

Distribution Limited

**WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.9
Paris, 3 June 1998
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
Twenty-second session**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room X (Fontenoy)
22 - 27 June 1998**

**Information Document: Report of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and
Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, 25 to 29 March 1998, Theatre Institute, Amsterdam,
The Netherlands**

SUMMARY

Background

At its twentieth session in December 1996 the World Heritage Committee decided that a "truly joint meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts" should be organised to discuss,

- (a) the application of the "conditions of integrity" versus the "test of authenticity",
- (b) the question of a unified or a harmonised set of criteria, and
- (c) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts (see Report of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, paragraph IX.14).

For this purpose the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, was held at the Theatre Institute in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, from 25 to 29 March 1998 hosted by the Government of the Netherlands.

This document provides the report of the Expert Meeting. The Agenda of the meeting and the List of Participants are provided in ANNEX I and ANNEX II.

Conclusions and recommendations

The main conclusions and recommendations of the meeting are presented in Table 4, Table 6 and Table 7.

The recommendations were prepared by the Expert Meeting to ensure greater recognition of the continuum of, and interactions between, culture and nature with respect to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

In summary, the Expert Meeting recommended that the criteria for natural and cultural properties be unified, that the conditions of integrity (to include the notion of authenticity, as appropriate) be related directly to each of the criteria and that sections C and D of the *Operational Guidelines* be revised.

On the subject of "outstanding universal value", the Expert Meeting endorsed the Global Strategy's regional and thematic approach to ensuring a more representative and balanced World Heritage List. The Expert meeting called for an anthropological approach to the definition of cultural heritage and people's relationship with the environment, the identification of sub-themes and for the increased availability of information about the Global Strategy.

The Expert Meeting also addressed the issue of the credibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage List. A series of specific recommendations were prepared with the aim of indicating that inscription of a property on the World Heritage List is, and must be seen to be, part of a process, not an isolated event, preceded and followed by a long-term commitment to its conservation.



Report of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting

25 to 29 March 1998, Theatre Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE
in association with the
Government of the Netherlands



Photograph: Detail of staircase, Theatre Institute, Amsterdam

Table of Contents

	Page numbers
List of Tables	ii
1. Introduction	1
2. Background - The Expert Meeting at Parc de la Vanoise, France, 1996	1
3. Position papers of the three Advisory Bodies	2
IUCN	3
ICOMOS	3
ICCROM	3
Consolidated view of the Advisory Bodies	4
4. Position papers on integrity and authenticity	4
5. Preliminary papers on the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> in different parts of the world	4
6. Case studies	5
7. Working group discussions, recommendations and conclusions	9
Criteria - integrity/authenticity	9
Outstanding universal value	13
Credibility of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> and the World Heritage List	16
8. Concluding remarks	17
 ANNEXES	
 ANNEX 1 Agenda	19
ANNEX 2 List of participants	21

List of Tables

Table 1:	Consolidated view of the Advisory Bodies
Table 2:	Proposal to combine and revise the criteria for the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List (new text shown in bold)
Table 3:	Proposed revisions to sections C and D of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>
Table 4:	Conclusions and recommendations of the working group on criteria - integrity/authenticity
Table 5:	Extract from the Expert Meeting on the "Global Strategy" and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List, June 1994
Table 6:	Conclusions and recommendations of the working group on “outstanding universal value”
Table 7:	Conclusions and recommendations of the working group on credibility

1. Introduction

1.1 The World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, was held at the Theatre Institute in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, from 25 to 29 March 1998 hosted by the Government of the Netherlands. The meeting was chaired by Ms Christina Cameron (Canada), and Mr Elias Mujica (Peru) served as Rapporteur. The Agenda of the meeting and the List of Participants are provided in ANNEX I and ANNEX II.

1.2 Mr Jan Riezenkamp, the Director General for Culture in the Netherlands, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants by expressing his honour and pleasure to extend hospitality to the expert group. He began his presentation by noting how appropriate it was for the Netherlands to host such a meeting, which would discuss the relationship between nature and culture with particular reference to the *World Heritage Convention*. He introduced the participants to the example of the long struggle against the sea and the creation of marshlands, polders and dykes in the Netherlands, and suggested that it could serve as a testing ground for a creative and inspiring approach to the understanding of the continuum of nature and culture. He also commented that the Netherlands is situated at the extreme of this continuum as, what might appear “natural” is often indeed “cultural”.

1.3 The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Bernd von Droste, began his presentation by thanking the Dutch Government for their generosity in hosting the meeting and noted the demonstrated links between people and the environment at the World Heritage sites in the Netherlands. He introduced the three issues to be discussed by the expert group as had been defined by the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1996. The Committee had asked for an in-depth discussion on:

- (a) the application of the "conditions of integrity" versus the “test of authenticity”,
- (b) the question of a unified or a harmonised set of criteria, and
- (c) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts (Report of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, December 1996, paragraph IX.14).

The Director of the Centre made an audiovisual presentation in six parts covering the notion of outstanding universal value, an analysis of the World Heritage List, mixed sites and cultural landscapes, the Global Strategy, integrity and authenticity.

2. Background - The Expert Meeting at the Parc de la Vanoise, France, 22-24 March 1996

2.1 In introducing the next speaker, the Chairperson said that the recommendations of the “Expert Meeting on Evaluation of general principles and criteria for nominations of natural World Heritage sites” (Parc de la Vanoise, France, 22-24 March 1996) had not been fully discussed by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session.

2.2 Mr Alain Megret (France) informed the participants of the main issues of the Vanoise meeting noting that it was the first step in developing a comprehensive World Heritage Global

Strategy for cultural and natural heritage and recognizing the continuum and complexity of interactions between culture and nature for World Heritage. He recalled that at Vanoise, it was thought that the four categories of World Heritage (cultural, natural, mixed, cultural landscapes) were dividing the definition of World Heritage. He commented that the suggested ensemble of the natural and cultural heritage criteria could provide a single identity for all World Heritage sites. He underlined that this suggestion had been intended to ensure that both IUCN and ICOMOS could use the same criteria for evaluation. With reference to the application of the natural criteria he referred to the need for a continuous rather than a “snapshot approach”. Thematic and regional studies should also be performed for natural heritage by IUCN. He stressed that for the credibility of the *Convention* it was thought to be essential to focus on the protection and management of sites, including those on the List of World Heritage in Danger and also on the protection of sites not yet included on the List. He referred to the “balance of the List” noting that balance is not about numbers, but about regions and types of sites. He noted that the experts at Vanoise had concluded that “outstanding universal value” was the key to the World Heritage system, that it was subject to different interpretations (such as, a combination of the unique and representative) and that regional comparative assessments were therefore essential. The expert meeting at Vanoise had concluded that outstanding universal value must be maintained and therefore that World Heritage properties have to provide exemplary examples of protection. In conclusion, Mr Megret outlined a pragmatic position which recognizes the need to complete the World Heritage List and to have evaluation criteria that allow for the recognition of the world’s natural and cultural diversity. The criteria should not become straight jackets for the inclusion of properties on the World Heritage List but should instead accommodate different perceptions of what might be of “outstanding universal value”.

