World Heritage 24 BUR (SPE)

Distribution limited **WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.10 (SPE)**
Paris, 15 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

Document submitted by the Task Force on Implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* on 11 September 2000

SUMMARY

The following table collates the recommendations of the Final Reports of:

- The Task Force on the Implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* (see **WHC-2000/CONF.202/8**)
- The Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List *Convention* (see **WHC-2000/CONF.202/10** and **2000/CONF.202/10 Add.**)
- The Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee (see **WHC-2000/CONF.202/11**)
- The International Expert Meeting on the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (Canterbury, United Kingdom 10-14 April 2000) (see **WHC-2000/CONF.202/9**)

The table was updated after the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, Paris, 26 June – 1 July 2000) (see **WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.4 (SPE)**).

The table is designed to serve as a guide for decision-making for the Special Session of the Bureau and should be read in conjunction with the Final Reports of these groups, the expert meeting, the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau and other related documents, namely:

- **WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.12** Status Report on Information Management Systems Initiative in the World Heritage Centre (English only)
- **WHC-2000.CONF.202/INF.5 (SPE)** Report on the development of the Information Management Systems Plan
- **WHC-2000/CONF.202/13** Report on the Evaluation of International Assistance provided under the World Heritage Fund
- **WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.10** Synthesis Report of the Meeting on “Cultural Landscapes: Concept and Implementation”, Catania, Italy, 8-11 March 2000
- **WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.13** Synthesis Report of the Expert Meeting on "Authenticity and Integrity in the African Context, Great Zimbabwe National Monument, Zimbabwe, 26-29 May 2000 (English only).
- **Other written contributions** to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre (preferably in English and French) by 7 September 2000

NOTE: See also WHC-2000/CONF.202/3 (SPE)

Explanatory Notes:

'**ITF**': Recommendations of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The number, which follows, refers to the recommendation of that Task Force.

'**CANT**': Recommendations of the International Expert Meeting (convened in Canterbury UK) concerning a global vision for the revision of the Operational Guidelines

'**RL**': Recommendations of the Working Group into the Representativity of the World Heritage List. The number, which follows, refers to the recommendation of that Working Group.

'RC': Recommendations of the Working Group on the Equitable Representation of the World Heritage Committee

'**OG**': an indicative guide to paragraph/s of the Operational Guidelines applicable to relevant recommendations.

'**RP**': refers to the section/s of the Rules and Procedures applicable to relevant recommendations.

Recommendations affecting the World Heritage Convention are addressed in more detail in the paragraphs following the table.

Recommendations are shown in **Bold,** Normal and/or <u>underlined</u> text according to processes for their consideration:

- <u>Underlined text</u>: Priority practical measures recommended by the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention that the Bureau could decide on either at its June 2000 meeting or at its Special Session in October 2000. These might be implemented for the December 2000 meeting of the Committee in order to ensure visible results of benefit to the Committee.

- Normal text: Measures that the Bureau, either at its June 2000 meeting or at its Special Session in October 2000, could submit to the Committee for decision, either in their present form or with further work during the Special Session, or which need further time for examination.

- *Italic text*: Recommendations that would require changes to the *Operational Guidelines*

Subheadings listed in the left hand margin are those identified in the Final Report of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (WHC-2000/CONF.202/8).

