

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

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

## **World Heritage**

**35 COM** 

**Limited Distribution** 

WHC-11/35.COM/13 Paris, 6 May 2011 Original: English/French

## UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

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

#### **WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Thirty-fifth session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 19-29 June 2011

#### Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the Operational Guidelines

#### SUMMARY

This document contains 3 sections:

Section I: Presentation of all amendments reviewed and agreed to by the

Working Group established by the World Heritage Committee

(Brasilia, 2010);

Section II: Presentation of all amendments reviewed and agreed to by the

Working Group held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 15

to 16 November 2010;

Section III: Draft Decision

Decision **34 COM 13** requested the Working Group which was established by the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010) as a consultative body (under Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure) to continue its work to finalize the revisions of the *Operational Guidelines*, and to present its report to the Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 13** See Section III;

PRESENTATION OF ALL AMENDMENTS REVIEWED AND AGREED TO BY THE WORKING GROUP ESTABLISHED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (BRASILIA, 2010);

#### **BACKGROUND**

- 1. Following the latest version of the amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* sent to all States Parties on 1 December 2009, comprising the amendments submitted to the World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) as well as those made by Committee members (Australia, Canada) during the debate on this issue, 20 States Parties have responded by sending their proposed amendments to the *Operational Guidelines*.
- 2. The new proposed amendments submitted during 2010, as well as the former amendments proposed by Australia and Canada and those of the Secretariat were considered by a Working Group established by the World Heritage Committee as a consultative body under Rule 20 of its Rules of Procedures.
- 3. All comments sent by States Parties as well as those provided by the Advisory Bodies, including on the implications of adopting any of these new amendments in relation to the *Operational Guidelines* as a whole, were available to the Working Group during its work in Brasilia.
- 4. In the entire text of the *Operational Guidelines*, Barbados has proposed to write "Outstanding Universal Value" in capital letters. These have been directly inserted in the text to avoid repetition.

#### A. Protection and Management (paragraphs 96 and 103)

> Proposed amendments to paragraph 96 of the *Operational Guidelines* 

Paragraph 96: Protection and management of World Heritage properties should ensure that their Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription, are sustained or enhanced over time. A regular review of the general state of conservation of properties, and thus also their Outstanding Universal Value, shall be done within a framework of monitoring processes for World Heritage properties, as specified within the *Operational Guidelines* (1).

(1): The processes of monitoring specified in the Operational Guidelines are Reactive Monitoring (see paragraphs 169-176) and Periodic Reporting (see paragraphs 199-210). NB: This will be presented as a footnote in the final text

**Paragraph 103:** Wherever necessary for the proper protection of the property, an adequate buffer zone should be provided.

# B. Process for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List (paragraphs 128, 132, 159, 160, 164, 165, 166 and 167)

Proposed amendments to paragraphs 128, 159, 160, 164, 165, and 166 of the *Operational Guidelines* concerning the deadline of submission

Paragraph 128: Nominations may be submitted at any time during the year, but only those nominations that are "complete" (see paragraph 132) and received by the Secretariat on or before 1 February<sup>2</sup> will be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee during the following year. Only nominations of properties included in the State Party's Tentative List will be examined by the Committee (see paragraph 63).

<sup>2</sup>: If 1 February falls on a weekend, the nomination must be received by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday. NB: This will be presented as a footnote in the final text

Paragraph 159: Nominations which the Committee decides to refer back to the State Party for additional information may be resubmitted to the following Committee session for examination. The additional information must be received by the Secretariat by 1 February (see footnote 2) of the year in which examination by the Committee is desired. The Secretariat will immediately transmit it to the relevant Advisory Bodies for evaluation. A referred nomination which is not presented to the Committee within three years of the original Committee decision will be considered as a new nomination when it is resubmitted for examination, following the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168.

Paragraph 160: The Committee may decide to defer a nomination for more in depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision by the State Party. Should the State Party decide to resubmit the deferred nomination in any subsequent year, it must be received by the Secretariat by 1 February (see footnote 2). These nominations will then be revaluated (evaluated again by the relevant Advisory Bodies during the course of the full year and a half evaluation cycle according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168.

Paragraph 164: If a State Party wishes to request a minor modification to the boundaries of a property already on the World Heritage List, it must be received by 1 February (see footnote ²) by the Committee through the Secretariat, which will seek the evaluation of the relevant Advisory Bodies on whether considered a minor modification or not₁. The Secretariat shall then submit the Advisory Bodies' evaluation to the Committee. The Committee may approve such modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently important as to constitute a significant boundary modification of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply.

**Paragraph 165:** If a State Party wishes to significantly modify the boundary of a property already on the World Heritage List, the State Party shall submit this proposal as if it were a new nomination. This re-nomination must be received by **1 February** (see footnote <sup>2</sup>) and will be evaluated in the full year and a half cycle of evaluation according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168.

This provision applies to extensions, as well as reductions.

Paragraph 166: Where a State Party wishes to have the property inscribed under additional, fewer or different criteria other than those used for the original inscription, it shall submit this request as if it were a new nomination. This renomination must be received by 1 February (see footnote 2) and will be evaluated in the full year and a half cycle of evaluation according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168. Properties recommended will only be evaluated under the new criteria and will remain on the World Heritage List even if unsuccessful in having additional criteria recognized.

**Paragraph 167**: A State Party may request that the Committee authorize a modification to the name of a property already inscribed on the World Heritage List. A request for a modification to the name shall be received by the Secretariat at least 3 months prior to the meeting of the Committee. [French change]

#### > Proposed amendments to paragraph 132 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 132: For a nomination to be considered as "complete", the following requirements (see format in Annex 5) are to be met:

#### Paragraph 132 (point 6): Monitoring

States Parties shall include the key indicators in place and/or proposed to measure and assess the state of conservation of the property, the factors affecting it, conservation measures at the property, the periodicity of their examination, and the identity of the responsible authorities.

#### Paragraph 132 (point 7): Documentation

All documentation necessary to substantiate the nomination shall be provided. In addition to what is indicated above, this shall include a) images of a quality suitable for printing (digital photographs at 300 dpi minimum, and, if possible, 35 mm slides, and if essential,–supplementary film, video or other audio visual material; and b) image/audiovisual inventory and authorization form (see Annex 5, point 7.a). The text of the nomination shall be transmitted in printed form as well as in electronic format (Word and/or PDF format preferred).