3. Position papers of the three Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS)

3.1 Following Mr Megret’s presentation, the Chairperson recalled that the issues to be addressed by the expert group have been the subject of on-going reflection by the World Heritage Committee. In structuring the discussion, the Chairperson hoped that the issues referred to above would be taken up, both in the general debate and the case studies, whilst at the same time keeping in mind the specific requests of the World Heritage Committee. With regard to the Committee’s specific requests, the Chairperson suggested that the issues of integrity/authenticity and the criteria should logically be addressed together. Ms Cameron also suggested that it was important for ICOMOS to now present all of its work on authenticity to date to the Committee. She made reference to the differing interpretations of “outstanding universal value” by IUCN and ICOMOS which ranged from “the best of the best”, “the representative of the best” to “the best of the representative”. In briefly referring to the issue of the balance of the World Heritage List, Ms Cameron reminded participants that there were gaps and duplications in the List that were contributing to an imbalance. Ms Cameron recalled that the issues to be examined by the expert group had been part of the preparation of Strategic Orientations in 1992 and of the expert meeting that developed the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List in 1994. She commented that the recognition of World Heritage cultural landscapes had led to a broader discussion on the “static” and “dynamic” values of World Heritage and to the questioning of how to manage living places on the List. In conclusion, she suggested that for some of the less complex and contentious issues to be addressed by the expert group, that “closure” could

probably be finally reached. The Chairperson then invited the three Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM) to present their position papers.

3.2 IUCN

In addressing the issues raised by the Committee, Mr Bing Lucas underlined that the position paper was drawn from IUCN's experience as Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee and through a consultative approach within the organisation and at a number of recent key meetings (e.g. IUCN General Assembly, Montreal; European Working Group and SPREP, Federated States of Micronesia). IUCN sees a strong case for a common approach to integrity to apply to all sites incorporating key elements of the test of authenticity for some types of sites. He made particular reference to the inconsistency of the Operational Guidelines referring to traditional protection for cultural but not for natural heritage. He furthermore commented that provisions in the Operational Guidelines concerning legislative, regulatory and institutional protection, as well as traditional management mechanisms should be harmonised and made consistent for both natural and cultural heritage. IUCN considers the four categories of World Heritage (natural, cultural, mixed and cultural landscape) as confusing and undermining the uniqueness of the *Convention*. IUCN therefore recommended the adoption of a unified set of criteria bringing together the existing natural and cultural criteria to emphasise the uniqueness of the *Convention*. He noted that "outstanding universal value" should be interpreted on the basis of "a selection of the most outstanding properties from an international point of view." In conclusion, Mr Lucas pointed to the high expenditure of energy on nomination and evaluation and referred to the need for a parallel level of effort to ensure the continuing integrity of World Heritage sites. In particular, he commented that far too little time was being devoted to the maintenance of the integrity of sites included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

3.3 ICOMOS

Ms Carmen Anon, speaking on behalf of ICOMOS, commented that the World Heritage concept and its interpretation have been enriched over the years. A recognition of different cultures and different types of heritage has taken place during recent years. She commented that it was not possible to create a separation between culture and nature. She agreed with IUCN that the "test of authenticity" could be replaced by "conditions of integrity". A single set of ten criteria would abolish the formal distinction between cultural and natural heritage. ICOMOS furthermore suggested that States Parties in regions of predominantly non-monumental heritage should be encouraged (with financial support) to prepare and submit nominations of properties for inclusion in the World Heritage List. Other States Parties already well represented should reduce their rate of nominations. She emphasised the need for protection, conservation and management of sites and the importance of communication between the States Parties, the experts and UNESCO.

3.4 ICCROM

Mr Jukka Jokilehto speaking on behalf of ICCROM commented that the lack of representativity of the World Heritage List derived partly from a lack of understanding. Greater States Party involvement in the Global Strategy is required as is a detailed evaluation of the representativeness of the List. He remarked that an integrated strategic process is needed to support the identification, evaluation and conservation of heritage – World Heritage

conservation could be used as an example of this process. Concerning the “test of authenticity” he commented that authentic can be understood to mean “genuine” in all of its meanings. However, cultural values evolve and vary over time. The evaluation of “outstanding universal value” - considering that heritage representing different cultures form the whole of the heritage of humankind - should be based on a critical comparative study that takes the cultural context into account. A regional approach to site evaluation and conservation is required of ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM. As far as the representativity of the List is concerned, this remains a critical and difficult issue. He pointed out that co-ordinated action is needed for raising awareness (sensitisation and encouragement), increasing capacity building and networking for preservation.

3.5 Consolidated view of the Advisory Bodies

The Chairperson thanked the Advisory Bodies for their position papers. She pointed out that much common ground seemed to exist amongst the three organisations and asked IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS to consolidate their common points of view, and to identify any differences of opinion for presentation to the meeting. After some deliberation, the representatives of the three Advisory Bodies agreed on a recommendation concerning the first two issues raised by the Committee (see Table 1). The Advisory Bodies commented that “downstream” implications can be considered if the meeting was to endorse these recommendations in principle.

Table 1: Consolidated view of the Advisory Bodies

a.	Recommend the application of conditions of integrity (incorporating the concept of authenticity) to cultural as well as natural properties.
b.	Recommend the abolition of the formal distinction between cultural and natural criteria and their amalgamation into a single list of ten criteria (without changes to the wording of the existing criteria) with a consequential focus on areas inscribed as “World Heritage sites”, rather than as World Heritage cultural and/or natural sites.
c.	Time has not permitted discussion of agenda item 3 (“outstanding universal value”).

4. Position papers on integrity and authenticity

4.1 The Chairperson recalled that the group of experts had also been provided with position papers on authenticity and integrity:

K. Masuda (Japan)	<i>The notion of authenticity</i>
J. Reynolds/P.Parker (United States of America)	<i>Exploring the notion of integrity in the World Heritage Global Strategy</i>

5. Preliminary papers on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in different parts of the world

5.1 The Chairperson recalled that the group of experts had also been provided with ten preliminary papers on the implementation of the Convention in different parts of the world:

D. Munjeri (Zimbabwe)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Africa</i>
P. Olindo (Kenya)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Africa</i>
M. Ayyad (Egypt)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab States</i>
M. Touri (Morocco)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab States</i>
I. McPhail (Australia)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention for the marine environment</i>
S. Sullivan (Australia)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Australia</i>
Z. Batjargal (Mongolia)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Mongolia</i>
L. San Roman (Costa Rica)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Central America and the Caribbean</i>
M-T. Franco (Mexico)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Latin America</i> (not yet received)
E. Mujica (Peru)	<i>Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Latin America</i>

6. Case studies

6.1 The Chairperson informed the group of experts that a suite of eleven case studies would be presented during the meeting. She invited the speakers of the case studies to present their papers keeping in mind the issues presented at the introduction of the meeting and by the Advisory Bodies.

6.2 The Secretariat informed the participants that Mr Mturi (Tanzania), who had been invited to present a case study on the “*Cultural and natural values of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania*”, was unfortunately not able to attend the meeting.