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
MEETINGS **STATUTORY** **1.1 General Assembly of States Parties**		*The Committee meet immediately <u>after</u> the General Assembly to elect office bearers (see ITF 1.1.3 B) (OG Para 130)* Rec. changes to General Assembly Rules of Procedure: To save time during voting in the General Assembly, Secretariat and scrutineers collect ballots instead of inviting participants to come forward and vote. Rotational/regional voting could be introduced (ITF 1.1.4 B) (RP Rule 12).	The following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly: • Strategic policy issues and report on performance; • Implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions • Report on international assistance (ITF 1.1.1 B) The Bureau decided to recommend 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) (OG Para 130)
1.2 Bureau Meetings	<u>The possibility of the extraordinary session of the Bureau not discussing or receiving presentations on nominations which have been deferred or referred back, but allowing them to proceed to the full Committee was discussed by the Bureau (ITF 1.2.2 and ITF 2.4.3). It was decided 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).</u> <u>Recommended changes to World Heritage Committee Rules of Procedure:</u> <u>The Bureau agreed 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).</u>	<u>The Task Force on Implementation to continue work after the Bureau meeting in order to develop concrete proposals for a subcommittee system, to start functioning in 2001 and replace the present system of Bureau/ Committee. The Task Force to report on proposals to the Committee in November 2000 (see ITF 1.2.1).</u> <u>On a trial basis (pending any Committee discussion of a sub-Committee structure): the Bureau meeting in November 2000 should</u> • <u>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)</u> *Committee agrees to a system of subcommittees to replace the Bureau, meeting only once a year just before the meeting of the Committee (to commence during 2001). (ITF 1.2.4 B)* *(NB this will require changes throughout the text of the Operational Guidelines)*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
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). 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. 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).	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). 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). 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). *To scale back the workload, the Committee should examine inscriptions and periodic monitoring, following their preparation in subcommittees. The Committee should only examine reports on* *reactive monitoring on an exceptional basis (see ITF 1.3.7 C Issues and Recommendat (OG para 131, section II).* *Depending on other decisions (on sub-committees and Operational Guidelines) the Committee may* *wish to revise the calendar for nominations (see ITF 1.3.8 C Issues and Recommendati for* *proposal offered for consideration) (OG Para 65, 131, Section III)).*	
2 DECISION-MAKING			
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).
Restructuring the Operational Guidelines		*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.)*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
Restructuring the Operational Guidelines (continued)		*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.* *A concise text on the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative WH List be included in the Operational Guidelines (CANT 4.4.a)* *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 1& Annex VII)* *Secretariat and Advisory Bodies to provide summary of documents that need to be provided to supplement the Operational Guidelines (See CANT 4.9.)*	
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).	*Tentative lists be obligatory for both natural and cultural properties (CANT 4.4.b)) (OG Paras 7,8)* *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)* *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)* *The results of this analysis to go to the Committee for their consideration (see RL 11 iii)* *Tentative lists be harmonised (CANT 4.4.c)) (OG Para 9)* *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)*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
Capacity Building			The Bureau recommended: *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)* Use evaluation missions to run regional training workshops for under-rep State Parties (see RL 11 vi). *Under-rep State Parties to get priority in the Preparatory Assistance budget for nominations (RL 11 vii) (OG Para 113-114)* *Grants of international assistance should improve representivity and be coherent with the Global Strategy (see RL 11 viii) (OG Para 113-114)* Develop Regional Plans of Action in line with the Global Strategy (see RL 11 ix). UNESCO Medium-Term Strategy should stress an intersectoral policy to better implement the Convention (see RL 11 x).
2.3 Nominations		*Representivity of the World Heritage List:* *Simplification and editing of paragraph 6 of existing guidelines (see CANT 4.2.)* *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))* *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)* *The results of Advisory Bodies' evaluations of nominations should be made available to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee, in a timely manner (ITF 2.3.3) (OG Paras 64, 65)* *Clarity is needed concerning: referral (including deadlines), deferral (to use same procedures and deadlines as for new nominations), rejection, re-nominations, strict*	*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)* *- 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*

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
2.3 Nominations (continued)		*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)* *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)* *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:* *a. Sites for immediate inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger* *b. First time nominations by un-represented State Parties* *c. Nominations from less-represented State Parties* *d. Nominations deferred from previous meetings* *e. Nominations from less-represented regions* *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)* *g. Joint or 'sister' nominations of a common topic with at least one nomination from a less-represented State Party* *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. 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.* *(see RL iv), (OG Section I.H)* *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)* *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)* *Types of nominations* *New sections of text are required to define 'Phased nominations' and 'Re-*	*actions (see ITF 2.3.2) (OG 57-63)* *Criteria* *The Bureau recommended to the Committee that* *(a) the cultural and natural heritage criteria be merged (CANT 4.4.d) (OG Paras 24,44),* *(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) (OG Para 24) and* *(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) .) (OG Section II.A)* *Statement of Values* *The Bureau recommended to the Committee that:* *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) (OG Paras 24(ii),47, 63, 64(2a)) 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).*

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
2.3 Nominations (continued)		*nominations' (see CANT p14 3.II.D.) (OG Section II.D).* *Definition of 'Outstanding universal value'* *A new section of text is required to provide a definition of 'Outstanding universal value' (see CANT p 12, 3.I.C.) (OG Section I.C)* *Global Strategy* *New sections of text will provide an introduction to the Global Strategy (including typology of property) and principles for comparative assessment (see CANT p 13, 3.II.B.) (OG Section II.B).* *Archiving and documentation of nominations* *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)*	
2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List	The Bureau agreed 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)	The agenda for Bureau and Committee meetings should group the presentation of, and decisions on, similar nominations for efficiency (ITF 2.4.1). 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). *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)* *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).*	The Bureau recommended that further consideration 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).
2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation	The Bureau agreed 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) -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)	The Task Force on Implementation should prepare between the Bureau of July 2000 and the Committee of 2000 proposals on the reactive monitoring activities including the role of the Centre, advisory bodies and other UNESCO sectors. The Task Force will also prepare Criteria for a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring (ITF 2.5.5 B). In reviewing the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee should examine reports on periodic monitoring, focusing on general trends and developing broad strategies to improve the state of conservation. The Committee should only examine reports on reactive monitoring on an exceptional basis. (ITF 2.5.4 B). *Working documents on monitoring should be distributed early (a minimum of 6 weeks prior to meetings) to relevant bodies and States Parties, so Committee has time to discuss issues. They should not be read aloud during meetings (ITF 2.5.1) (OG Paras 68-76)*	The Bureau recommended further examination 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. (CANT 4.6g and OG 68).