#### Paragraph 132 (point 10): Number of printed copies required:

- Nominations of cultural properties (excluding cultural landscapes): 2 identical copies
- Nominations of natural properties and cultural landscapes: 3 identical copies
- Nominations of mixed properties: 4 identical copies

#### Paragraph 132 (point 11): Paper and electronic format

Nominations shall be presented on A4-size paper (or "letter"); and in electronic format (Word and/or PDF format).

- ➤ Having examined paragraph 132, the Working Group decided that the following amendments to paragraphs 108 and 115 were also necessary:
  - **108.** Each nominated property should have an appropriate management plan or other documented management system which must specify how the outstanding universal value of a property should be preserved, preferably through participatory means.
  - 115. In some circumstances, a management plan or other management system may not be fully in place at the time when a property is nominated for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee. The State Party concerned should then indicate when the management plan or system will be fully in place, and how it proposes to mobilize the resources required to achieve this. The State Party should also provide documentation which will guide the management of the site until the management plan or system is finalized fully in place.

#### C. Evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies (paragraph 150)

Proposed amendments to paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines

Paragraph 150: Letters from the concerned State(s) Party(ies) detailing the factual errors they might have identified in the evaluation of their nomination made by the Advisory Bodies must be received by the Chairperson at least 14 days before the opening of the session of the Committee with copies to the relevant Advisory Body(ies). Provided that the Chairperson, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body, is satisfied that the letter deals only with factual errors and contains no advocacy, the letter shall be distributed in the working languages to the members of the Committee and may be read out by the Chairperson following the presentation of the evaluation. If a letter contains both notification of factual errors and advocacy, only those parts of it dealing with factual errors shall be distributed.

#### D. Decision of the World Heritage Committee (paragraph 155)

> Proposed amendments to paragraph 155 of the Operational Guidelines

**Paragraph 155:** 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 protection and management in force **and the requirements for protection and management.** The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value shall be the basis for the future protection and management of the property.

#### E. Modifications to the boundaries (paragraphs 107, 164, 168 and 176)

#### > Proposed amendment to paragraph 107 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 107: Although buffer zones are not part of the nominated property, any modifications to or creation of buffer zones subsequent to inscription of a property on the World Heritage List should be approved by the World Heritage Committee using the procedure for a minor boundary modification (see paragraph 164 and Annex 11). The creation of buffer zones subsequent to inscription is normally considered to be a minor boundary modification.<sup>1</sup>

#### > Proposed amendments to paragraph 164 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 164: If a State Party wishes to request a minor modification to the boundaries of a property already on the World Heritage List, it must be received by 1 February (see footnote 2) by the Committee through the Secretariat, which will seek the evaluation of the relevant Advisory Bodies on whether this can be considered a minor modification or not. The Secretariat shall then submit the Advisory Bodies' evaluation to the World Heritage Committee. The Committee may approve such a modification, or it may consider that the modification to the boundary is sufficiently significant as to constitute a significant boundary modification of the property, in which case the procedure for new nominations will apply.

See paragraph 107and Annex 11

> Proposed amendments to paragraph 168 of the Operational Guidelines

Timetable / Procedures for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List:

At least 14 working days before the opening of the annual World Heritage Committee session Year 2

Correction of factual errors by States Parties

The concerned States Parties can send, at least 14 working days before the opening of the session of the Committee, a letter to the Chairperson, with copies to the Advisory Bodies, detailing the factual errors they might have identified in the evaluation of their nomination made by the Advisory Bodies.

Proposed amendment by the Secretariat to improve the drafting of paragraph 176 of the Operational Guidelines

**Paragraph 176 e):** [...] In case an emergency action is required, the Committee may authorize its financing from the World Heritage Fund through an emergency assistance request.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In case of transnational/transboundary properties any modification will need the agreement of all States Parties concerned.

#### F. The List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 179-181)

Proposed amendments to paragraphs 179, 180 and 181 of the Operational Guidelines

Paragraph 179 (b)(vi): threatening impacts of climatic, geological or other environmental factors.

#### Paragraph 180 (b)(v) - New Paragraph:

v) threatening impacts of climatic, geological or other environmental factors.

Paragraph 181: In addition, the threats and/or their detrimental impacts on the integrity of the property must be those which are amenable to correction by human action. In the case of cultural properties, both natural factors and man-made factors may be threatening, while in the case of natural properties, most threats will be man-made and only very rarely a natural factor (such as an epidemic disease) will threaten the integrity of the property. In some cases, the threats and/or their detrimental impacts on the integrity of the property may be corrected by administrative or legislative action, such as the cancelling of a major public works project or the improvement of legal status.

#### G. International assistance (paragraphs 240, 241, 248, 249, 250 and 252)

> Proposed amendment to paragraph 240 of the *Operational Guidelines* 

Paragraph 240: A balance will be maintained in the allocation of resources for cultural and natural heritage. This balance is reviewed and decided upon on a regular basis by the Committee and during the last 3 months of each biennium by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

> Proposed amendment to paragraphs 241 of the *Operational Guidelines* 

#### VII.E Summary Table

Type of international assistance	Purpose	Budget ceilings per request	Deadline for submission of request	Authority for approval
Emergency Assistance	This assistance may be requested to address ascertained or potential threats facing properties included on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List which have suffered severe damage or are in imminent danger of severe	Up to US\$ 5.000	At any time	Director of the World Heritage Centre

damage due to sudden, unexpected phenomena. Such phenomena may include land subsidence, extensive fires, explosions, flooding or man-made disasters including war. This assistance does not concern cases of damage or deterioration caused by gradual processes of decay, pollution or erosion. It addresses emergency situations strictly relating to the conservation of a World Heritage property (see Decision 28 COM 10B 2.c). It may be made available, if necessary, to more than one World Heritage property in a single State Party (see Decision 6 EXT. COM 15.2). The budget ceilings relate to a single World Heritage property.	Between US\$ 5.001 and 75.000	At any time	Chairperson of the Committee
The assistance may be requested to:  (i) undertake emergency measures for the safeguarding of the property;	Over US\$ 75.000	1 February	Committee
(ii) draw up an emergency plan for the property.			