6.3 Mr El-Haber (Lebanon) in presenting his paper entitled “*Cultural and natural values of the Quadisha Valley, Lebanon*” referred to the natural heritage of the valley, including its high plant diversity, and the exceptional cultural values of the Cedars of Lebanon. The Quadisha Valley has recently been nominated for inclusion on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape. He mentioned the cultural and spiritual values of both cultural and natural features of the valley and illustrated his talk with examples of material evidence including a number of grottoes with paintings and monasteries all in a beautiful landscape setting. He concluded by mentioning the need for locally-based community protection of the valley. In

the discussion that followed, a number of experts questioned whether the valley was a cultural landscape of outstanding universal value, how such a site could be better evaluated using a combined set of cultural and natural criteria, and how for sites such as this the artificial break between the “cultural” and “natural” created problems for identification, evaluation and ultimately conservation?

6.4 Mr Xie Ningao (China) presented his paper on the “*Cultural and natural values of the five sacred mountains of China*”. He noted their importance for the people of China as places of worship, for aesthetic purposes, the establishment of mountain schools, as religious places for both Taoism and Buddhism and their influence on landscape painting. Each mountain and its geomorphological features have a meaning for the people. In the ensuing discussion, experts reflected on the ancient traditions such as those relating to the sacred mountains of China (and to other similar traditions in other parts of Asia) that brought together culture and nature. Mr Lucas (IUCN) recalled how at the time of evaluation of these sites for inclusion in the World Heritage List, that it might have been useful to have had integrated cultural and natural criteria.

6.5 Mr K Rao (India) in his paper on the “*Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in India*” provided a considered reflection on the notions of integrity and authenticity. He noted that integrity includes wholeness and completeness and should be applied as one common approach to all sites. Concerning the question of one set of criteria (the value of which he questioned) he said that human influence can be seen in nearly all sites, whereas natural values cannot be found at all cultural sites. He referred to the lack of specificity and rigour in the evaluation of cultural sites compared to natural sites and commented that separate criteria defined the separate roles of the Advisory Bodies. In the discussion that ensued it was stressed that it was necessary to further explore the application of a combined set of criteria (for example, for countries such as India where there are 16 cultural and five natural sites on the World Heritage List), to acknowledge the critical role of management and conservation, to recognise that visual integrity is an important notion to be investigated, to further discuss the evaluation procedures of the Advisory Bodies given their consolidated view and to also look at the continuum between culture and nature as being inclusive of the marine environment. The possibility of enforcing a moratorium on nominations to address the issue of the balance and representativeness of the List was again raised but did not gain support from the experts. Instead discussion concentrated on the need to address fundamental issues such as, the process of nomination and the management and monitoring of sites.

6.6 In his paper on the “*Cultural and natural values of the traditional pilgrimage routes of the Huichol Indian people of Mexico*” Mr H.F Borja (Mexico) displayed an extraordinary example of a linear cultural landscape in the form of the 500 kilometre long pilgrimage route from the coast to the mountains of the Sierra Madre. The itinerary crosses a range of ecosystems with a number of sacred sites (springs, mountains etc.) where rituals are performed along the way by the Huichol. Mr Borja’s presentation prompted a discussion of similar pilgrimage routes in other parts of the world (some of which have been inscribed on the World Heritage List). Discussion concentrated on the issue of World Heritage inscription as a tool for achieving recognition for groups of people and their heritage. Mr Lucas (IUCN)

made reference to the global recognition that had resulted from the inclusion of Tongariro National Park (New Zealand) and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park (Australia) on the World Heritage List as cultural landscapes demonstrating outstanding interactions between people and the environment.

6.7 Mr H. Mandui (Papua New Guinea) presented a paper on the “*Cultural and natural values of Kuk in the Western Highlands*”. The site of Kuk is an extraordinary example of an agricultural site more than 9000 years old (the earliest agricultural sites in the Western Pacific) and is expected to be nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List in the near future. Mr Mandui showed illustrations of the prehistoric agricultural drainage system, of the axes and wooden spades discovered at the site and referred to the management and conservation issues relating to the site. During the discussion concerning this paper it was noted that Kuk is a vivid example of a site with potential World Heritage values relating to the interactions between people and the environment primarily for agricultural purposes.

6.8 Mr F. Pannekoek (Canada) discussed the “*Cultural and natural values of the Head-Smashed Buffalo Jump Complex, Canada*”, one of the few World Heritage sites inscribed only for its associative values solely under cultural criterion (vi). He questioned whether the proposed strengthening of the links between nature and culture for the purpose of World Heritage conservation, might be a set back for the Indian community with associations with the site today. He referred to the “preservation movement” and its concentration on the physical natural environment as potentially excluding of the types of cultural values present at the site. Mr Pannekoek referred to the revival of cultural and spiritual values for the Indian community living near the site and commented that these values differ completely from the historical associative values for which the site was inscribed. He stated that he was against the merging of the natural and cultural criteria as it would limit the diversity of the types of sites protected through World Heritage listing. In the discussion that ensued, other examples of cultural revival through World Heritage listing and conservation were mentioned and the notion of “occupied natural areas” was used to refer to those sites where for example, indigenous peoples are living, but where the interactions between people and the environment (cultural landscape values) and/or natural values are not of World Heritage value.

6.9 Mr Y. Vedenin (Russian Federation) presented a case study on the “*Cultural and natural values of the Solovetski Archipelago, Russian Federation*”, a unique example of different layers of cultural values, illustrated by stone circles and labyrinths, sacred sites and a great number of worship places of the orthodox church in a natural landscape setting. The 3000 year old archaeological landscape contains more than 50 lakes and evidence of important ecological processes. The site is one of the very few from the Arctic region, which is included in the World Heritage List. Mr Vedenin questioned why the World Heritage Committee had decided to inscribe the nominated site only for its cultural values and not as a mixed site and a cultural landscape. He emphasised that the specific interaction between the natural environment and the cultural values makes it a cultural landscape.

6.10 Ms O. Baseova (Czech Republic) presented a case study on the “*Cultural and natural values of the Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape, Czech Republic*” one of the few designed landscapes included on the World Heritage List. Human creativity has completely changed

the natural environment and created a complex cultural landscape producing new natural environments at Lednice-Valtice. Specific legislative regulations in the Czech Republic allow the protection of different heritage zones of the site, which encompasses more than 200 square kilometres. The discussion centred on the importance of appropriate management of such a property, which needs to take both the natural and cultural values into account.

6.11 Mr Hargers and Mr Hogestijn (The Netherlands) offered an interpretation of the “*Cultural and natural values of Schokland and its surroundings*”, a World Heritage site, which illustrates a specific human adaptation to the natural environment, resulting in an organized settlement system, a large scale social network and a material culture in a difficult natural environment. Both the cultural and the natural values are integrated in the masterplan for the site.

6.12 Mr R. Löfgren (Sweden) presented a case study on the “*Cultural and natural values of the Laponean Area, Sweden*”, a “mixed” World Heritage site in the Arctic Circle. The site is a wilderness area with a long history of human occupation. The site illustrates a balance between the natural and the cultural values and was therefore submitted for inscription on the World Heritage List on the basis of both natural and cultural criteria. The reindeer herding by the Saami people represents techniques of sustainable land-use that considers the characteristics and limits of the natural environment. At the same time the natural environment is linked to tangible and intangible cultural expressions. For the Saami people ancestral traces and sacred sites are visible in the natural terrain. In the discussion questions were raised concerning the introduction of new technologies (such as reindeer herding by helicopter) and the dynamic changes in living landscapes.

