be one or two years without nominations in order to allow for the preparation of tentative lists by SPs and their assessment by the Advisory Bodies.
<i>Use evaluation missions to run regional training workshops for under-rep State Parties (see RL 11 vi).</i>	There is usually an element of training in evaluation missions and while it is an excellent idea in theory to use evaluation missions to run regional training workshops, it may be difficult to implement in practice as those who undertake field missions for IUCN do so in a voluntary capacity - taking leave from full-time employment or private consultancies. It will therefore be difficult for them to take more time to participate in training courses. Hence it is necessary to plan such training events well in advance to see what may be possible.

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<i>Under-rep State Parties to get priority in the Preparatory Assistance budget for nominations (RL 11 vii) (OG Para 113-114)</i>	Agree but State Parties containing under-represented biomes should also have priority for Preparatory Assistance.
<i>Grants of international assistance should improve representivity and be coherent with the Global Strategy (see RL 11 viii) (OG Para 113-114)</i>	Agree.
<i>Develop Regional Plans of Action in line with the Global Strategy (see RL 11 ix).</i>	Agree.
<i>UNESCO Medium-Term Strategy should stress an intersectoral policy to better implement the Convention (see RL 11 x).</i>	Agree.
2.1 Strategic Planning The Bureau recommended that the Committee commence a review to formulate a Strategic Plan with clear timelines and milestones for the period 2001-2005, based in part on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolution endorsing the Orientations. The Strategic Plan should contain at a minimum: a vision, goals, objectives, action plan, timelines, reporting mechanisms, accountable parties and a review cycle (ITF 2.1.1 B).	IUCN supports a review of the Strategic Plan which would aim to produce a plan which is genuinely strategic and pro-active with outputs identified and mechanisms to measure effectiveness. At present, meetings are held with limited follow up on implementation and evaluation of their effectiveness in contributing to a global strategy.
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u> Restructuring the Operational Guidelines	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u> IUCN hopes that, following the current review of the Operational Guidelines, there will not be any further changes for several years so that State Parties can become familiar with the new format.
<i>It is recommended that the new Section 1 of the Operational Guidelines will include some existing text but will also require new text and a complete revision indicated in the outline presented (CANT 4.1.)</i>	Need to give guidance for implementation. (IUCN has already had input to the recommendations of the Canterbury meeting).
<i>The Expert Meeting recommends the WH Committee consider the recommended changes to the content of the Operational Guidelines contained in section 4 of the report (CANT 2.H.2.). It is recommended that this is done in the context of the conclusions of the other working groups, the Report on the Evaluation of International Assistance and reports of the Catania, Italy and Great Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe meetings.</i>	Need to review. (IUCN has already had input to the recommendations of the Canterbury meeting).

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<i>A concise text on the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative WH List be included in the Operational Guidelines (CANT 4.4.a))</i>	Agree.
<i>New text on International Assistance for the Operational Guidelines has been forwarded to C3E who are carrying out the evaluation of International Assistance (See CANT I & Annex VII)</i>	Need to review.
<i>Secretariat and Advisory Bodies to provide summary of documents that need to be provided to supplement the Operational Guidelines (See CANT 4.9.)</i>	Agree.
2.2 Tentative Lists	
The Bureau agreed that the submission of tentative lists by States Parties prioritising future nominations for both cultural and natural nominations was an important part of the Committee's process of strategic planning (ITF 2.2.1).	Agree but this does not address the recommendations (see italics below in left hand column). States Party should also be encouraged to get together and compare lists for the same region.
<i>Tentative lists be obligatory for both natural and cultural properties (CANT 4.4.b)) (OG Paras 7,8)</i>	Agree.
