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Documents

**Agenda:**
WHC/16/40.COM/3A.Rev

**Timetable:**
WHC/16/40.COM/3B.Rev.2

**List of documents:**
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.3A.Rev.2
09.00-09.30: Bureau session  →  Room ÇAMLICA

[12.2 The Bureau shall meet during the sessions of the Committee as frequently as deemed necessary]

09.30-13.00: PLENARY session  →  Room USKÜDAR

Working groups  →  OGs:  Room ÇAMLICA
               →  Budget:  Room EMIRGAN

14.00-18.30: PLENARY session
40th session of the World Heritage Committee

**Orientation session for Committee Members**

**Order of SOC discussion**

CLT > MIX > NAT

- LAC
- AFR
- ARB
- APA
- EUR/NA

**Order of NOM discussion**

CLT > MIX > NAT

- AFR
- ARB
- APA
- EUR/NA
- LAC
3. Procedural matters and conduct of the Committee session
3. Basic information

Rules of Procedure
Page 193 of the Basic Texts
3. Basic information

**Chairperson**

Rule 14: Duties of the chairperson….

Rule 15: Replacement of the chairperson

15.1 If the Chairperson is unable to act at any session of the Committee or Bureau, or part thereof, his functions shall be exercised by a Vice-Chairperson, in the English alphabetical order of States members of the Bureau commencing with the country of the Chairperson.

**Rapporteur**

Rule 14: Duties of…… the Rapporteur

14.4 In addition to exercising the powers which are conferred upon him elsewhere by the present Rules, the Rapporteur shall certify that the Secretariat has accurately recorded the Committee’s decisions. He shall work with the Secretariat to monitor and record Committee debate on amendments.
3. Speaking order and time limits

**Taking the floor**

Order of speaking:
1. Committee Members
2. Advisory Bodies
3. State Party Observers
4. NGO – other Observers

22.1 The Chairperson shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their wish to speak.

22.6 States Parties shall not speak to World Heritage properties in their own territories, except at the explicit invitation of the Chairperson within the allowed time for their speech and in response to specific questions posed.
Taking the floor

22.7 Representatives of a State Party, whether or not a member of the Committee, may be invited by the Chairperson to present their views after the Advisory Bodies have presented their evaluation of the site proposed by the State for inscription. The presentation shall be limited to a clarification or an update on the proposed site. After this permitted time, the State Party may be allowed to take the floor again, but only in order to answer questions, within a limited time, that have been asked. This provision also applies to other observers mentioned in Rule 8.
3. Speaking order and time limits

**Time limit for interventions:**

- 3 minutes for Committee members
- 2 minutes for observers

**operations by timer/sound**
3. Quorum and Points of order

**Quorum**

17.1 At plenary meetings, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the States members of the Committee.

**Point of order**

28.1 During a discussion, any State member may raise a point of order; such point of order shall be immediately decided upon by the Chairperson.
3. Consultative and Subsidiary bodies

Working groups, consultative and subsidiary bodies:

Rule 20. Consultative bodies

20.1 The Committee may create such consultative bodies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

20.2 The composition and the terms of reference (including mandate and duration of office) of such consultative bodies shall be defined by the Committee at the time of their creation. These bodies can include States non members of the Committee.
3. Consultative and Subsidiary bodies

Working groups, consultative and subsidiary bodies:

Rule 21. Subsidiary bodies

21.1 The Committee may establish such subsidiary bodies as it deems necessary for the conduct of its work, within the limits of the technical facilities available.

21.2 The composition and the terms of reference (including mandate and duration of office) of such subsidiary bodies shall be defined by the Committee at the time of their creation. These bodies can only be constituted from amongst States members of the Committee.
3. Amendments

Amendments

23.1 At the request of any member of the Committee, supported by two other members, discussion of any motion, resolution or amendment may be suspended until the written text is circulated in the working languages to all Committee members present.

23.2 The proposed amendments or Decisions will only be accepted and communicated to the members of the Committee if they are signed only by the member of the Committee who is author.

23.3 New draft decisions/proposals and amendments thereto should, whenever possible, be submitted to the Secretariat at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned. The Rapporteur shall work with the Secretariat to distribute such draft decisions/proposals and amendments to all Committee Members in a timely manner.
3. Amendments

In case of an amendment to the Draft Decision

**Blue Form for amendment:**
- Available in the room
- Sent by email
- 1 form per amendment

**Amendment submitted:**
- By hardcopy to the Rapporteur
- By email to the Rapporteur

**Email Rapporteur:**
wh-rapporteur@unesco.org
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3. **Amendments**

**In case of multiple amendments on the same Draft Decision:**

All must be submitted to the Rapporteur on blue form.