6.13 Mr P. Fowler (United Kingdom) gave an overview of the “*Cultural and natural values of archeological landscapes of Europe and the British Isles*” and stressed the problems of the application of “authenticity” and “integrity” at Hadrians Wall, Lascaux Caves and the early field systems at Dartmoor (as metaphors for the rest of Europe). He commented that the landscapes of work and agriculture and evidence of peasant societies and wooden architecture, for example, were poorly represented on the World Heritage List. He noted that the distinction between “natural” and “cultural”, and its evaluation by the two Advisory Bodies IUCN and ICOMOS, is defined by a time scale. He emphasised the need to leave further interpretations of “outstanding universal value” to future generations and noted that “real World Heritage” will spark a response in other cultures. In the discussion that followed, a number of experts referred to the movement away from the monumental towards other concepts of heritage, and again the question of the suitability of the existing criteria to recognise this diversity was questioned.

6.14 The Chairperson thanked all the speakers for their case study presentations and for the enriching debate on a number of themes and issues. She informed the participants that the papers were available, in addition to the great number of background papers and position papers and that a publication is envisaged of all the documents prepared for, and at, the expert meeting.

7. Working group discussions and recommendations

7.1 The issues raised during the presentation of the case studies included a number of points which were beyond the scope of the Committee's request, but necessitated careful consideration. In particular, further deliberations on the question of the credibility and balance of the World Heritage List and the transmission of World Heritage to future generations were thought to be required by the expert group.

The participants decided to discuss the issues raised by the case studies and the objectives defined by the Committee in three working groups:

Criteria - integrity/authenticity

Outstanding universal value

Credibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage List

7.2 Criteria - integrity/authenticity

The working group chaired by Ms Bercé was asked to reflect on the possibility of a unified set of criteria and on the notions of integrity and authenticity. This issue relates to one of the conclusions of the Expert Meeting of La Vanoise (March 1996), which had been presented by Mr Megret at the opening session.

The working group was composed of: Ms Bercé (Chairperson), Ms Parker (Rapporteur), Mr Rao, Mr Masuda, Mr Olindo, Mr Touri, Mr Mandui, Mr Vedenin, Mr Rosabal, Professor Ming-Gao and Xiao Feng, Mr Cleere and Ms Titchen.

The experts of the working group reaffirmed the principles which guided the drafting of the *World Heritage Convention*. One of the objectives was to protect a heritage which has been recognized as belonging to the whole of humankind. After 25 years we can recognize that the drafting of the *Convention* was supple to allow interpretations and adaptations, and to avoid the temptation to change the *Convention* itself. On the other hand, there is a need to further stress the interactions between humankind and nature, which appear today in our eyes as essential, in implementing the *Convention*.

Properties can be seen as forming a continuum, from the Taj-Mahal to the natural sites, whilst also including those properties which combine in endless variation the natural and cultural. In the terms of the *Convention*, this heritage has been perceived in a global manner. To underline and confirm this unity, it seems convenient to draw up one list of World Heritage sites, to encompass all these distinctions.

In the same spirit of having a single List of unique sites, one list of ten natural and cultural criteria should be established. The drafting of a unified list of criteria requires careful editing, revision and review of the two existing lists of criteria.

As a first step, due to lack of time and because of the concern to verify the pertinence of such a presentation, a draft unified list was created by combining the two sets of criteria. Whilst risking the production of an imperfect collage, the group made the effort and the result was distributed to the working group participants.

Table 2: Proposal to combine and revise the criteria for the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List (new text shown in bold)

23. The criteria for the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List should always be seen in relation to one another and should be considered in the context of the definitions set out in Articles 1 **and 2** of the Convention which ~~is~~ **are** reproduced below:

Article 1

For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”:

monuments : architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science ;

groups of buildings : groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science ;

sites : works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view.

Article 2

For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “natural heritage”:

natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view ;

geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation ;

natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

24. A property nominated ~~A monument, group of buildings or site as defined above which is nominated~~ for inclusion in the World Heritage List will be considered to be of outstanding universal value for the purposes of the Convention when the Committee finds that it meets one or more of the following criteria ~~and the test of authenticity. Each property nominated should therefore :~~

- (i) represent a masterpiece of the human creative genius; or
- (ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town-planning and landscape design ; or
- (iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared ; or
- (iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history ; or
- (v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change ; or

- (vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List ~~only in exceptional circumstances and~~ in conjunction with other criteria ~~cultural or natural~~) ; or
- ~~(i)~~ **(vii)** be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features ; or
- ~~(ii)~~ **(viii)** be outstanding examples representing **human interaction with the environment** or significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals ; or
- ~~(iii)~~ **(ix)** contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance ; or
- ~~(iv)~~ **(x)** contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

Several experts, including Ms Parker considered that in combining the criteria, few modifications and additions should be made to the text of the criteria, however, they should stress nature-culture interactions. The criteria should be perceived as tools which could facilitate the analysis of sites and could underline the arguments in favour or not in favour of a nomination. Under no circumstances should they constitute an obstacle to the application of the spirit of the *Convention*.

The unification of the criteria should be accompanied by explanatory paragraphs in a clear language. Several experts noted the difficulty of interpretation and the understanding of the text of the *Operational Guidelines* to people not fully initiated to the work of the *Convention*.

The experts recommended that the group in its plenary discuss the most efficient and open manner to ensure representativity of the List of the different cultural regions of the world. How can those cultures which are underrepresented in the List be enabled to nominate properties when the current criteria would not ensure their inclusion?

The members of the group considered, in principle, that the missing credibility of the List stems from an unequal representation of cultures in which nature and culture are closely associated (as the representative from China had developed in his presentation).

To follow up on the suggestions, to redress this situation of the imbalance of the List and to redraft the current criteria, it is envisaged that a working group be established, which includes voluntary members and representatives from the NGOs, who are familiar with these problems. The working group will establish proposals for amendments to the criteria. This working group could work via fax or Email. The combining of the criteria could be inspired by what has been done for cultural landscapes, for which the interactions between people and the environment have been recognised.

To this end the working group recommended that sections C and D of the *Operational Guidelines* be revised and presented to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session:

Table 3: Proposed revisions to sections C and D of the *Operational Guidelines*

New	The Global Strategy for a representative World Heritage List (to explain the diversity of types of World Heritage and the regional and thematic approach to ensuring a balanced and representative World Heritage List).
C.	Criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List
D.	Criteria for the inclusion of natural properties in the World Heritage List Conditions of integrity (to include the notion of authenticity for some types of cultural heritage)
New	Protection and management provisions (to include a consistent approach to protection and management, including traditional maintenance, for all World Heritage properties)

Reservations were expressed by Mr Vedenin and Mr Masuda, who recalled that the management of properties can be highly variable between different types of properties. Mr Masuda expressed his doubts on the efficiency of combining the criteria to give the List a more representative character.

The majority of the participants hoped however that this combination would provide added recognition to the links between nature and culture. This approach should allow cultures currently underrepresented because of the dichotomy between culture and nature, to recognize and identify their properties for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

The experts wished, without being able to propose a precise method – for lack of time available – that the Secretariat send a questionnaire to States Parties, which would illustrate the difficulties they encounter in the application of the current criteria and to collect their suggestions to amend them, with the intention of leaving all obstacles which hinder a balanced representation of all cultures to be a thing of the past.