## Proposed amendments to paragraphs 248, 249, 250 of the Operational Guidelines

**Paragraph 248:** All requests for international assistance for cultural heritage are evaluated by ICOMOS and ICCROM, except requests **up to and including** US\$ 5,000.

**Paragraph 249**: All requests for international assistance for mixed heritage are evaluated by ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN, except requests **up to and including** US\$ 5,000.

**Paragraph 250**: All requests for international assistance for natural heritage are evaluated by IUCN, except requests up to and including US\$ 5,000.

#### > Proposed amendments to paragraph 252 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Paragraph 252: All requests for International Assistance of more than US\$ 5,000, except those of Emergency Assistance up to and including US\$ 75,000, are evaluated by a panel composed of representatives of the World Heritage Centre Regional Desks and the Advisory Bodies, and if possible the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee or one vice-chairperson, meeting at least twice a year before action by the Chairperson and/or Committee. Requests for the approval of the Chairperson can be submitted at anytime to the Secretariat and approved by

the Chairperson after appropriate evaluation. Requests for Emergency Assistance of up to and including US\$ 75,000 will be submitted for approval by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee after comments by the Advisory Bodies and without examination by the panel.

#### ANNEXES OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

It is proposed to amend the following annexes of the *Operational Guidelines*:

- > ANNEX 3: GUIDELINES ON THE INSCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
- > ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
- > ANNEX 10: STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE (ANNEX proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies)
- ANNEX 11: MODIFICATIONS TO WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (ANNEX proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies)
- > ANNEX 3: GUIDELINES ON THE INSCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The ICOMOS List of thematic studies is available at the following address:

http://www.icomos.org/studies

The **IUCN List of thematic studies** is available at the following address:

http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa\_worldheritage/wheritage\_pub/

# ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

#### **Executive Summary**

This information, to be provided by the State Party, will be updated by the Secretariat following the decision by the World Heritage Committee. It will then be returned to the State Party confirming the basis on which the property is inscribed on the World Heritage List.

State Party	
State, Province or Region	
Name of Property	
Geographical coordinates to the nearest second	
Textual description of the boundary(ies) of the nominated property	
A4 (or "letter") size map of the nominated property, showing boundaries and buffer zone (if present)	Attach A4 (or "letter") size map
Criteria under which property is nominated (itemize criteria) (see Paragraph 77 of the Operational Guidelines)	
<b>Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value</b> (text should clarify what is considered to be the outstanding universal value embodied by the nominated property, approximately 1-2 page format)	According to the paragraph 155, the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be composed of:  i. Brief synthesis ii. Justification for Criteria iii. Statement of Integrity (for all properties) iv. Statement of authenticity for properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) v. Requirements for protection and management
Name and contact information of official local institution/agency	See format in Annex 10 Organization: Address: Tel: Fax: E-mail: Web address:
Proposed amendments to Annex 5, Point 1.	

Id	Name of the component part	Region(s) /	Coordinates of the Central	Area of	Area of the	Map N°
<mark>n°</mark>		District(s)	Point	<b>Nominated</b>	<b>Buffer Zone</b>	
				component of	(ha)	
				the Property		
				(ha)		
001						

002					
003					
004					
005					
006					
007					
800					
009					
Etc.					
		Total area (in hectares)	ha	ha	

1.d	Geographical coordinates to the nearest second	In this space provide the latitude and longitude coordinates (to the nearest second) or UTM coordinates (to the nearest 10 metres) of a point at the approximate centre of the nominated property. Do not use other coordinate systems. If in doubt, please consult the Secretariat.
		In the case of serial nominations, provide a table showing the name of each component part, its region (or nearest town as appropriate), and the coordinates of its centre point. Coordinate format examples:
		N 45° 06' 05" W 15° 37' 56" or
		UTM Zone 18 Easting: 545670
		Northing: <sup>45</sup> 86750

# 1.e Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone

Annex to the nomination, and list below with scales and dates:

(i) An original copy of a topographic map showing the property nominated, at the largest scale available which shows the entire property. The boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone should be clearly marked. Either on this map, or on an accompanying one, there should also be a record of the boundaries of zones of special legal protection from which the property benefits. Multiple maps may be necessary for serial nominations (see table in 5.1.d). The maps provided should be at the largest available and practical scale to allow the identification of topographic elements such as neighbouring settlements, buildings and routes in order to allow the clear assessment of the impact of any proposed development within, adjacent to, or on the boundary line.

Care is needed with the width of boundary lines on maps, as thick boundary lines may make the actual boundary of the property ambiguous.

Maps may be obtained from the addresses shown at the following Web address http://whc.unesco.org/en/mapagencies

If topographic maps are not available at the appropriate scale, other maps may be substituted. All maps should be capable of being geo-referenced, with a minimum of three points on opposite sides of the maps with complete sets of coordinates. The maps, untrimmed, should show scale, orientation, projection, datum, property name and date. If possible, maps should be sent rolled and not folded.

Geographic Information in digital form is encouraged if possible, suitable for incorporation into a GIS (Geographic Information System). In this case the delineation of the boundaries (nominated property and buffer zone) should be presented in vector form, prepared at the largest scale possible. The State Party is invited to contact the Secretariat for further information concerning this option.

- (ii) A Location Map showing the location of the property within the State Party,
- (iii) Plans and specially prepared maps of the property showing individual features are helpful and may also be annexed.

To facilitate copying and presentation to the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee A4 (or "letter") size reduction and a digital image file of the principal maps should also be included in the nomination text if possible.

Where no buffer zone is proposed, the nomination must include a statement as to why a buffer zone is not required for the proper protection of the nominated property.

> Proposed amendment to Annex 5, Point 5 e) : Property management plan or other management system

(to add at the end of the paragraph)

A timetable for the implementation of the management plan is recommended.

- Proposed amendments to current Title of Annex 5, Point 7.a): Photographs and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form
- Proposed new Annex 10

#### ANNEX 10: STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Format of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and of a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value,

The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be submitted either in English or in French. An electronic version (Word or .pdf format) should also be submitted.

A Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should respect the following format (2 A4 pages max):

- a. Brief synthesis
- b. Justification for Criteria
- c. Statement of integrity (for all sites)
- d. Statement of Authenticity (for sites under criteria i-vi)
- e. Requirements for protection and management

#### **Deadline**

1 February of the year preceding the one in which the approval of the Committee is requested (see footnote 2)

#### ANNEX 11: MODIFICATIONS TO WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

(NEW ANNEX)

#### MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE BOUNDARIES OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Boundary modifications should serve better identification of World Heritage properties and enhance protection of their Outstanding Universal Value

A proposal for a minor boundary modification, submitted by the State Party concerned, is subject to the review of the relevant Advisory Body(ies) and to the approval of the World Heritage Committee.

A proposal for a minor boundary modification can be approved, not approved, or referred by the World Heritage Committee.

#### **Documentation requested**

- 1) Area of the property (in hectares): please indicate a) the area of the property <u>as inscribed</u> and b) the area of the property as proposed to be modified (or the area of the proposed buffer zone). (Note that reductions can be considered as minor modifications only under exceptional circumstances).
- 2) **Description of the modification**: please provide a written description of the proposed change to the boundary of the property (or a written description of the proposed buffer zone).
- 3) **Justification for the modification**: please provide a brief summary of the reasons why the boundaries of the property should be modified (or why a buffer zone is needed), with particular emphasis on how such modification will improve the conservation and/or protection of the property.
- 4) Contribution to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value: please indicate how the proposed change (or the proposed buffer zone) will contribute to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
- 5) **Implications for legal protection**: please indicate the implications of the proposed change for the legal protection of the property. In the case of a proposed addition, or of the creation of a buffer zone, please provide information on the legal protection in place for the area to be added and a copy of relevant laws and regulations.
- 6) **Implications for management arrangements**: please indicate the implications of the proposed change for the management arrangements of the property. In the case of a proposed addition, or of the creation of a buffer zone, please provide information on the management arrangements in place

#### for the area to be added.

- 7) **Maps**: please submit two maps, one clearly showing <u>both</u> delimitations of the property (original and proposed revision) and the other showing <u>only the proposed revision</u>. In the case of the creation of a buffer zone, please submit a map showing both the inscribed property and the proposed buffer zone. Please make sure that the maps:
- are either topographic or cadastral;
- are presented at a scale which is appropriate to the size in hectares of the property and sufficient to clearly show the detail of the current boundary and the proposed changes (and, in any case, the largest available and practical scale);
- have the title and the legend/key in English or French (if this is not possible, please attach a translation);
- mark the boundaries of the property (current and proposed revision) through a clearly visible line that can be distinguished from other features on the maps;
- bear a clearly labeled coordinate grid (or coordinate ticks);
- clearly refer (in the title and in the legend) to the <u>boundary of the World Heritage property</u> (and to the <u>buffer zone of the World Heritage property</u>, if applicable). Please clearly distinguish the boundary of the World Heritage property from any other protected area boundaries.
- 8) Additional information: In the case of a proposed addition, please submit some photographs of the area to be added that provide information on its key values and conditions of authenticity/integrity.

Any other relevant document can be submitted such as thematic maps (e.g. vegetation maps), summaries of scientific information concerning the values of the area to be added (e.g. species lists), and supporting bibliographies.

The above-mentioned documentation should be submitted in English or French in two identical copies (three for mixed properties). An electronic version (the maps in formats such as .jpg, .tif, .pdf) should also be submitted.

#### **Deadline**

1 February of the year in which the approval of the Committee is requested (see footnote<sup>2</sup>)

# II PRESENTATION OF ALL AMENDMENTS REVIEWED AND AGREED TO BY THE WORKING GROUP (UNESCO HEADQUARTERS, PARIS, 15-16 NOVEMBER 2010)

#### A. BACKGROUND

At its 34th session in Brasilia (2010), and in order to consider item 13 on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Committee decided to create a Working Group open to all States Parties as a consultative body (under Section 20 of its Rules of Procedure).

This Working Group met six times during the 34th session of the Committee and reviewed Section I of document *WHC-10/34.COM/13* presented in Seville in 2009, with inclusion of comments submitted by States Parties during the first half of 2010.

Section II of this document concerning amendments presented in the context of expert meetings whose findings had not yet been discussed by the Committee could not be reviewed during the 34th session due to time constraints.

The World Heritage Committee, in its Decision **34 COM 13**, requested the Working Group "to continue its work to finalize the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*, and to present its report to the Committee at its 35th session in 2011, including reflections concerning the process for the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and the recommendations of the international expert meetings presented in section II of Document *WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev*".

Therefore, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Working Group, the Director of the World Heritage Centre invited the Working Group to meet in Paris at UNESCO Headquarters from 15 to 16 November 2010 to discuss proposed amendments to Section II of document *WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev*. This meeting was open to all States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*.

#### **B. OPENING OF THE MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP**

The following States Parties attended the meeting: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, India, Israel, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as well as Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN).

The Chairperson of the Working Group (hereinafter called "the Chairperson") opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. He recalled the above-mentioned background and presented the working document *WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev.*, as well as the other documents made available: Provisional Agenda; "States Parties' comments"; "Advisory Bodies' comments".

The Chairperson indicated that the Working Group should focus on the review of Section II of the working document, but also on Annex 5 – Point 3 of Section I: "Justification for Inscription" which was added to the Agenda, as well as the question of introducing the concept of sustainable development into the *Operational Guidelines*.

The provisional agenda was adopted as proposed by the Secretariat (see Annex I).

The Chairperson opened the debate and recalled the paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines* and Annexes to be reviewed:

65, 68: Tentative Lists (Procedure and Format)

110, 111, 112: Management systems

119: Sustainable use (following the recommendations of the Expert

Meeting on the relations between the *World Heritage Convention*, conservation and sustainable development; Paraty,

Brazil, 29-31 March 2010)

132.5: Protection and management

137: Serial properties (based on the recommendations of the

International Expert Meeting on serial properties and

nominations; Ittingen, Switzerland, 25-27 February 2010)

Annex 2B: Tentative List Submission Format for Serial, Transnational and

Transboundary Sites

Annex 3: Historic Urban Landscape (see conclusions at the end of this

report)

Science and technology: based on the recommendations of the Expert Workshop on Science and Technology within the framework of the *Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List* (London, United Kingdom, 21-23 January 2008): see conclusions at the end of this report.