After Rapporteur’s agreement, Secretariat will integrate the Amendments into the draft Decision, in both languages, in track-changes, for distribution.
3. Voting Procedure

In accordance with Chapter VII of the Rules of Procedure of the World Heritage Committee:

**Rule 35. Voting rights**
Each State member of the Committee shall have ONE vote in the Committee.

**Rule 36. Conduct during voting**
After the Chairperson has announced the beginning of voting, no one shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting.
3. Voting Procedure

Rule 37. Two-thirds majority
Decisions of the Committee on matters covered by the provisions of the Convention shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present and voting. (Rule 37 and Article 13.8 of the Convention).

Rule 38. Simple majority
38.1 Except where otherwise specified in the Rules of Procedure, ALL other decisions of the Committee shall be taken by a majority of the States members present and voting.
3. Voting Procedure

Rule 38. Simple majority (continued)

38.2 Decisions as to whether a particular matter is covered by the provisions of the *Convention* and decisions on any other matters not covered by the Rules shall be taken by a majority of the States members present and voting.
3. Voting Procedure

Rule 39. Counting of votes

... "States members present and voting" shall mean States members casting an **affirmative** or **negative** vote. Therefore, States members **abstaining** from voting shall be regarded as **not** voting.
3. Voting Procedure

Rule 40. Show of hands

40.1 Voting shall **normally** be by a **show of hands**.

40.2 When the result of a vote by a show of hands is in doubt, the Chairperson may take a second vote by a roll-call.

40.3 A vote by a roll-call shall also be taken if it is requested by not less than two States members before the voting takes place.
3. Voting Procedure

Rule 41. Secret ballot

A decision shall be voted on by **secret ballot** whenever two or more States members shall so request or if the Chairperson so decides.
3. Voting Procedure
3. Voting Procedure

Rule 42. Conduct of voting by secret ballot
(if decided by the Chairperson or if requested by two or more Committee members):

42.1 Before the vote begins, the Chairperson shall appoint two tellers from amongst the Delegations of the members of the Committee to scrutinize the votes cast.

42.2 When the counting of the votes is completed and the tellers have reported to the Chairperson, he shall announce the results of the ballot bearing in mind the voting will be recorded as follows:
Rule 42. Conduct of voting by secret ballot (continued)

From the total number of members of the Committee will be deducted:

a) the number of members **absent**, if any;
b) the number of **blank** ballot papers, if any;
c) the number of **invalid** ballot papers, if any.

The remaining number will constitute the number of votes recorded (Rule 42.2)
3. Voting Procedure

“Simple” majority

20 votes recorded:
→ 11 required for proposal to pass

\[ \frac{20}{2} = 10 + 1 \]
3. Voting Procedure

“2/3” majority

20 votes recorded:
→ 14 required for proposal to pass
(20/3 x 2 = 13.33)
4. **Working Groups**
4.1 Budget Working Group

Key issues
Proposed timetable:
14.00-15.00

Proposed number of meetings:
3

Room:
EMIRGAN
4.2 Operational Guidelines Working Group

Key issues
Proposed timetable:
14.00-15.00

Proposed number of meetings:
3

Room:
ÇAMLICA
ICCROM
The Outstanding Universal Value
Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage

- identification
- protection
- conservation
- presentation
- transmission to future generations

(article 4)
“Outstanding universal value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List”.
The fact that a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage has not been included in either of the two lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 shall in no way be construed to mean that it does not have an outstanding universal value for purposes other than those resulting from inclusion in these lists. (Article 12)
The 3 pillars of Outstanding Universal Value

(Note: Authenticity is not applicable to natural properties)

Illustration of the three pillars of Outstanding Universal Value. All three must be in place for a property to meet the requirements of the World Heritage List.
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Paragraph 78: To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding.
Criterion (iv): In the history of military architecture, the Fortress of Suomenlinna is an outstanding example of general fortification principles of the 17th and 18th centuries, notably the bastion system, and also showcases individual characteristics.
Suomenlinna consists of several defensive and utilitarian buildings that blend the architecture and functionality of the fortress within the surrounding landscape. The property includes the islands upon which the fortress was built. This forms a consistent ensemble extensive enough to preserve and present the values of the property. Most of the fortifications and utilitarian buildings dating from the Swedish and Russian periods are well preserved. The fortress has only a few buildings dating from the Finnish era, but they retain their own distinctive identity. A sharp rise in sea level or increased rainfall could threaten the property.
The fortifications and the various buildings, all dating from different eras, as well as the surrounding environment, help preserve Suomenlinna’s characteristics, particularly with regard to building materials, methods and architecture. Since Suomenlinna became a residential area, traditional construction methods have been favoured to ensure the preservation of the property, and are implemented in a manner that respects its cultural and historical values.
What is needed to assure its future?