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation (continued)		*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)* *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)* *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)* *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)*	
2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List		*New sections of text to be provided on the definition and objectives of the List of World Heritage in Danger (see CANT p 16, 3.III.D.) (OG Section III.D)* *The Committee should develop clear indicators (based on statements of value agreed at inscription) to report on conservation and management. These indicators should be followed in a consistent way (including preparation of checklist to enable comparative analysis).* • *A monitoring framework to be developed to identify the threshold levels of threat that trigger nomination to the In Danger List (Operational Guideline paras 80-85)* • *A monitoring framework to also specify an action plan and review process that determines when to remove a property from the In-Danger list (paras 92 and 93)* *(ITF 2.6.1 B) (OG Paras 68-76)* *Funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List (continued)		*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)* *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)* *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)* *The criteria for inclusion on the List in Danger should be consistent with the Statement of Values (CANT 4.6.f)* *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)* 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).	
Deletion		*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)* *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)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)*	
Management		*Recommended that a section on management of World Heritage properties be included in the Operational Guidelines (CANT 4.6.a))* *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))*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
Management (continued)		*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))*	
2.7 World Heritage Fund and International Assistance	The Bureau agreed to 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). The Bureau agreed 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); - 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); - the Centre should identify opportunities to consolidate funding and conclude cooperation agreements with other organisations involved in world heritage activities (ITF 2.7.4).	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. *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)* *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)* *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)* *The Bureau 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).* 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).	
3 INFO & DOCUMENT MANAG-EMENT			
3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents	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.	Committee documents should be reduced in volume and improved in format • the use of single documents for each agenda item • table of contents be prepared for long documents • the same paragraph numbers for English and French versions • cross–reference documents with the budget and Operational Guidelines where appropriate for clarity	The Bureau agreed that further discussion was required to clarify the critical issue of rights of access to documents (ITF 3.1.6 C).

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents (continued)		appropriate for clarity • supplementary information tabled at the meeting should be limited to new information • revisions should be made clear (e.g. bolding, revision mode) • use of tables instead of plain text to be encouraged • use of CD ROMs and other electronic media where practical (note some states do not have) • Decisions should be drafted in such a way to enable monitoring of implementation. The Task Force on Implementation should after the Bureau in July 2000, work with the Centre to identify practical means to achieve such a reduction (ITF 3.1.1). Deadlines established for document production and submission of material should be strictly adhered to by all parties. Items should not be referred to the Committee if materials arrive too late for adequate synthesis (ITF 3.1.2). All documents/ Access to certain documents to be decided by the Committee in November 2000 should be available in French and in English, including on the internet web site (ITF 3.1.3). The Committee should encourage wide distribution and promotion of information on best conservation practices, including through web linkages (ITF 3.1.4 B). 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). 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). *A new section of text to be provided on documentation and information management (see CANT p 18, 3.V.D.) (OG Section V.D)*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites		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 September 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). The Centre should initiate a data capture project to seek out all evidence of early Committee activities and integrate them within a contemporary electronic record, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure the survival of a complete record of all Committee decisions and supporting rationale (ITF 3.2.1). A report should be prepared for the Committee on the status of the Information Management System improvements being currently undertaken, especially relating to information on sites, and improved strategies for access by all stakeholders identified. The Committee may wish to establish a working group to guide developments (ITF 3.2.2 B). *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)*	
4 OTHER MATTERS			
4.1 The Roles of Advisory Bodies and the Centre **4.1** The Roles of Advisory		The Committee should review the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies in relation to the Committee, the Centre, and possibly UNESCO, leading to MOUs as appropriate (ITF 4.1.1). Advisory bodies to analyse inscribed sites and those on the tentative list on a chronological, geographical and thematic basis (ASAP). 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). The results of this analysis to go to the Committee for their consideration (see RL 11 iii). *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 identifying potential or existing threats and protective actions (ITF 2.3.2) - See 'Nominations'*	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
Bodies and the Centre (continued)		*2.3* *The results of Advisory Bodies' evaluations of nominations should be made available to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee, in a timely manner (ITF 2.3.3) - See 'Nominations' 2.3* *The assessment documents of the Advisory Bodies and Center should be presented in a single summary table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, and rejection) (ITF 2.4.2) (OG Section I.F)* *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)* *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)*	
4.2 Contract Development and Management		The Committee, as a high priority, should direct the Center to improve the timeliness of contracts and contract payments (ITF 4.2.1 B).	
Education, Training and Research		*A new section of text to be provided on education, training and research (see CANT p 18, 3.V.C.) (OG Section V.C)* 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).	
EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE		*The following recommendations appear to require changes to the World Heritage Convention - see notes following this table	
Term of Committee members		*To reduce to four years the current term of office of the Members of the World Heritage Committee (RC Recommendation 1, para 5) (OG paras 129-132)* - (may require amendment to Article 9 of the World Heritage Convention) - World Heritage Committee Rules of Procedure which may require modification: Part 1: Membership	