Annex 5 point 3: Justification for Inscription

Annex 5 point 4 b: Factors affecting the property (amendments proposed by

Australia following the Expert Workshop on Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites,

Mogao Caves, China, 26-29 September 2009)

The Chairperson then moved to the review of each of the paragraphs starting with:

#### **II.C** Tentative Lists

Amendment to paragraph 65 of the *Operational Guidelines* (based on the Recommendations of the Expert Meeting on "Upstream Processes to Nominations: Creative Approaches in the Nomination Process" (27-29 April 2010, Phuket, Thailand)):

The Working Group decided to delete the word "preferably":

**65.** States Parties shall submit Tentative Lists to the Secretariat, preferably at least one year prior to the submission of any nomination. States Parties are encouraged to re-examine and re-submit their Tentative List at least every ten years.

#### Amendments to paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

68. Upon reception of the Tentative Lists from the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre checks for compliance of the documentation with Annex 2. If the documentation is not considered in compliance with Annex 2, the World Heritage Centre refers it back to the State Party. If—When all information has been provided, the Tentative List will be is registered by the Secretariat and transmitted to the relevant Advisory Bodies for information. A summary of all Tentative Lists is presented annually to the Committee. The Secretariat, in consultation with the States Parties concerned, updates its records, in particular by removing from the Tentative Lists the inscribed properties and nominated properties which were not inscribed.

#### II.F Protection and management

The Chairperson recalled that the inclusion of the Historic Urban Landscape approach in the relevant sections of the *Operational Guidelines* was requested as a result of the expert meeting held in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil, 7-11 December 2009) and of the *ad hoc* Sub-Working Group of the Working Group on the *Operational Guidelines* established during the 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

The Chairperson of the *ad-hoc* Sub-Working Group on the Historic Urban Landscape approach provided the background including links with the proposed UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape that is being put forward for approval at the 36th session of the General Conference of UNESCO (2011).

#### Management systems

#### Amendment to paragraph 110 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

**110.** An effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the nominated property and its cultural and natural context. Management systems may vary according to different cultural perspectives, the resources available and other factors. They may incorporate traditional practices, existing urban or regional planning instruments, and other planning control mechanisms, both formal and informal. Impact assessments for proposed interventions are essential for all World Heritage properties.

#### Amendments to paragraph 111 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

- **111.** In recognizing the diversity mentioned above, common elements of an effective management system could include:
- a) a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders;
- b) a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;
- c) the monitoring and assessment of the impacts of trends, changes, and of proposed interventions:
- d) the involvement of partners and stakeholders;
- e) the allocation of necessary resources;

- f) capacity-building; and
- g) an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.

#### Amendments to paragraph 112 of the Operational Guidelines:

**112.** Effective management involves a cycle of short, medium and long-term and day-to-day actions to protect, conserve and present the nominated property. An integrated approach to planning and management is essential to guide the evolution of properties over time and to ensure maintenance of all aspects of their Outstanding Universal Value. This approach goes beyond the property to include any buffer zone(s), as well as the broader setting.

#### Sustainable use

#### Amendments to paragraph 119 of the Operational Guidelines:

119. World Heritage properties may support a variety of ongoing and proposed uses that are ecologically and culturally sustainable. and which may contribute to the quality of life of communities concerned. The State Party and its partners must ensure that such sustainable use or any other change does not adversely impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and/or authenticity of the property. Furthermore, any uses should be ecologically and culturally sustainable. For some properties, human use would not be appropriate. Legislations, policies and strategies affecting World Heritage properties should ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value, support the wider conservation of natural and cultural heritage, and promote and encourage the active participation of the communities and stakeholders concerned with the property as necessary conditions to its sustainable protection, conservation, management and presentation.

# III. PROCESS FOR THE INSCRIPTION OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

#### III.B Format and content of nominations

#### **132. 5.** Protection and management

#### Amendments to paragraph 132 point 5 of the Operational Guidelines:

<u>Management</u>: An appropriate management plan or other management system is essential and shall be provided in the nomination. Assurances of the effective implementation of the management plan or other management system are also expected. <u>Sustainable development principles should be integrated into the management system.</u>

A copy of the management plan or documentation of the management system shall be annexed to the nomination. If the management plan exists only in a language other than English or French, an English or French detailed description of its provisions shall be annexed.

A detailed analysis or explanation of the management plan or a documented management system shall be provided.

A nomination which does not include the above-mentioned documents is considered incomplete unless other documents guiding the management of the property until the finalization of the management plan are provided as outlined in paragraph 115.

The Working Group noted that the same highlighted text could be introduced in Point 5.e of Annex 5 (see below):

## ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

#### 5.e Property management plan or other management system

As noted in paragraph 132 of the *Operational Guidelines*, an appropriate management plan or other management system is essential and shall be provided in the nomination. Assurances of the effective implementation of the management plan or other management system are also expected. Sustainable development principles should be integrated into the management system.

A copy of the management plan or documentation of the management system shall be annexed to the nomination, in English or French as indicated in section 7.b.

If the management plan exists only in a language other than English or French, an English or French detailed description of its provisions shall be annexed. Give the title, date and author of management plans annexed to this nomination.

A detailed analysis or explanation of the management plan or a documented management system shall be provided.

#### Serial properties

#### Amendments to paragraph 137 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

- **137.** Serial properties will include two or more component parts related because they belong to: by clearly defined links:
- a) the same historico cultural group;
- a) Component parts should reflect cultural, social or functional links over time that provide, where relevant, landscape, ecological, evolutionary or habitat connectivity.
- b) the same type of property which is characteristic of the geographical zone;
- b) Each component part should contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as a whole in a substantial, scientific, readily defined and discernible way, and may include, inter alia, intangible attributes. The resulting Outstanding Universal Value should be easily understood and communicated.
- c) the same geological, geomorphological formation, the same biogeographic province, or the same ecosystem type;

c) Consistently, and in order to avoid an excessive fragmentation of component parts, the process of nomination of the property, including the selection of the component parts, should take fully into account the overall manageability and coherence of the property (see paragraph 114).

and provided it is the series <u>as a whole</u> – and not necessarily the individual parts of it – which are of Outstanding Universal Value.