The experts considered that the credibility of the notion of World Heritage is questioned because of the absence of effective management of certain sites. It would be preferable to strengthen the actual provisions in relation to the management plans, in particular for natural heritage. Mr Touri particularly insisted on this point.

The group briefly examined the combination of the notions of authenticity and integrity. In a nearly unanimous manner, it was considered that the conditions of integrity should be used each time it was pertinent, for both cultural and natural sites. However the test of authenticity should not be deleted entirely as it has importance for certain cultures and types of cultural heritage.

In conclusion, the working group gave a favourable opinion to:

- a unified World Heritage List,
- to the principle of a unified list of criteria, and,
- the greater recognition of the continuum of, and interactions between, culture and nature, to favour the identification of properties currently underrepresented in the List.

After further discussion by the working group, the following recommendations proposed by the working group on criteria - integrity/authenticity were approved in plenary by the expert group (see Table 4).

Table 4: Conclusions and Recommendations of the working group on criteria - integrity/authenticity

<p>1. The working group recommends that the criteria for cultural and natural sites be unified into a common set of ten criteria.</p> <p>2. The working group recommends that the wording of all ten criteria be largely retained, and in the same order, but requests some changes in how the criteria are expressed (to be specifically related to the Global Strategy)</p> <p>The following would be added:</p> <p>(a) the old natural criterion (ii) to include human interaction with the environment (b) the old natural criterion (iii) to include the words “and/or spiritual” (c) the notion of traditional protection and management to be included in the sections of the Operational Guidelines describing integrity, protection etc.</p> <p>3. In order to make the criteria more understandable, explicit, and clear, the working group recommends that sections be drafted into the Operational Guidelines explaining the criteria and their applicability to different situations giving examples from regions and types of heritage currently underrepresented on the List.</p> <p>4. The working group recommends that the conditions of integrity and authenticity be linked and related to each criterion as appropriate in the Operational Guidelines, and retain the test of authenticity for some types of cultural heritage.</p>
--

It was furthermore decided that the Secretariat, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies prepare a new draft of Sections C and D of the *Operational Guidelines* to be sent to Madame Bercé and all members of the meeting of experts for review and comment within a timeframe that might provide its consideration at the twenty second session of the World Heritage Committee. Madame Bercé stressed the need for the expert group to remain in communication by whatever means possible to ensure their continued involvement in finalizing these proposals for submission to the Committee.

7.3 Outstanding universal value

The working group on “outstanding universal value” was attended by Mr Löfgren, Ms Baseova, Ms Anon, Ms Sullivan (Chairperson), Mr Jokilehto (Rapporteur), Mr Pannekoek, Mr Lucas, Mr Batjargal, Mr Ricard, Mr De Jong, Mr Borja, Ms Rössler and Mr Levi Strauss. The Chairperson of the working group on outstanding universal value, Ms Sullivan, and the Rapporteur, Mr Jokilehto provided a preliminary report as “work in progress” on the discussion of the group to the plenary session.

Ms Sullivan underlined that the working group did not find a solution to the question what is “outstanding universal value”? as it encompasses all the diversity and differences in the world. Each site has some uniqueness. The group found it valuable to review (as presented by

the 1994 Global Strategy Expert Meeting) major themes, such as human beings in relation to life and death, which finds different expressions for each region and each culture (see Table 5).

Table 5: Extract from the Expert Meeting on the "Global Strategy" and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List, June 1994

In order to redress the imbalances in the current List, some areas have been identified as having high potential to complete gaps in representation. Areas such as these should be considered in their broad anthropological context through time:

HUMAN COEXISTENCE WITH THE LAND

- **Movement of peoples (nomadism, migration)**
- **Settlement**
- **Modes of subsistence**
- **Technological evolution**

HUMAN BEINGS IN SOCIETY

- **Human interaction**
- **Cultural coexistence**
- **Spirituality and creative expression**

For natural heritage the bio-geographical approach seems to work, as it defines “what is the best example” for one bio-geographical region. A thematic approach has been applied with the IUCN Global Studies, such as forests, wetlands etc. For cultural heritage the approach is more difficult, however the thematic structure seems to be a fruitful advance.

The Rapporteur of the Working Group emphasised that the *Convention* was created as a holistic document and is an outstanding response to the universal nature of heritage - for natural heritage in its biological and geographical diversity and for cultural heritage in its geo-cultural diversity. The group saw it as essential to develop tools which would guide the selection of heritage. A framework could be to define 20 to 40 themes, based on the 1994 Global Strategy. A first step could be to verify how these themes are represented in the current World Heritage List. The group endorsed an anthropological approach for the overall Global Strategy. The Strategy should define the themes and the gaps in the World Heritage List. With a set of themes a type of matrix could be developed which would assist the States Parties and the World Heritage Committee.

In the plenary discussion it was stressed that the management of sites is most important, as they lose their values if not properly managed. The number of sites as such is not so important if they are well managed. Concerning the themes it should be ensured that some themes or sub-themes, which are already represented on the List, should be reviewed. Finally, it was pointed out that the Global Strategy should be referred to in the *Operational Guidelines* to guide States Parties in their deliberations on the nominations of properties for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

The following recommendations proposed by the working group on “outstanding universal value” were approved in plenary by the expert group:

Table 6: Conclusions and recommendations of the working group on “outstanding universal value”

1. The *World Heritage Convention* was appreciated due to its sufficiently general character that allowed for interpretation according to evolving values, and for the identification of uniqueness and/or representation of heritage resources in the different regions of the world. The Convention should be seen as a holistic document, and the List as an on-going developing instrument, which unites cultural and natural heritage.
 2. The requirement of outstanding universal value characterising cultural and natural heritage should be interpreted as an outstanding response to issues of universal nature common to or addressed by all human cultures. In relation to natural heritage, such issues are seen in bio-geographical diversity; in relation to culture in human creativity and resulting cultural diversity.
 3. Identification of the outstanding universal value of heritage sites can only be made through systematic thematic studies, based on scientific research according to themes common to different regions or areas. This multidisciplinary, scientific research is necessary to identify whether a type of property might or might not be relevant for consideration for listing as part of a theme. In relation to culture, such a framework should be based on an anthropological approach, and the themes should be formulated in a manner that allows responses to be identified in the different cultures and regions. The themes could be elaborated with reference to list proposed by the 1994 strategic meeting for cultural heritage (see Table 5) and the Vanoise meeting for natural heritage, giving due importance to human creativity, and relationship with environment.
 4. It is essential to develop relevant tools for such studies, and for the identification of diversity, the outstanding or unique quality of specific properties, and properties that are of great importance to humanity. The group also endorsed the unification of the natural and cultural criteria as another important tool to achieve these ends.
 5. In comparative studies, like should be compared with like, and the aim should be to identify the most outstanding representatives of a kind in a cultural or physical region. Comparison may be done on a global basis, if similar sites are not found in the region. Having prepared the framework, it would be possible to verify how far the current List already responds to it.
 6. A framework of universal application has already been identified in relation to biological aspects of natural heritage, and is complemented in relation to representativeness in different regions. Similar work is proceeding in relation to geo-physical phenomena. As well as world heritage recognition, the international arrangements for nature conservation include the creation of a range of internationally recognised reserves, for example, Biosphere Reserves and Ramsar sites. There are also a range of regional conventions and agreements in place. No such arrangements exist for the international recognition of cultural sites, apart from World Heritage listing. This in part explains the pressure for placement on the World Heritage List of cultural sites. The Committee might like to consider whether a more extended range of international agreements for cultural sites would be desirable or helpful.
 7. Tentative lists for both natural and cultural properties should refer to the themes outlined above, and should be used as a tool to assess regional and cultural balance. Serial nominations which relate to important themes should also be encouraged in an international and regional context.
- In conclusion,
- the working group endorsed what has been done so far in reference to the Convention, recognising that thematic studies had already been beneficial in promoting renewed and fresh interest in protecting heritage.
 - the group endorsed the meetings in different regions and the encouragement to bring forward new types of heritage for improved regional and cultural balance and representativeness of the List.
 - the group endorsed the development of thematic and regional studies on issues of universal