<i>States Parties are reminded of the invitation to submit tentative lists in conformity with Article 11 of the Convention. The Committee should extend to natural sites its decision not to examine nominations of sites for inscription if the property does not appear on the tentative list (see RL 11 i) (OG Para 7)</i>	
<i>Advisory bodies to analyse inscribed sites and those on the tentative list on a chronological, geographical and thematic basis as soon as possible. This analysis to give State Parties a clear overview of the present situation, and likely trends in the short to medium term with a view to identify under-represented categories. State Parties can then use these information to 'prepare, revise and/or harmonise their tentative list' (see RL 11 ii) (OG Para 9)</i>	This task would require careful handling by the ABs so as not to prejudge the outcomes of subsequent evaluation missions if and when individual sites are nominated. If undertaken in an open way with good dialogue if could, however, give very useful guidance to States Parties on strengths and weaknesses in their tentative lists and enable them to make their own judgements as to those cases where they consider it worth the effort required to proceed to prepare nominations. At present the existence of sites on tentative Lists unquestioned by anyone can lead SPs to have a possibly false sense of confidence about the credibility of sites on the Tentative List. IUCN would also require additional resources to fulfil this task. Presumably this might be the case the others Advisory Bodies as well.
<i>The results of this analysis to go to the Committee for their consideration (see RL 11 iii)</i>	Agree.

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<i>Tentative lists be harmonised (CANT 4.4.c)) (OG Para 9)</i>	This recommendation should specify what kind of harmonisation is to be achieved– geo-cultural, regional and biogeographical.
<i>In order to encourage a Committee process of strategic planning, the Bureau reminds all state parties of the necessity to prepare tentative lists and to specify the order in which they would propose the inscription of the sites (ITF 2.2.1) (OG Paras 7,8)</i>	Agree – when selecting nominations for review (given that a threshold of 40 nominations a year is likely), preference should be given to states which have adequately compiled tentative lists and harmonised them on a regional basis.
2.3 Nominations	
Representivity of WH List	
Preparation and assessment of nominations The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Centre should implement and distribute to all State Parties, a checklist for the preparation and assessment of nominations to ensure that nominations are complete before they are sent to Advisory Bodies for evaluation (ITF 2.3.1) (OG Para 64, 65)	IUCN welcomes this recommendation but would like to stress that a checklist is only as good as its application. For this checklist to be effectively applied it will require rigorous enforcement by the World Heritage Centre. At present nominations are sent to the ABs which are not adequate. Some nominations fail to address specific criteria. Inadequate nominations have also led to situations in the past where sites have been inscribed without basic information such as the delineation of the site's boundaries. Inadequate information on sites also leads to difficulties during State of Conservation monitoring.
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the advisory bodies should present their recommendations for inscription in a consistent format: assessing outstanding universal value, relationship to the priorities of the Global Strategy, using a check list to support recommendations, and identify potential or existing threats and protective actions (see ITF 2.3.2) (OG 57-63)	Agree but there is a need to clarify format. This should be further discussed and agreed by the Advisory Bodies.
The Bureau recommended further examination by the Special Session of the Bureau in October 2000 as to whether the results of advisory bodies' evaluations of nominations should be made available, in a timely manner, to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee (ITF 2.3.3 and OG 65). It was agreed that if this recommendation is adopted by the Committee, it would be the role of the World Heritage Centre, and not the advisory bodies, to provide the evaluations to the State Party.	IUCN has consistently supported the approach with distribution of evaluations handled by the WHC as it levels the playing field for all State Parties with sites up for consideration as State Parties on the Bureau or Committee, of course, get the information in the normal documentation.