#### **NEW ANNEX 2B**

Annex 2B



# TENTATIVE LIST SUBMISSION FORMAT FOR SERIAL, TRANSNATIONAL AND TRANSBOUNDARY FUTURE NOMINATIONS

	FUTURE NOMINATIONS
STATE PARTY:	DATE OF SUBMISSION:
Submission <sup>2</sup> prepared by:	
Name:	E-mail:
Title:	
Title.	
Address:	Fax:
Institution:	Telephone:
1.a Name of the serial transnation	onal / transboundary future nomination <sup>3</sup> :
	<u> </u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This submission will be valid only when all the States Parties indicated in Section 1.b have sent their submissions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The text provided in this section should be identical in all submissions of the States Parties involved in the presentation of the same serial, transnational / transboundary future nomination.

1.b	Other States Parties participating:
1.c	Name(s) of the national component part(s):
1.0	realite(s) of the national component part(s).
1.d	State, Province or Region:
1.e	Latitude and Longitude, or Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates:
<b>2.a</b>	Brief Description of the serial, transnational / transboundary future nomination <sup>2</sup> :
<b></b> u	Brief Besonption of the serial, transnational / transboundary future frommation.
2.b	Description of the component part(s):
3.	JUSTIFICATION FOR OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE <sup>2</sup> OF THE FUTURE
	NOMINATION AS A WHOLE
the Wa	(Preliminary identification of the values of the future nomination as a whole which merit inscription on orderitage List)
uio vvo	Tollage Listy
3.a	Criteria met <sup>2</sup> [see Paragraph 77 of the Operational Guidelines]:
	(Please tick the box corresponding to the proposed criteria and justify the use of each below)
	(course not not not consupply and proposed of the notation)
	(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (vii) (viii) (ix) (x)
0 h	Chatamanta of authoritists and dominta with lass Danagraphs 70.05 of the Orangianal Ovidalinesh
3.b	Statements of authenticity and/or integrity [see Paragraphs 79-95 of the Operational Guidelines]:
3.c.1	Justification of the selection of the component part(s) in relation to the future nomination as a
whole	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

#### 3.c.2 Comparison with other similar properties<sup>2</sup>:

This comparison should outline the similarities with other properties inscribed or not on the World Heritage List, and the reasons for the exceptional character of the future nomination.

The Chairperson then presented the amendment proposed by United Kingdom based on the recommendations of the Expert Workshop on Science and Technology within the framework of the *Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List* (London, United Kingdom, 21-23 January 2008). This amendment was proposed to be inserted in Annex 3 after the Heritage Routes as a new typology of heritage. The Working Group concluded after intense discussions that the text below be considered by the future workshop on criterion (vi).

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The World Heritage Convention refers to science in its definitions of heritage.

Article 1 defines 'cultural heritage' as monuments, groups of buildings and/or sites which are of 'Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of history, art or science'.

Article 2 defines 'natural heritage' as features, geological and physiographical formations and sites which are of 'Outstanding Universal Value from the ... scientific point of view'

#### **Definitions of Science and Technology**

'Science' is understood as including systems of knowledge which may be historical, traditional, indigenous and/or contemporary. These typically include predictive ideas, and modes of explanation based on observations of nature or deductive discoveries that are logical and rational in their own terms, can be validated, and are open to change and refutation through further observations.

'Technology' may be considered the practical application of scientific knowledge which results in the production of material artifacts and technological ensembles.

#### Inscription of heritage linked to science and technology on the World Heritage List

In the context of the *World Heritage Convention*, which focuses on values embodied in specific places, developments in science and technology are expressed through surviving physical evidence found on the sites. For inscription on the World Heritage List, such evidence needs to meet one or more of the criteria for Outstanding Universal Value as well as the conditions of authenticity and/or integrity.

Two crucial points should be considered when determining whether a heritage linked to science and technology is suitable for inscription on the World Heritage List.

- i) Recall absolutely the need to have an Outstanding Universal Value;
- ii) Designate areas that demonstrate important scientific and technological achievements.

With regard to possible inscriptions of science and/or technology sites under Criterion (vi), five principles should be observed:

- a) Criterion (vi) can be interpreted to cover scientific heritage;
- b) Although Criterion (vi) has clear merit in this area, the World Heritage Committee had sought to place restrictions on the utilization of this criterion, as a sole justification, with regard to all forms of heritage. Criterion (vi) should usually, and preferably, be used in conjunction with one or more other criteria;
- c) Nominations under Criterion (vi) should refer to strong links to tangible features of sites. For all sites, the emphasis should be upon the ideas in the heritage that are reflected in the features of the site, not simply on the person who developed them;
- d) Criterion (vi) may be used in connection to natural sites, so as to reflect the value of the site for science;
- e) There might be some exceptional instances where Criterion (vi) has the potential to be used on its own for recognizing the heritage of science and/or technology.

For the *World Heritage Convention*, the focuses should be upon the physical sites, which are the tangible heritage, where great achievements of universal value were manifested, and to an extent, remain. Such tangible evidence needs to survive and this can be in the form of landscape, and natural features, buildings, ensembles and objects.

The tangible context for the original scientific insight is also important.

Although each nomination should be examined on a case-by-case basis, the focus should be upon the place, or a collection of places, where the most important fundamental developments, of universal significance, occurred.

Principles of authenticity and integrity are fundamental to the *World Heritage Convention*. In the case of scientific and technological heritage, it is possible to have elements of faithful reconstruction on a site, in exceptional circumstances.

#### **Beyond Nominations**

Education and interpretation of World Heritage properties for scientific and/or technological heritage is of particular importance.

Awareness-raising on this topic should be used as a tool to communicate, *inter alia*, the scientific heritage of individual sites, the management and conservation of such sites, the importance of scientific heritage, and more generic concerns such as sustainable development.