significance, and in particular an anthropological approach to the definition of cultural heritage and people's relationship with environment.

- in making these recommendations, the group suggested that the already identified general themes needed to be broken down into more workable sub-themes related to potential nominations.
- the group recommended that special attention be given to communication, and that the overall framework and themes related to all types of heritage sites should be published and widely diffused to States Parties and relevant institutions as part of the Global Strategy. A clear reference to these should be made in the Operational Guidelines. The set of values characterising the outstanding universal significance of heritage resources should be built into an Integrated Strategic Process as an essential reference for conservation management.

7.4 Credibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage List

The working group on Credibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and the World Heritage List was attended by Mr Megret, Mr El Haber, Mr Fowler, Mr Munjeri, Mr Ayyad, Mr McPhail, Ms San Roman, Mr Morris, Mr Mujica and Mr von Droste. The Rapporteur, Mr Munjeri provided a progress report on the discussion of the group to the plenary session.

The group discussed underlying concerns, solutions and possible action programmes to make the World Heritage List more credible. The group also commented on the role of the various regions of the world to play in this process. In particular, the group reviewed the following points:

1. The **conceptual and intellectual credibility** of the *Convention* and the measurement of credibility. It reviewed the possibility of establishing a test of credibility at the scientific, popular and methodological levels.
2. **Practical and management questions:** Management plans should provide an optimum protection of original values, be flexible but ensure standards, enhance the educational involvement of people and the national commitment, include sociological concerns and regional variations.
3. **States Parties:** The political commitment of States Parties is necessary. The implications of deletion from the World Heritage List, prospects for conservation and threats to sites, institutional capacity building at all levels, socio-economic incentives, training and education are all vital components in the maintaining of credibility of the *Convention* and the List.
4. **Representativeness:** The regionalisation of strategies is important; a study by ICOMOS/IUCN on existing tentative lists and the identification of gaps and underrepresented regions is needed; a wider but defensible representation is important and international assistance in the preparation of tentative lists and for educational programmes on World Heritage is required. The experts asked for practical follow-up to Global Strategy meetings.
5. **Monitoring** was seen as a benchmark statement of integrity, which involves all stakeholders and is the basis for ongoing continuing monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites.

The experts touched also on conceptual matters and the development of a methodology. Finally, the following conclusions and recommendations proposed by the working group on “credibility” were approved in plenary by the expert group:

Table 7: Conclusions and recommendations of the working group on “credibility”

<p>WHEREAS</p> <p>the experts at Amsterdam took note of concerns related to the CREDIBILITY of the Convention and its implementation e.g. ambiguous objectives, lack of representativeness, perceptions of bias</p> <p>and whereas</p> <p>INSCRIPTION IS, AND MUST BE SEEN TO BE, PART OF A PROCESS, NOT AN ISOLATED EVENT, PRECEDED AND FOLLOWED BY STEPS IN AN EVOLVING CONTINUUM CONCEPTUALISED AS A VERY LONG-TERM COMMITMENT,</p> <p>and whereas we specifically noted that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. for a Site to be credible, the original values must be, and be seen to be, preserved and indeed enhanced by fully meeting the conditions of integrity and authenticity. ii. the management must be, and be seen to be, interdisciplinary and intersectorial iii. local participation is essential <p>WE RECOMMEND THAT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requirements for nominating World Heritage sites must be clear, explicit and systematic to which end the current Operational Guidelines should be rigorously reviewed and, as appropriate, revised. 2. States Parties making a nomination must demonstrate not only their commitment to the Convention but also their ability to building capacities at local and national levels to protect and manage a World Heritage site. 3. In order to have a more representative and therefore a more credible List, that State Parties be encouraged to nominate types of sites not well represented by region (see Paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines); to which end the World Heritage Centre with the Advisory Bodies acting with local interests should encourage and, if necessary initiate, appropriate studies to identify appropriate nominations. There is a need to address the issue of tentative lists in the context of “outstanding universal value” and develop a mechanism to give guidance to States Parties on lists submitted and to encourage harmonisation of tentative lists in relation to regions and themes. 4. Appropriate and flexible management plans must support nominations, clearly indicating the participation of local people and sensitivity to socio-economic consequences of inscription. Such plans should include possible encouragement for local people and proposals for the future of traditional, sustainable practices where such exist. 5. MONITORING: We strongly urge States Parties to implement paragraphs 68 to 75 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> since the credibility of the World Heritage List as well as the integrity of individual sites depends very much on what happens once the responsibilities of inscription have been formally accepted. A process of two stages could well be considered. 6. That a great effort needs to be made to produce and disseminate proper explanations and information to as wide an audience as possible.
--

8. Concluding remarks

8.1 The Rapporteur, Mr Mujica, in presenting the structure of the report and the results of the three different working groups, concluded that the expert group had been careful in

preparing its recommendations not to propose to change too much. He stressed that the unified set of criteria would be an important step towards bringing nature and culture together in the implementation of the Convention. The expert group recognized that the integrity and authenticity concepts are not only significant for nominations to the World Heritage List, but to the management of the sites. He commented that the discussions on the credibility of the World Heritage List and the concept of outstanding universal value will remain at the centre of the future implementation of the World Heritage Convention. He noted that there was complete agreement amongst the experts for a substantial revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. He observed that an ongoing process of revision would be required if world cultural and natural heritage are to be identified and conserved holistically. He asked the Secretariat to prepare the report of this expert meeting in an understandable form for presentation to the World Heritage Committee, its Bureau and the States Parties to the Convention. Furthermore, he stressed the importance of outlining the process by which the working groups had devised their recommendations, and the process by which the expert group had approved these recommendations. He thanked the Chairperson, all participants and the World Heritage Centre for their contributions.

8.2 Mr Megret (France) affirmed that there was a need to reform and thanked the Advisory Bodies for their ability to adapt and bring their thinking closer together. He suggested that the experts watch regions currently underrepresented on the World Heritage List to see whether the Global Strategy and the recommended revisions to the criteria make a difference to the balance of the List.