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>

<p style="text-align: center;">Bureau Decision</p> <p style="text-align: center;">From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">IUCN Comment</p>
<p><i>Simplification and editing of paragraph 6 of existing guidelines (see CANT 4.2.)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>To review the statement on the balance between cultural and natural properties and to relate it more closely to the text on representivity which should be based on the resolution of the twelfth General Assembly on this subject (CANT 4.2.a))</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>Section B of the Operational Guidelines should clarify that incomplete or late nominations are the responsibility of the States Party and will not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle (ITF 2.3.4 B) (OG Para 65)</i></p>	<p>Agree. This should be strictly enforced by the WHC (see IUCN comment above on a checklist for nominations).</p>
<p><i>Clarity is needed concerning: referral (including deadlines), deferral (to use same procedures and deadlines as for new nominations), rejection, re-nominations, strict application of procedures and deadlines by the Secretariat, clear statements about transboundary, joint nominations, serial and phased nominations as well as extensions (CANT 4.4.f)) (OG Paras 16,19,20)</i></p>	<p>IUCN welcomes this recommendation and believes that clarity on these issues will facilitate the work of the State Parties, Bureau/Committee, WHC and Advisory Bodies.</p>
<p><i>Recommended a possible restriction of numbers of nominations presented to the World Heritage Committee each year be applied (see CANT 4.4.g) and RL 11 iv) (OG Para 65)</i></p>	<p>The mechanism for this needs to be addressed considering numbers of nominations. However the possibility of a two-year cycle for nominations ifs preferable.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Bureau Decision From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">IUCN Comment</p>
<p><i>WH Centre (in consultation with chair of Committee, and approved by Bureau) to put nominations on a prioritised 'list for consideration in sequence'. The list is based on the following factors in this order:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Sites for immediate inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger</i> <i>b. First time nominations by un-represented State Parties</i> <i>c. Nominations from less-represented State Parties</i> <i>d. Nominations deferred from previous meetings</i> <i>e. Nominations from less-represented regions</i> <i>f. Nominations from any State Party, which illustrate un-represented or less-represented categories (categories from an Advisory Body analysis above and reviewed and approved by the Committee)</i> <i>g. Joint or 'sister' nominations of a common topic with at least one nomination from a less-represented State Party</i> <i>h. Rewarding Abstinence: State Parties well-represented on the list, but who have abstained from nominations (or had their nominations deferred) will have their nominations considered first (the longest abstainer has their nomination considered first)</i> <i>i. Nominations submitted and not falling within (a) - (h) above but not considered because they were not of highest priority at the time, to be considered in date order in receipt of nomination.</i> <p><i>(see RL iv), (OG Section I.H)</i></p>	<p>There is also a need to give priority to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) under-represented biomes/cultural themes; and 2) State Parties that have produced good tentative lists and harmonised them on a regional level. <p>Both of these factors need to be given high priority on this list.</p>
<p><i>State Parties with substantial listings would be awarded points depending on numbers of nominations, linking nominations with an under-represented State Party, nominations from under-represented categories, voluntary suspending nominations, and providing assistance to under-represented State Parties (see RL 11 v) (OG Section I.H)</i></p>	
<p><i>Working group recommended that the current text of paragraph 65 concerning ICOMOS and IUCN evaluations be retained and subject to further review by 24th Session of Bureau and Committee (See CANT 4.5) (OG Para 65)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<p>Criteria The Bureau recommended to the Committee that:</p> <p>(a) the cultural and natural heritage criteria be merged (CANT 4.4.d),</p> <p>(b) the use of cultural heritage criterion (vi) be discussed in the light of the outcomes of the African meeting on authenticity (CANT 4.4.e) and</p> <p>(c) a new section of text be provided as a general introduction to integrity (La Vanoise recommendation of March 1996) and authenticity (CANT p 13, 3.II.4).</p>	<p>Agree. IUCN feels that natural criteria should keep their current numbers. Thus there would be a logical flow from geology, to ecology/biology to culture. This may mean some fine-tuning, for example, criterion iii is human interpretation of natural phenomenon and therefore should probably be iv. This would be followed by cultural criteria v dealing with land use, then artificial environments (cultural criteria i-iv), and finally beliefs and traditions (criterion vi).</p> <p>The merging of criteria will have downstream effects relating to consistency of presentation. Significant changes to criteria were made in 1992 and there will be more with the merging of cultural and natural criteria. There needs to be discussion on how sites are presented to the public and in WH publications. It would be a large task to revisit all the sites inscribed to reassess them under revised/merged criteria. It may be simpler to list WH sites without criteria but instead have a carefully crafted summary of WH values for each site.