• Strong and unequivocal legal protection
• Strong institutional framework
• Sufficient resources
• Effective management system is in place, including in the buffer zone.
• Maintenance of an effective and well-resourced management plan
• Long term issues:
  • Sea-level rise
  • Increased rainfall
  • Increased visitors to the property
Paragraph 51:

At the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, the Committee adopts a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which will be the key reference for the future effective protection and management of the property.
STATEMENT OF OUV

• Brief summary
  – Summary of factual information
  – Summary of qualities

• Criteria (values and attributes which manifest them)

• Integrity (all sites)

• Authenticity (criteria i-vi)

• Management and protection requirements necessary to maintain OUV
  – Overall framework
  – Specific long-term expectations
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

• Why it is important to the committee
  – The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value shall be the basis for the future protection and management of the property (paragraph 155 of the Operational Guidelines)

• Statement of OUV is the main reference point for
  – Tentative Lists
  – Nomination Dossiers
  – ICOMOS and IUCN Evaluations
  – Committee Decisions
  – Periodic Reporting
  – Evaluations of State of Conservation
  – In-Danger Listing
  – Deletion from the World Heritage List
A Statement of OUV is of great benefit to all involved in the conservation of the property as:

- it allows a clear understanding of why the property is considered to be of OUV;
- can give direction to management through indicating what attributes of the property need to be maintained;
- can guide the assessment of the state of conservation of the property; and
- is an essential reference point for monitoring, for the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies.
6. Nominations
The Nomination process
The Nomination Process

The State Party makes an inventory of its heritage

UPSTREAM PROCESS
Advice, consultation and analysis that occur prior to the submission of a nomination. Enables the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat to provide support directly to States Parties, throughout the whole process leading up to a possible Nomination

From the sites on its national inventory the State Party chooses those that it considers of Outstanding Universal Value and includes them on its Tentative List
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The Nomination Process

The State Party selects one site from its Tentative List to nominate it for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The State Party prepares a nomination file and, if it wishes, submits a draft copy by 30 September to WHC for comments.

WHC reviews the draft nomination and sends its comments to the State Party in view of finalization of the document (October-November).
The Nomination Process

The **State Party** makes corrections, completes the nomination and submits it by **1 February** to the **WHC**

**WHC** analyses all nomination files received and checks their **completeness** (month of February)

**WHC** transmits the nomination files that are considered **complete and meet the requirements** set by the **Operational Guidelines** to the **Advisory Bodies** (March)
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The Nomination Process

The Advisory Bodies study the nomination files and send their experts on mission to the proposed properties in order to prepare their evaluations (June-October).

Advisory Bodies first panel meetings decide whether supplementary information is needed or if recommendations could be already elaborated (December).

Advisory Bodies forward to States Parties by 31 January (2nd year) a short interim report outlining the status and any issues relevant to evaluations, and any request for supplementary information.

Orientation session for Committee Members
The Nomination Process

In case it is requested, the **State Party** submits any supplementary information by **28 February** (2nd year)

Advisory Bodies **second panel** meetings decide recommendations on the basis of their discussion and the evaluations (March 2nd year)

Advisory Bodies’ **evaluations and recommendations** are transmitted to the concerned **States Parties** (May 2nd year)
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The Nomination Process

States Parties may send letters detailing **factual errors** identified in the evaluation of their nomination (format Annex 12 OGs, 14 days before the opening of the session of the Committee).

The World Heritage Committee takes **decisions**

The nominated property may be:
- **inscribed** on the World Heritage List
- **referred** or **deferred** back to the State Party
- or **not inscribed**
Factual errors

150. Letters from the concerned States Parties, submitted in the appropriate form in Annex 12, detailing the factual errors that might have been identified in the evaluation of their nomination made by the Advisory Bodies, must be received by the World Heritage Centre no later than 14 days before the opening of the session of the Committee with copies to the relevant Advisory Bodies. The letters shall be made available as an annex to the documents for the relevant agenda item, and no later than the first day of the Committee session. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies may add their comments to the letters, in the relevant section of the form, before they are made available.
Requirements for nominations
para. 63. Nominations to the World Heritage List are not considered unless the nominated property has already been included on the State Party's Tentative List.

para. 65. States Parties shall submit Tentative Lists to the Secretariat, at least one year prior to the submission of any nomination...
Nomination

The nomination document is the primary basis on which the Committee considers the inscription of the properties on the World Heritage List.