8.3 In thanking the Rapporteur and all of the participants, the Chairperson, Ms Cameron, said that she was impressed by the amount of work that had been done by the group. She also thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the hard work of the Secretariat. Ms Cameron particularly thanked the Advisory Bodies for their work. She commented that this was the first time that all three organizations had presented a consolidated view and noted that this was reassuring to their “clients” (i.e. the Committee, States Parties to the Convention etc.). Ms Cameron thanked Ms van der Kolk for everything that she and her team had done to make the meeting participants comfortable during their stay in Amsterdam. Finally, Ms Cameron thanked the interpreters for their hard work during the meeting.

8.4 Ms Sullivan then gave thanks, on behalf of all of the meeting participants, to Ms Cameron for having chaired the meeting.

8.5 Finally, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Bernd von Droste, thanked the group for having acted in the spirit of UNESCO by having worked together between and across disciplines. In concluding the meeting he referred to its unexpected positive results which would help to bring forward the credibility of the World Heritage List and the *World Heritage Convention*.

ANNEX I

AGENDA

Tuesday 24 March 1998

Arrival of participants

Wednesday 25 March 1998

10.00 am - 1.00 pm

Official welcome by Mr Riezenkamp, Director General for Culture, The Netherlands

Keynote address by Bernd von Droste, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre

A. Megret (France): Review of the results of the Expert Meeting, Parc national de la Vanoise, France (March 1996)

Introduction to the meeting:

- objectives
- meeting methodology
- expected outputs

Discussion of main issues and establishment of working groups

LUNCH

2.00 pm - 3.30 pm

Discussion in working groups

Coffee break

4.00 pm - 6.30 pm

Case studies by region

A. Mturi (Tanzania): Cultural and natural values of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania (cancelled)

R. El-Haber (Lebanon): Cultural and natural values of the Qadisha Valley, Lebanon

Xie Ninggao (China): Cultural and natural values of the five sacred mountains of China (including the World Heritage sites of Mount Huangshan and Mount Taishan)

K. Rao (India): Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in India

Thursday 26 March 1998

9.00 am - 1.00 pm Working Groups

LUNCH

2.30 pm - 6.30 pm Case studies by region (continued)

H. Mandui (Papua New Guinea): Cultural and natural values of Kuk in the Western Highlands, Papua New Guinea

H.F. Borja (Mexico): Cultural and natural values of the traditional pilgrimage routes of the Huichol Indian people of Mexico

F. Pannekoek (Canada): Cultural and natural values of the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump Complex, Canada

Y. Vedenin (Russian Federation): Cultural and natural values of the Solovetski Archipelago, Russian Federation

O. Baseova (Czech Republic): Cultural and natural values of the Lednice-Valtice cultural landscape, Czech Republic

J.W.H. Hogestijn/Hagers (The Netherlands): Cultural and natural values of Schokland and its surroundings, the Netherlands

R. Löfgren (Sweden): Cultural and natural values of the Laponian Area, Sweden

P. Fowler (United Kingdom): Cultural and natural values of archaeological landscapes of Europe and the British Isles

Friday 27 March 1998

9.00 am – 1.00 pm

Presentations by Working Groups

LUNCH

2.30 pm – 6.00 pm

Preparation of the meeting recommendations

Saturday 28 March 1998

9.00 am Departure for site visit at Kinderdijk

1.00 pm Lunch

2.00 pm Return to Amsterdam

6.00 pm Departure by boat to Paardenburg and dinner in Paardenburg

Sunday 29 March 1998

Departure of participants

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Mr Mohamed AYYAD

Professor of Plant Ecology
 Department of Environmental Sciences
 Faculty of Science
 Alexandria University
 21511 Moharram Bey
 ALEXANDRIA
 Egypt

☎ 203 597 2352
 Fax 203 545 7611
 Email ayyad@alex.eun.eg

Ms Olga BASEOVA

Institut for the Protection of Historic Monuments
 Narondni Obrany 2
 160 00 Praha 6
 Czech Republik

☎/Fax 42 02 312 0346

Dr Zambyn BATJARGAL

Director General
 National Agency for Hydrometeorology and
 Environmental Monitoring
 Mongolia
 Central Post, Box. 435
 Ulaanbaatar
 Mongolia

☎ 976 1 326592
 Fax 976 1 326611
 Email Batbaig@magicnetmn

Ms Françoise BERCE

Conservateur Général du Patrimoine
 Ministère de la Culture
 65 rue de Richelieu
 75001 Paris

☎ 0033-1-43 72 15 43
 Fax 0033-1 40 15 87 87

Prof. Dr. G. J. BORGER **

University of Amsterdam
 The Netherlands

☎ 31 20 525 40 92
 Fax 31 20 525 4051

Mr Humberto Fernandez BORJA

Director Conservación Humara, A.C.
 Avenida México 33-PH
 Edificio Roxy - Parque Mexico
 Colonia Hipodromo Condesa
 Ciudad de Mexico
 Apartado Postal 11-391
 Col. Condesa
 C.P. 06101 Mexico, D.F.
 Mexico

☎ 52 5 211 59 35
 Fax 52 5 514 67 10
 Email 103503.1572@compuserve.com

Dr Christina CAMERON

Director-General
 National Historic Sites
 Parks Canada
 Department of Canadian Heritage
 25 Eddy Street
 HULL K1A 0M5
 Canada

☎ 1 819 994 18 08
 Fax 1 819 953 4909
 Email christina_cameron@pch.gc.ca

Mr Ricardus M. EL-HABER

Ecology and Biodiversity Consultant
 National Focal Point for Specially Protected Areas
 Secretary General Friends of Nature NGO
 Founder National Trust - Lebanon
 PO Boc 967
 Jounieh
 Lebanon

☎ 961 3 668 864
 Fax 961 9 220 665
 Email fon@sodetel.net.lb

Mr Rob de JONG **

Ministerie van OCenW
 Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg
 P.O. Box 1001
 3700 BA Zeist
 The Netherlands

☎ 31 30 698 33 50
 Fax 31 30 968 32 83

Prof. Peter FOWLER

Department of Agriculture and Environmental Science
 King George VI Building
 Newcastle University
 Newcastle upon Tyne
 NE1 7RU
 United Kingdom

☎ 44 1 91 222 7095
 Fax 44 1 91 222 5228
 Email P.J.Fowler@ncl.ac.uk

Mr A. J. HAARTSEN **

IKC Natuurbeheer
 Marijkeweg 24
 6709 PG Wageningen
 The Netherlands

☎ 31 31 747 48 00

Drs Jan-Kees A. HAGERS **

State Service for Archeological Investigations (ROB)
 PO Box 1600
 NL- 3800 BP Amersfort
 The Netherlands

☎ 31 33 422 76 76
 Fax 31 33 422 77 99
 Email jhage@archis.nl

Mr Rolf LÖFGREN

Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)
 Naturvaardsverket
 10648 Stockholm
 Sweden

☎ 468 698 1000
 Fax 468 698 1662

Drs J. LUBBERS **

Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken en
 Ontwikkelingssamenwerking
 PO Box 20061
 2500 EB The Hague
 The Netherlands