Issues	Proposed changes agreed by the Bureau in June 2000, for implementation at the Bureau and Committee meetings in Cairns.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Special Session of the Bureau.	Proposed changes discussed by the Bureau in June 2000, for further consideration by the Committee in Cairns.
Number of Committee members		*At the same time to increase to twenty-eight the current number of Members of the World Heritage Committee (RC Recommendation 2, para 5) (OG paras 129-132)* - (may requires amendment to Article 8 of the World Heritage Convention) - (may also require creation of a special category of 'members elect') - World Heritage Committee Rules of Procedure which may require modification: Part 1: Membership Part II: Sessions Part III: Participants Part V: Officers Part VI: Conduct of Business	
Equitable represent-ation of the world's regions and cultures		*To distribute a fixed number of seats to groups of States Parties, while leaving a number of seats open for elections on a free basis (RC Recommendation 3, para 5) (OG paras 133-134)* - (does not require revision of the 1972 Convention as a principle relating to equitable representation of the world's regions and cultures is stated in Article 8(2) of the World Heritage Convention). - *(Attention should be paid to the Resolution of the 7th General Assembly contained in the Article 12 of its Report. A modification of the Rules of Procedure and/or Operational Guidelines would codify the procedure) (see RC para 10)* - World Heritage Committee Rules of Procedure which may require modification: Part III: Participants Part V: Officers Part VI: Conduct of Business	

Information relating to the three Recommendations proposed in the Final Report of the Working Group on Equitable Representation of the World Heritage Committee as they relate to the World Heritage Convention.

- Some members of the Working Group considered that it was legally possible for the UNESCO General Conference to adopt by consensus a Protocol amending exclusively Articles 8(1) and 9 of the 1972 Convention. The group suggested that this possibility is explored depth by the Bureau and or the Committee (see RC para 8).
- A member of the Working Group introduced a proposal based on a special category of 'Members-Elect'. The Group embraced this proposal as a possible alternative to increasing the number of members, in case this increase proves impracticable. The Members Elect would be guided by the following principle:
    - The General Assembly would choose at the next available meeting seven Members of the World Heritage Committee and seven Members Elect.
    - The following General Assembly would confirm the seven Members Elect as Members of the Committee, and at the same time elect a new group of seven Members Elect.
    - Members-Elect will posses the same rights and privileges as Members of the Committee, except the right to vote (see RC para 9)
- It has to be noted that some members and observers expressed their reservations on introducing such a category and would rather prefer a simple increase in the number of members. The advantage of this proposal is that it does not necessitate revising the Convention. It could be implemented by changes to the Rules of Procedure (creation of a new category Member Elect), a modification of Operational Guidelines (to guarantee rights of Member Elects), and a declaration to ensure confirmation of Member Elects as full fledged Members after the two years (see RC para 9).
- Due to a mutual interdependence, the recommendations proposed by this Working Group form a coherent entity, and should be treated as a whole. They form a package of solutions that, when implemented together, should lead to a more equitable representation of States Parties within the World Heritage Committee
  (see para 12)
- Amendment of Articles of the Convention is to be done in accordance with Article 37:
  -37 (1) provides for the ability of State Parties to revise the Convention at the General Conference of UNESCO, and provides any revision is only binding between those States party to the revision
  -37 (2) provides that any adoption of a new convention revising this convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new convention otherwise provides, this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification, acceptance or accession, as from the date on which the new revising convention enters into force (paper by Secretariat, March 2000, relating to the Working Group, para 3).
- If the Convention is amended it is likely there would be three classes of States Parties until the amended Convention came into operation (likely to be a period of some years): those who are a party to the 1972 Convention only/ those who are a party to the 1972 Convention and the amended Convention/those who are a party to the amended Convention only. These three groupings of States Parties could result in administrative problems (paper by Secretariat, March 2000, relating to the Working Group, paras 6, 8).
- Article 41 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969 provides that
  1. Two or more of the parties to a multilateral treaty may conclude an agreement to modify the treaty as themselves alone if:
     b. the modification in question is not prohibited by the treaty and:
     i. does not affect the enjoyment by the other parties of their rights under the treaty or the performance of their obligations
     ii. does not relate to a provision, derogation from which is incompatible with the effective execution of the object and purpose of the treaty as a whole. (paper by Secretariat, March 2000, relating to the Working Group, para 7).