</p> <p>No comment.</p> <p>Agree</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<p>Statement of Values</p> <p>With reference to TFI 2.3.2 concerning the presentation of the advisory bodies' recommendations for inscription in a consistent format, the Bureau recommended that the Committee decide that a statement of specific World Heritage values of a property be a key element of a nomination dossier (CANT 4.6.b) and that these values must be the focus of nomination, assessment, inscription, management, and be the reference point for a cycle of on-site monitoring, periodic reporting, and potential reactive monitoring, in danger listing, and deletion (CANT 4.6.c).</p>	<p>IUCN agrees with the principle that the nomination dossier and evaluation should contain a clear statement of specific World Heritage values. However, IUCN feels that this concept needs more clarity as to the relationship between a statement of “Specific WH Values” and “outstanding universal value” which qualifies a site for inscription.</p> <p>IUCN would prefer to refer to a ‘summary of the qualities a site possesses which contribute to its ‘outstanding universal value’ as use of the term “specific WH values” may lead to a concentration on protecting those individual qualities when it is often the totality which is of ‘outstanding universal value’ and is needed to maintain integrity.</p> <p>Also WHC should clarify how it will relate to the current “Statement of Significance” which appears to be used for communication purposes and the “Brief Descriptions” which appear to give a more technical summary of why a site is inscribed. IUCN feels that it would be most desirable to agree on inscription a text, which is used as a standard to identify the qualities, which add up to ‘outstanding universal value’. This is a question which would merit revisiting for those sites where there is now no agreed statement but simply a statement drawn by the WH Centre from data on file.</p>
<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>	<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>
<p>Archiving and documentation of nominations</p> <p>A new section of text to be provided on the archiving and documentation of nominations (see CANT p 15, 3.II.G.) (OG Section II.G)</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List</p>	
<p>The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the assessment documents of the advisory bodies and Centre should be presented in a single summary table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, and rejection) (ITF 2.4.2) (OG Para 57)</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>The Bureau recommended that further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau in October 2000 be given to grouping the presentation of and decisions on nominations according to similar nominations, themes and/or region and with reference to those sites already on the World Heritage List (ITF 2.4.1).</p>	<p>Agree. IUCN already refers to existing WH sites in its evaluations.</p>

<p align="center">Bureau Decision</p> <p align="center">From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p align="center">IUCN Comment</p>
<p>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</p>	<p>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</p>
<p><i>The number of nominations for inscription that the Committee and the other bodies of the convention examine each year should not exceed [40] (see ITF 2.4.4 B)(OG Paras 65,67)</i></p>	<p>IUCN agrees with the principle of limiting the number of nominations to be considered in the light of the fact that the capacity of ABs and the Bureau/Committee structure is limited finite but noting that this is an issue which needs further discussion.</p>
<p><i>New sections of text are to be provided on notification of inscription to State Parties and on advice to States Parties following inscription of a property on the World Heritage List (see CANT p 15, 3.II.F.) (OG Section II.F).</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p><i>The Task Force on Implementation should present proposals for the process of treating referral and deferral of nominations for inscription (ITF 2.4.3 B).</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation</p>	
<p>The Bureau recommended to the Committee that reactive monitoring reports should be presented in a single document in a consistent format to facilitate discussion and consideration (standardised formats) (ITF 2.5.2) (OG Para 68)</p>	<p>This decision should not allow bureaucratic procedures interfere with reporting on an emergency situation in a WH site. There should always be a “fast-track” mechanism for issues that require immediate attention from the Bureau/Committee. This could mean delegation of authority to the Chair or the Director of the WHC to take decisions on sites in emergency situations and/or to take emergency cases direct to the Bureau and/or Committee.</p>
<p>The Bureau recommended to the Committee that presentations on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites should be encouraged to use images and maps to improve comprehension (ITF 2.5.3) (OG Paras 69-71,77)</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>The Bureau recommended further examination by the Special Session of the Bureau (October 2000) as to whether working documents on monitoring should be made available, in a timely manner, to the State Party concerned, whether or not they are members of the Committee (Task Force Recommendation 2.5.1, CANT 4.6.g and O G 68).</p>	<p>IUCN believes that State of Conservation reports should be made available to the State Party concerned but as for evaluations, this should be the responsibility of the WHC and not the Advisory Bodies.</p>