☎ 31 70 348 51 67
 Fax 31 70 348 43 03
 Email lubbers@dml.minbuza.nl

Dr Ian Mc PHAIL

Chair GBRMPA
 GPO Box 1379
 Townsville QLD 4810
 Australia

Fax 61 77 213 445

Mr Herman MANDUI

Papua New Guinea National Museum and Art Gallery
P.O. Box 5560
Boroko, PORT MORESBY
Papua New Guinea

① 675 325 24 58
Fax 675 325 1779

Mr Kanefusa MASUDA

Agency for Cultural Affairs in Japan
Cultural Properties Protection Department
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100
Japan

① 81 3 3581 4012
Fax 81 3 3591 0278
Email masuda@bunka.go.jp

M. Alain MEGRET

Directeur adjoint
Direction de la Nature et des Paysages
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire de l'Environnement
20 Avenue de Ségur
75302 PARIS 07 SP
France

① 01 4219 1935
Fax 01 4219 1977

Mr David MORRIS

Superintendent
Olympic National Park
600 East Park Avenue
Port Angeles, Washington 98362
United States of America

① 360-452-0310
Fax 360-452-0335
Email David_Morris@NPS.gov

Mr Elias J. MUJICA

Deputy Coordinator
Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean
Ecoregion (CONDESAN)
International Potato Center
Av. La Universidad 795, La Molina
P.O Box 1558, Lima 12
Peru

① 51 1 349 6017
Fax 51 1 349-5638
Email e.mujica@cgnet.com

Mr Dawson MUNJERI

Executive Director
 The National Museums and Monuments
 Penrose Hill - 107 Rotten Row
 PO Box CY 1485 - Causeway
 HARARE
 Zimbabwe

① 263 4 75 28 76 / 77 42 08
 Fax 263 4 75 30 85
 Email natmus@baobab.cszim.co.zw

Prof. Xie NING-GAO

Director of Landscape Research Unit
 Department of Geography
 Beijing University
 Beijing 100871
 P.R. China

Fax 86 10 6601 7912

Dr. Perez M. OLINDO

African Elephant Foundation International
 P.O. Box 50556
 Nairobi
 Kenya

① 254 2 242 788
 Fax 254 2 713 342

Dr. Frits PANNEKOEK

Director, Historic Sites Service
 Alberta Community Development
 8820-112 ST
 Edmonton Alberta
 T6G 2P8
 Canada

① 1 403 4312 310
 Fax 1 403 427 5598
 Email FPannekoek@mcd.gov.ab.ca

Dr. Patricia PARKER

Chief
 American Indian Liaison Office
 National Park Service (2205)
 Room 3410
 1849 C Street NW
 Washington DC 20240
 United States of America

① 1 202 208 5475
 Fax 1.202 273 0870
 Email Pat_Parker@nps.gov

Mr G. POST

Ministerie van LNV
Directie natuurbeheer
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
The Netherlands

☎ 31 70 378 5613
Fax 31 70 378 61 44

Mr Kishore RAO

Deputy Inspector General (WILDLIFE)
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex
Lodhi Road, New Delhi - 110003
India

☎ 91 11 43 60 957
Fax 91 11 462 68 37
Email kr Rao@envfor.delhi.nic.in

M. Michel RICARD

Sous-directeur des Affaires internationales
Direction des Archives
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication
65 rue de Richelieu
75001 Paris
France

☎ 0033-1-40 14 32 88
Fax 0033-1-40 15 33 07

Mr Toshio SAWADA

Unit Chief,
Monuments and Sites Division
Cultural Properties Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
100 Japan

☎ 81 3 35811726
Fax 81 3 3591 0293

Ms Lorena SAN ROMAN

Coordinator
Programme Latin America and Caribbean
Earth Council
Apdo. 2323-1002
San José, Costa Rica

☎ 506- 236-1611
Fax 506-255 2197
Email Isanroma@terra.ecouncil.ac.cr

Drs F.F.J. SCHOORL

Ministerie van OCenW
Directie Cultureel Erfgoed
P.O. Box 25000
2700 LZ Zoetermeer
The Netherlands

① 31 79 323 4699
Fax 31 79 323 4945

Ms Sharon SULLIVAN

First Assistant Secretary
Australian and World Heritage Group
Environment Australia
GPO Box 1567
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Australia

① 61 2 6217 2 111
Fax 61 2 6217 2095
Email sharon.sullivan@dest.gov.au

Drs. A. SYTSEMA

Ministerie van OCenW
Directorie Cultureel Erfgoed
P.O. Box 25000
2700 LZ Zoetermeer
The Netherlands

① 31 79 323 4550
Fax 31 79 323 4945

Mr Abdelaziz TOURI

Directeur
Direction du patrimoine culturel
Ministère des Affaires culturelles
17, rue Michlifen
Agdal, Rabat
Maroc

① 212 7 67 13 81
Fax 212 7 67 13 97

Prof. Yuri VEDENIN

Director
Russian Research Institute for Cultural and Natural Heritage
Kosmonatov Ul. 2
Moscow 129366
Russia

① 7 095 286 1319
Fax 7 095 286 1324
Email polar@glas.apc.org and postmaster@heritage.msk.su

Dr Pan XIAO-FENG

Department of Geography
Beijing University
Beijing 100871
P.R. China

Fax 86 10 6601 7912

Observer

Dr David BREEZE

Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments
Historic Scotland
Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh EH9 1SH
United Kingdom

Fax 44 131 668 8730

Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Convention

ICOMOS

Mr Henry CLEERE

Conseil International des Monuments et des Sites
49-51 rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

① 01 45 67 67 70
Fax 01 45 66 06 22
Email icomos@cicrp.jussieu.fr

Ms Carmen ANON

Puerto Santa Maria 49
Madrid 28043
ESPAGNE / SPAIN

① 34 1 388 39 57
Fax 34 1 300 34 27
Email citerea@legendnet.net

IUCN

Mr Pedro Rosabal

The World Conservation Union
Rue Mauverney 28
CH-1196 Gland
Switzerland

① 41 22 999 01 63
Fax 41 22 999 00 15
Email pmr@hq.iucn.org

Mr Bing Lucas

Vice Chair World Heritage
World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)
1/268 Main Road
Tawa, Wellington 6006

① 64 4 232 5581
Fax 64 4 232 9129

ICCROM

Mr Jukka JOKILEHTO

Assistant to the Director General
Via di San Michele, 13
00153 ROME
Italy

☎ 39 6 585 531
Fax 39 6 585 53 349
Email jj@iccrom.org / iccrom@iccrom.org

UNESCO Secretariat

World Heritage Centre
UNESCO
7, place de Fontenoy
75732 Paris 07 SP

☎ 33-1 45 68 15 71 or 18 91 or 14 04
Fax 33-1 45 68 55 70

Bernd VON DROSTE
Mechtild RÖSSLER
Sarah TITCHEN

Email b.von-droste@unesco.org
Email m.rossler@unesco.org
Email s.titchen@unesco.org

UNESCO Division of Cultural Heritage
1, rue Miollis
750015 Paris

Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS

☎ 33-1 45 68 41 90
Fax 33-1 45 68 55 96

Secretariat of the Ministry of OcenW

Wil van der Kolk
Irene Timer / José Brussee

Postbox 2000
2700 LZ Zoetermeer
The Netherlands
☎ 31 79 323 47 33
Fax 31 79 323 49 69

** Host country representative