All relevant information should be included in the nomination document.
Requirements for nominations

Nomination document

Executive Summary

1. Identification of the property (including maps)
2. Description of the property
3. Justification for inscription
4. State of conservation and factors affecting the property
5. Protection and Management
6. Monitoring
7. Documentation
8. Contact information of responsible authorities
9. Signature on behalf of the State Party(ies)
Requirements for nominations

Maps

- An appropriate typology
- Clear legend
- Coordinates system
- Clearly defined boundaries
- Scale
Requirements for nominations

Maps

Central point coordinates

Thin boundary lines
Requirements for nominations

Maps

Thick boundary lines
Requirements for nominations

Comparative Analysis

Paragraph 132.3 of the Operational Guidelines

In section 3.2, a comparative analysis of the property in relation to similar properties, whether or not on the World Heritage List, both at the national and international levels, shall be provided.

The comparative analysis shall explain the importance of the nominated property in its national and international context.
Requirements for nominations

**Management**

Paragraph 132.5 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.

[...] 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.
Requirements for nominations

Signature

Paragraph 132.9 of the Operational Guidelines
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Requirements for inscription of properties on the World Heritage List
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Requirements for inscription
### Justification for inscription, application of criteria, integrity and authenticity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Paragraphs in Operational Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative analysis</td>
<td>§ 78 and 143-149, and in particular 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>§ 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>§ 78 and 143-149, and in particular 87-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity (cultural properties)</td>
<td>§ 79-86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **√**: OK - Good
- **≈**: Adequate – Can be improved
- **O**: Not demonstrated at this stage
- **X**: Not OK – Not adequate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation, protection and management</th>
<th>Paragraphs in Operational Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>§ 99-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>§ 96-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>§ 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>§ 108-118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OK - Good | Adequate – Can be improved |
| Not demonstrated at this stage | Not OK – Not adequate |
Requirements for inscription
Requirements for inscription
Evaluation of New Nominations of natural and mixed World Heritage properties

10 July 2016
The 3 pillars of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value
(natural sites)

OG: Paras 77 & 78
FOUR PRINCIPLES GUIDE IUCN’S EVALUATIONS

- Highest standards of assessment based on independent expert analysis and field assessment, and consistent with the Operational Guidelines;
- Partnership with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, and UNEP-WCMC;
- Promotion of World Heritage properties as “flagships” of conservation;
- Use of IUCN and other specialist networks - including with IUCN World Commission for Protected Areas, Species Survival Commission as well as new agreements with the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS) and International Association of Geomorphologists (IAG)
FIGURE 2: SUMMARY OF IUCN EVALUATION PROCEDURE

IUCN REPORT TO WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

- IUCN Second World Heritage Panel
- Additional information may be provided by States Parties and by stakeholders

IUCN World Heritage Panel

- IUCN World Heritage Programme
  - Desk Reviews and Comparative Analyses
  - Additional information may be provided by States Parties and by stakeholders
  - Field Evaluation, including extensive consultations with stakeholders
    - Consultation with ICOMOS and WHC as required

IUCN World Heritage Programme

- UNESCO World Heritage Centre
  - Nomination dossiers
Members, commissions, partners
Related documentation
Nominations for 2016

http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/40com
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Nominations for 2016

http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/40com

ICOMOS Report for the World Heritage Committee
Nominations - electronic version
Role of the World Heritage Committee
para. 23. Committee decisions are based on objective and scientific considerations, and any appraisal made on its behalf must be thoroughly and responsibly carried out. The Committee recognizes that such decisions depend upon:

a) carefully prepared documentation;
b) thorough and consistent procedures;
c) evaluation by qualified experts; and
d) if necessary, the use of expert referees.
para. 24. The main functions of the Committee are, in co-operation with States Parties, to:

a) **identify**, on the basis of Tentative Lists and nominations submitted by States Parties, **cultural and natural properties of Outstanding Universal Value** which are to be protected under the *Convention* and to inscribe those properties on the World Heritage List; ...
The World Heritage Committee can take 4 types of decisions regarding nominations:

• **Inscribe** the property on the World Heritage List
• **Refer** the nomination back to the State Party
• **Defer** the examination of the nomination
• **Not to inscribe**
Deferral v/s **Referral**

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** 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. States Parties might seek advice from the relevant Advisory Body(ies) and/ or the World Heritage Centre to discuss how the recommendations of the Committee might be addressed. If 1 February falls on a weekend, the nomination must be received by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday.
Deferral v/s Referral