<p align="center">Bureau Decision From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p align="center">IUCN Comment</p>
<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>	<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>
<p><i>Each year the State Parties of one region shall submit to the Centre their periodic report on the state of conservation of their sites. The Centre will examine those reports inter alia in the light of the results of the earlier examination of the same sites and establish a document summarising the reports and commenting on the state of conservation of the sites. That document of the Centre shall be submitted to the subcommittee which will then identify the sites where no problems, minor problems or major problems exist. The Committee will then examine the report of the sub-Committee but limiting the discussion to the sites with major problems. Any member of the Committee will however, have the right to demand a discussion on a site considered by the Subcommittee as being with no or only minor problems. The same procedure will apply to the reactive monitoring, but the Task Force on implementation, still has to make proposals to the Committee on those reactive monitoring Proposed approach to state of conservation reporting using sub-committees (ITF 2.5.6 C) (OG Section II)</i></p>	<p>Agree. However, the sub-committee should have the power to express concern about minor problems to State Parties and offer advice on improving conservation.</p> <p>The role of the ABs in this process is not addressed and IUCN would like clarification on its role.</p>
<p><i>The next revision of the Operational Guidelines should refer to the distribution of state of conservation documentation to the State Party concerned at the same time as to the Bureau and Committee (See CANT 4.6.g)) (OG Paras 69-71, 77)</i></p>	<p>Agree but WHC should be responsible for this distribution of documentation.</p>
<p><i>New sections of text to be provided on a definition of ‘periodic reporting’ and follow-up to periodic reporting (see CANT p 15, 3.III.B.) (OG Section III.B)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>New sections of text to be provided on the objectives of reactive reporting, purpose of reactive monitoring reports and follow-up to these reports (see CANT p 16, 3.III.C.) (OG Section III.C)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>

<p align="center">Bureau Decision From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p align="center">IUCN Comment</p>
<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>	<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>
<p>2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List</p>	
<p><i>The Committee should carry out systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of inscription on the World Heritage in Danger List and related assistance in the protection of sites (ITF 2.6.4 C).</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>Funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List. For each site on the In Danger list a precise action plan and a reporting mechanism shall be established (ITF 2.6.2 B) (OG Para 113)</i></p>	<p>IUCN welcomes this recommendation but believes that this activity will need to be properly resourced.</p>
<p><i>Operational Guidelines to more clearly (paras 86 & 87) stress State Party involvement (and where appropriate responsibility) in the action planning process, and the need to designate responsibility for implementing the actions (ITF 2.6.3 B)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>Simplification and editing of Para 6 of existing guidelines (see CANT4.2.) That section (vi) (on World Heritage in Danger listing) should be divided into three parts dealing with properties under threat, properties where the threat has been mitigated, and properties whose values have been lost (CANT 4.2.b) (OG Para 6)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>The criteria for inclusion on the List in Danger should be consistent with the Statement of Values (CANT 4.6.f)</i></p>	<p>IUCN agrees with this recommendation. However, as stated in section 2.3 “Statement of Values”, it believes that the relationship of “Statement of Values” to outstanding universal value and Brief Descriptions/Statements of Significance needs to be clarified, or desirably integrated into a single agreed statement.</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<i>Recommended that legal advice should be sought on several legal questions which need to be resolved in order to facilitate the revision of the Operational Guidelines with a degree of confidence, including whether there is authority under the Convention to include a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger without State Party consent and whether there is authority under the Convention to delete a property from the World Heritage List without State Party consent (CANT 4.7.) (OG Sections I.E & III.C)</i>	Agree.
<i>Deletion</i>	
<i>New sections of text to be provided on the objectives of deletion from the World Heritage List and criteria and benchmarks for deletion (CANT p 16, 3.III.E.) (OG Section III.E)</i>	Agree.
<i>Recommended that legal advice should be sought on several legal questions which need to be resolved in order to facilitate the revision of the Operational Guidelines with a degree of confidence (CANT 4.7.) (OG Sections I.E & III.C)</i>	
<i>Recommended that a section on management of World Heritage properties be included in the Operational Guidelines (CANT 4.6.a))</i>	IUCN welcomes this recommendation and would also like to see an Annex to the Operational Guidelines containing key references for best practice in conservation management.