Awareness-raising on this topic should, as appropriate, be linked to other international programmes and initiatives which seek to raise the overall profile of science.

#### ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Amendments to Annex 5, Point 3: Justification for Inscription

NOMINATION FORMAT	EXPLANATORY NOTES
3. Justification	The justification should be set out under the following sections.
for Inscription <sup>4</sup>	This section must make clear why the property is considered to be of "Outstanding Universal Value".
	The whole of this section of the nomination should be written with careful reference to the criteria for inscription found in Paragraph 75 requirements of the Operational Guidelines. It should not include detailed descriptive material about the property or its management, which are addressed in other sections, but should concentrate on why the property is important. convey the key aspects that are relevant to the definition of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
3.1.a Brief synthesis	The brief synthesis should comprise (i) a summary of factual information and (ii) a summary of qualities. The summary of factual information sets out the geographical and historical context and the main features. The summary of qualities should present to decision-makers and the general public the potential Outstanding Universal Value that needs to be sustained, and should also include a summary of the attributes that convey its potential Outstanding Universal Value, and need to be protected, managed and monitored. The summary should relate to all stated criteria in order to justify the nomination. The brief synthesis thus encapsulates the whole rationale for the nomination and proposed inscription.
3. <mark>1 a</mark> b Criteria	See Berggroph 77 of the Operational Cuidelines
under which inscription is proposed (and	See Paragraph 77 of the Operational Guidelines.  Provide a separate justification for each criterion cited.
justification for inscription under these criteria)	State briefly how the property meets those criteria under which it has been nominated (where necessary, make reference to the "description" and "comparative analysis" sections below of the nomination, but do not duplicate the text of these sections). and describe for each criterion the relevant attributes.
3.d Integrity and/or Authenticity	The statement of integrity and/or authenticity should demonstrate that the property fulfils the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity set out in Section II.D of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> , which describe these conditions in greater detail.
	In the case of a cultural property it should also record whether repairs have been carried out using materials and methods traditional to the culture, in conformity with the Nara Document (1995) (see Annex 4).
	In the case of natural properties it should record any intrusions from exotic species of fauna or flora and any human activities that could

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See also paragraphs 132 and 133.

#### compromise the integrity of the property.

## 3.1 c Statement of Integrity

The statement of integrity should demonstrate that the property fulfils the conditions of integrity set out in Section II.D of the *Operational Guidelines*, which describe these conditions in greater detail.

The Operational Guidelines set out the need to assess the extent to which the property:

- includes all elements necessary to express its Outstanding Universal Value:
- is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property's significance;
- suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect (Paragraph 88).

The Operational Guidelines provide specific guidance in relation to the various World Heritage criteria, which is important to understand (Paragraphs 89–95).

# 3.1 d Statement of Authenticity (for nominations made under criteria (i) to (vi)

The statement of authenticity should demonstrate that the property fulfils the conditions of authenticity set out in Section II.D of the *Operational Guidelines*, which describe these conditions in greater detail.

This section should summarise information that may be included in more detail in section 4 of the nomination (and possibly in other sections), and should not reproduce the level of detail included in those sections.

Authenticity only applies to cultural properties and to the cultural aspects of 'mixed' properties.

The Operational Guidelines state that 'properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural values (as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes' (Paragraph 82).

The Operational Guidelines suggest that the following types of attributes might be considered as conveying or expressing Outstanding Universal Value:

- form and design;
- materials and substance:
- use and function:
- traditions, techniques and management systems;
- location and setting;
- language and other forms of intangible heritage;
- spirit and feeling; and
- . other internal/external factors.

# 3.1 e Protection and management requirements

This section should set out how the requirements for protection and management will be met, in order to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained over time. It should include both details of an overall framework for protection and management, and the identification of specific long term expectations

for the protection of the property.

This section should summarise information that may be included in more detail in section 5 of the nomination document (and also potentially in sections 4 and 6), and should not reproduce the level of detail included in those sections.

The text in this section should first outline the framework for protection and management. This should include the necessary protection mechanisms, management systems and/or management plans (whether currently in place or in need of establishment) that will protect and conserve the attributes that carry Outstanding Universal Value, and address the threats to and vulnerabilities of the property. These could include the presence of strong and effective legal protection, a clearly documented management system, including relationships with key stakeholders or user groups, adequate staff and financial resources, key requirements for presentation (where relevant), and effective and responsive monitoring.

Secondly this section needs to acknowledge any long-term challenges for the protection and management of the property and state how addressing these will be a long-term strategy. It will be relevant to refer to the most significant threats to the property, and to vulnerabilities and negative changes in authenticity and/or integrity that have been highlighted, and to set out how protection and management will address these vulnerabilities and threats and mitigate any adverse changes.

As an official statement, recognised by the World Heritage Committee, this section of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should convey the most important commitments that the State Party is making for the long-term protection and management of the property.

# 3.e 3.2 Comparative aAnalysis (including state of conservation of similar properties)

The property should be compared to similar properties, whether on the World Heritage List or not. The comparison should outline the similarities the nominated property has with other properties and the reasons that make the nominated property stand out. The comparative analysis should aim to explain the importance of the nominated property both in its national and international context (see Paragraph 132).

The purpose of the comparative analysis is to show that there is room on the List using existing thematic studies and, in the case of serial properties, the justification for the selection of the component parts.

# 3.b 3.3 Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Based on the criteria used above, the proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should make clear why the property is considered to merit inscription on the World Heritage List (see Paragraphs 154-157 of the Operational Guidelines). It may be a unique survival of a particular building form or habitat or designed town. It may be a particularly fine or early or rich survival and it may bear witness to a vanished culture, way of life or eco-system. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional eco-systems, outstanding landscapes or other natural phenomena.

A Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is the official statement adopted by the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription of a

property on the World Heritage List. When the World Heritage Committee agrees to inscribe a property on the World Heritage List, it also agrees on a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that encapsulates why the property is considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value, how it satisfies the relevant criteria, the conditions of integrity and (for cultural properties) authenticity, and how it meets the requirements for protection and management in order to sustain Outstanding Universal Value in the long-term.