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. These nominations will then be evaluated again by the relevant Advisory Bodies during the course of the full year and a half evaluation cycle including an evaluation mission according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168. States Parties are encouraged to seek advice from the relevant Advisory Body and/ or the World Heritage Centre to discuss how the recommendations of the Committee might be addressed. Where required, the State Parties may wish to consider inviting an Advisory mission.
Role of the World Heritage Committee

Deferral v/s **Referral**

Referral and deferral are **different mechanisms**, clearly defined in the Operational Guidelines, and are used with careful consideration by the Advisory Bodies whilst they are making their recommendations. They should be seen both essentially as constructive options that can assist States Parties to **further develop nominations that may be successfully inscribed**.
Deferral v/s **Referral**

The Advisory Bodies decide to recommend that a property should be *referred back* to the State Party when *additional information* that is needed from the State Party is **minor**, and supplementary to the original nomination, can be provided in a short period of time and **does not need to be assessed through a new mission** to the property.
The time available for the Advisory Bodies to assess a referred nomination is normally very short.

This time constraint means that the referral mechanism is only suitable in circumstances where there is already a high degree of certainty about the potential merits of the nomination and where the additional information can be satisfactorily assessed on the basis of a desk study alone and in a relatively short period of time.
The Advisory Bodies decide to recommend that a property should be **deferred** if the additional information from, or actions needed, by the State Party are more **major**, would lead to a substantial revision of the nomination and thus a **new substantially revised nomination dossier**, and would need to be assessed through a **new mission** to the property.
Deferral v/s Referral

The two main causes emerging for the deferred properties could be associated with the lack of adequate justification of the OUV (necessity of deeper or more extended comparative analysis, necessity of reviewing the application of criteria; necessity of determining the attributes that convey OUV, necessity of changing the boundaries) and the need to improve and/or implement the management system or the management plan.
Deferral v/s Referral

Although the decision to refer is seen as being more encouraging to a State Party and might lead to a quicker inscription, referral is a limited option as the changes that a State Party can make to the nomination dossier should be minor, and there is no possibility to include new attributes or to enlarge boundaries to encompass areas that have not been assessed by the first evaluation mission, or to add new or substantially change justifications for OUV which might need time to be assessed by the relevant experts.
Deferral v/s Referral

A deferred property stands more chance of addressing the issues that frustrated its first attempt, as a thorough revision can be made to the nomination dossier and the Advisory Bodies can undertake a full assessment, including through a mission to the property.
Role of the World Heritage Committee

Deferral v/s Referral
Conserve and transmit to future generations

State of Conservation
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The State of conservation process
Conservation at the heart of the World Heritage Convention (Articles 4 & 6)
Reactive Monitoring

Article 11.4: Provisions for monitoring in case of danger

1980: Operational Guidelines

Chapter IV: “Reactive Monitoring”
Statutory framework

• Paragraph 169  
  → definition, cycle; deadlines

• Paragraph 172  
  → development projects

• Paragraph 174  
  → third-party information
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Monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties

Scientific and technical advice for the Committee’s decision-making
Joint work with the World Heritage Centre
Tools
Commitment to States Parties
Monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties
Monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties
Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger is a call for action.
What’s next?

• Set of corrective measures

• Timeframe
“DSOCR”:

Desired state of conservation for removal from the List in Danger

• Prepared by the State Party, WHC and the ABs
• Adopted by the Committee
“DSOCR”: Defined state of conservation that a property must reach in order to demonstrate that it is no longer threatened by serious and specific danger

- Indicators to monitor OUV
- Rationale for the indicators selected
- Method of verification for each indicator
- Timeframe
Example: Los Katíos National Park (Colombia)

- 2009: DL on request of SP
- Main issues: illegal logging, unauthorized settlements, fishing and hunting, threat from major infrastructure projects

DSOCR (2012):
- 3 indicators for addressing existing threats
- 2 indicators for avoiding potential threats
Example: Los Katíos National Park (Colombia)

- DL used by SP to its benefit:
  - Increased political awareness
  - More funds channelled to address threats to property
  - Increased (inter)national support
- 2015: property removed from DL
Related documentation
States Parties reports

Mission reports

Previous Decisions

SOC Reports
Working documents
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Istanbul, Turkey
10-20 July 2016

- Working documents
- State of conservation
- Mission reports
Role of the World Heritage Committee
Committee Decisions

• No action required
• Implementation of specific measures
• Need for a State Party report
• Need for a mission
• etc.
Committee Decisions

- **Inscription** on the List in Danger
- **Removal** from the List in Danger
- **Deletion** from the World Heritage List
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Questions and Answers