<i>Recommended that management must be focused on the protection of the outstanding universal natural and cultural values as defined in the statement of values (CANT 4.6.c))</i>	Agree but management should not be detrimental to other values that are not mentioned in the “statement of values”.
<i>The Secretariat and the Advisory bodies should put a proposal to the committee to prepare a set of short, well illustrated, easy to use guides to management of World Heritage properties (CANT 4.6.d))</i>	IUCN welcomes this recommendation but notes that such a project should begin by reviewing existing literature as many good management publications already exist. The project should concentrate on filling gaps in existing literature. Alternatively the project could prepare guides which offer literature reviews of existing publications in a given field with guidelines specific to managing for WH values.

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
2.7 World Heritage Fund and International Assistance	
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that it should encourage all parties to respect the Operational Guidelines provisions for international assistance especially on deadlines and follow up to previous projects (ITF 2.7.3) (OG Section IV).	Agree but there is a need for a mechanism to ensure that the WHC enforce this.
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Centre should present the budget in a single document with several columns according to category of delegation (Chair, Committee, Bureau, Centre). The budget proposals should be in line with the strategic priorities. The budget will indicate, per objective of the strategic plan, the resources requested and the results expected. Every 6 months (or every year if the budget becomes biennial), the Centre will present a document reporting on the expenses actually made and the results achieved (ITF 2.7.1).	IUCN welcomes this recommendation but notes that the Secretariat should ensure that it does not lead to increased bureaucracy.
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that budget items should be supported by related working documents; each working document with budgetary implications should be cross-referenced to the budget (ITF 2.7.2).	Supporting budget items with “working documents” should not imply that “project proposals” need to be written for each budget line. This should be further clarified as it can lead to increased bureaucracy as well as increased number of documents for review by the Committee.
The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Centre should identify opportunities to consolidate funding and conclude cooperation agreements with other organisations involved in world heritage activities (ITF 2.7.4).	Agree.
The Bureau recommended that the external evaluation of International Assistance performed by C3E (WHC-2000/CONF.202/13) also be considered as part of the examination of International Assistance by the special session of the Bureau to be held in October 2000.	IUCN applauds this timely report and hopes that the Bureau/Committee will make the implementation of its recommendations a priority. For further comments see the document: “IUCN Comments on the Main Conclusions and Recommendations of the C3E Report.”

<p align="center">Bureau Decision From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p align="center">IUCN Comment</p>
<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>	<p><u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u></p>
<p><i>New sections of text provided as on principles and policy governing international assistance, including co-ordination of resources from all sources and evaluation and follow-up of international assistance (see CANT Annex VII) (OG Section IV)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>The Committee should allocate international assistance in line with strategic priorities (eg. World Heritage In Danger, Global Strategy). It should consider establishing principles and procedures for assessing requests for international assistance (ITF 2.7.5 B) (OG Paras 94-97, 113-116)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>The Committee should require periodic (every 6 years) independent evaluations to assess the relevance and effectiveness of international assistance, their impact on sites and the balance between natural and cultural sites (ITF 2.7.6 B)(OG Paras 121, 120)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>The Committee should move to a biennial budgeting for the World Heritage Fund to harmonise with the UNESCO budget cycle (ITF 2.7.7 C).</i></p>	<p>Biennial funding for Advisory Bodies is essential to ensure that full advantage can be taken of the earlier closing date for nominations. In effect, ABs need to operate on a rolling basis but annual funding mechanisms does not recognise this.</p>
<p>3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT</p>	
<p>3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents</p>	
<p>The Bureau recommended the Committee adopt ITF 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 concerning the reduction in volume and improvement in format of documents.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>The Bureau agreed that further discussion was required at the Special Session of the Bureau (October 2000) to clarify the critical issue of rights of access to documents (ITF 3.1.6 C).</p>	<p>Agree.</p>

<p align="center">Bureau Decision From Report of 24th session of Bureau</p>	<p align="center">IUCN Comment</p>