Statements of Outstanding Universal Value should be concise and are set out in a standard format. They should help to raise awareness regarding the value of the property, guide the assessment of its state of conservation and inform protection and management. Once adopted by the Committee, the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is displayed at the property and on the UNESCO World Heritage Centre's website.

The main sections of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value are the following:

- a. Brief synthesis
- b. Justification for criteria
- c. Statement of integrity (for all properties)
- d. Statement of authenticity (for properties nominated under criteria i to vi)
- e. Requirements for protection and management.

## ANNEX 5: FORMAT FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Amendments by the Working Group following a proposal by Australia on the basis of the recommendations of the Expert Workshop on *Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites* (Mogao Caves, China, 26-29 September 2009).

#### Amendments to Annex 5, Point 4.b: Factors affecting the property

(iv) Visitor/tourism
pressures Responsible
visitation at World
Heritage sites

Describe the "carrying capacity" of the property. Can it absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects?

An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Possible forms of deterioration due to visitor pressure are: wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces; increases in heat or humidity levels; disturbances to species habitats; or disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life.

Provide the status of visitation to the property (notably available baseline data; patterns of use, including concentrations of activity in parts of the property; and activities planned in the future).

Describe projected levels of visitation due to inscription or other factors.

Define the carrying-capacity of the property and how its management could be enhanced to meet the current or expected visitor numbers and related development pressure without adverse effects.

Consider possible forms of deterioration of the property due to visitor pressure and behaviour including those affecting its intangible attributes.

#### Amendments to Annex 5, Point 5: Protection and Management of the Property

## 5.h Visitor facilities and statistics infrastructure

As well as providing any available statistics or estimates of visitor numbers or patterns over several years, this The section could should describe the inclusive facilities available on site for visitors, and demonstrate that they are appropriate in relation to the protection and management requirements of the property. It should set out how the facilities and services will provide effective and inclusive presentation of the property to meet the needs of visitors, including in relation to the provision of safe and appropriate access to the property. The section should consider visitor facilities that may include for example interpretation/explanation, whether by (signage, trails, guides, notices or publications, guides); property museum/exhibition devoted to the property, visitor or interpretation centre; and/or potential use of digital technologies and services (overnight accommodation; restaurant or refreshment facilities; shops; car parking; lavatories; search and rescue- etc.).

# 5.j Staffing levels and expertise (professional, technical, maintenance)

Indicate the skills and training qualifications which are available at the property needed for the good management of the property, including in relation to visitation and future training needs.

#### **Conclusions by the Chairperson of the Working Group:**

The Chairperson noted that all amendments proposed by the Working Group will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in Bahrain (19-29 June 2011).

Following the intense discussions on the proposed text on Science and Technology, which the Working Group did not adopt, the Chairperson noted that a thematic study should be carried out regarding « **Science and Technology** » as no consensus could be reached. In the meantime, States Parties have been encouraged to host and offer an expert meeting on criterion (vi). This refers to the Decision **34 COM 8B.31**, point 3 by which the World Heritage Committee requested "the World Heritage Centre to organize a meeting for deliberating on sites presenting Outstanding Universal Value, essentially on an associative basis". The outcome of this meeting on criterion (vi) will be circulated at a later stage.

Furthermore, concerning the **Historic Urban Landscape** approach, and following the report of the Sub-Working Group, the Chairperson suggested that this be continued, in particular taking into account the comments received on the first draft of the proposed UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape from Member States of UNESCO by 25 December 2010. These comments will be consolidated and presented to the Intergovernmental Meeting on the preparation of the Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape which will be held on 25-27 May 2011. Further information will be provided to the World Heritage Committee as requested in Decision **34 COM 7.1**.

The Representative of Thailand requested that a sentence be inserted into paragraphs 103, 107, 119, 164, 169 for future consideration in Bahrain. Noting that the discussions had been concluded, the Chairperson asked for an official letter on this issue.

The Chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for their work. He informed the meeting of two other events:

the Information Meeting for States Parties to be held on 17 November 2010 (AM) and the Informal Working Group on the Use of the World Heritage Emblem on the same day (PM).

He then closed the meeting.

#### **ANNEX 1**



#### UNESCO

# World Heritage Centre

Centre du patrimoine mondial

Meeting of the Working Group on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

Réunion du groupe de travail sur la révision des Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial

UNESCO Headquarters/Siège de l'UNESCO, Room/Salle X

15-16 November/novembre 2010

#### Agenda

#### Ordre du jour

I. Opening of the Working Group meeting by the Chairperson of the Working Group established by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session

Ouverture de la réunion du groupe de travail par le Président du groupe de travail mis en place par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 34e session

II. Adoption of the Agenda

Adoption de l'ordre du jour

III. Presentation of the background by the Chairperson of the Working Group

Présentation de l'historique par le Président du groupe de travail

IV. Discussions on proposed amendments to Section II of document WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev.

Discussions sur les amendements proposés à la section II du document WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev.

V. Discussions on Annex 5, point 3: Justification for Inscription

Discussions relatives à l'Annexe 5, point 3 : justification de l'inscription

VI. Discussions on the introduction of the notion of sustainable development within the Operational Guidelines

Discussions relatives à l'introduction de la notion de développement durable dans les Orientations

VII. Closure of the meeting

Clôture de la réunion

#### III. DRAFT DECISION

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 13** 

The World Heritage Committee,

- 1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/13,
- 2. Recalling Decisions 31 COM 16, 32 COM 13, 33 COM 13 and 34 COM 13 respectively adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions;
- 3. <u>Takes note</u> of the results of the Working Group on the revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention established as a Consultative Body (Brasilia, July-August 2010) presented in Section I and the results of the Working Group (UNESCO, Paris, November 2010) presented in Section II of Document WHC-11/35.COM/13;
- 4. Adopts these revisions to the Operational Guidelines;
- 5. <u>Reiterates its request</u> to the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to organize an expert meeting to reflect on the integrity of cultural properties and to seek extrabudgetary funding to support the organization of this meeting;
- 6. <u>Requests</u> the World Heritage Centre to integrate all changes in a revised version of the Operational Guidelines for electronic and hardcopy publication.