<p>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</p>	<p>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</p>
<p><i>A new section of text to be provided on documentation and information management (see CANT p 18, 3.V.D.) (OG Section V.D)</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><i>Clear rules should be developed to clarify rights of access to documents. Rules to be consistent with the objective of minimising the production and duplication of documentation, while encouraging and supporting transparent and open decision-making (ITF 3.1.6 C).</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p><i>The Committee should encourage wide distribution and promotion of information on best conservation practices, including through web linkages (ITF 3.1.4 B).</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p><i>The decisions and resolutions of the Committee and the General Assembly as well as the text of the Global Strategy should be regrouped in one single document. The countries which have just ratified the Convention as well as the new members of the Committee should be handed documents containing complete information (ITF 3.1.5 B).</i></p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage sites</p>	
<p>With reference to Task Force Recommendation 3.2.1, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that a portion of data capture project was already underway. The Secretariat is seeking guidance as the to expansion of the project and noted that an assessment would need to be made of the costs involved.</p>	
<p>The Bureau agreed that the strategy and budget for the Information Management System (IMS) needed to be discussed further. It was agreed that the special session of the Bureau to be held in October would set aside enough time for this discussion to bring together on-going work and to prepare a focused and budgeted proposal providing direction for the Information Management Strategy, including IMS (Information Management System).</p>	<p>IUCN looks forward to reviewing the draft workplan for information management and to collaborating with the WHC on information management issues.</p>

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>
<i>A list of sites for which international assistance has been granted should be published, and updated regularly. The list will report outcomes and results (ITF 3.2.3 B) (OG Para 121)</i>	Agree.
4. OTHER MATTERS	
4.1 The Roles of Advisory Bodies and the Centre	
It was considered that at this stage an analysis of tentative lists would be premature because States Parties must be given time to define a calendar for the submission of nominations. In this regard, it was recalled that the Group on the Representativity of the List had recommended that the advisory bodies analyse, scientifically the recommendations of regional and thematic meetings on the harmonisation of tentative lists that have taken place since 1984 as well as Global Strategy meetings organised since 1994. (RL II ii and iii).	IUCN agrees with this recommendation and reiterates its comments above in section 2.2 “Tentative Lists”.
It was strongly underline that the analysis of tentative lists must be an exercise based not only on achievements but also on the evolution of Global Strategy. The latter must be evaluated at regular 5-year intervals. In effect, it constitutes a platform that should allow under-represented regions to nominate properties for inscription. In this manner it will clearly illustrate the obligations of international solidarity.	IUCN notes that underrepresented biomes should also be considered as priority for nominating properties along with underrepresented regions.
<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>	<u>Recommendations of the Task Forces not addressed by June/ July Bureau:</u>
<i>A new section of text to be provided on the roles of the Advisory Bodies (CANT p 13, 3.I.D.) (OG Section I.D)</i>	Agree

Bureau Decision From Report of 24 th session of Bureau	IUCN Comment
<i>A new section of text to be provided on the role of the Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee and also ‘Partners in Site Management’ (CANT p 13, 3.I.D.) (OG Section I.D)</i>	Agree.
4.2 Contract Development and Management <i>The Committee, as a high priority, should direct the Center to improve the timeliness of contracts and contract payments (ITF 4.2.1 B).</i>	Agree.
Education, Training and Research <i>A new section of text to be provided on education, training and research (see CANT p 18, 3.V.C.) (OG Section V.C)</i>	Agree.
<i>Training strategies should pay attention to training that focuses on post inscription processes and activities including management and periodic reporting (see CANT 4.6:e) (OG Paras 98-102).</i>	IUCN agrees that the emphasis on training for post-inscription management is a priority issue (see IUCN comments on “Capacity Building” in Section 2 above).
5. EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	IUCN believes that it is not appropriate for IUCN, in its role as Advisory Body to the Committee, to comment on this issue.
Terms of Committee members (RC 1, para 5) Number of Committee members (RC 2, para 5) Equitable representation of the world’s regions and cultures (RC 3, para 5)	
The Chairperson specified that the working and information documents concerning this agenda item as well as the text of the Observer of Belgium and the evaluation of international assistance (C3E) will be communicated to the Bureau for its special session in October 2000. All additional written inputs should be sent to the World Heritage Centre before 7 September 2000.	