

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.202/9

Paris, 30 May 2000

Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fourth session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, (Room IV)

26 June - 1 July 2000

Item 6.2 of the Provisional Agenda : Report of the International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (Canterbury, UK, 10-14 April 2000)

BACKGROUND

At its twenty-third session held in Marrakesh, Morocco 29 November – 4 December 1999, the World Heritage Committee established the following groups and requested that they present the results of their work to the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau:

Task Force on the Implementation of the
World Heritage Convention

WHC-2000/CONF.202/8

**International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the
*Operational Guidelines for the Implementation
of the World Heritage Convention*
(Canterbury, UK, 10-14 April 2000)**

**This document
WHC-2000/CONF.202/9**

Working Group on the Representativity of the
World Heritage List

WHC-2000/CONF.202/10

Working Group on Equitable
Representation in the World Heritage Committee

WHC-2000/CONF.202/11

The twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee requested the Expert Meeting on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* to review (i) the subject of a unified set of criteria and proposals to revise (ii) Paragraph 65 (transmission of evaluations by Advisory Bodies to States Parties concerned) and (iii) Paragraph 68 (transmission of state of conservation reports to States Parties concerned) of the *Operational Guidelines*. At the same session the Committee referred proposals to revise (iv) Paragraphs 113-116 of the *Operational Guidelines* (International Assistance) to the Task Force. The Committee asked that due consideration be taken of the concerns expressed during the discussions by the twenty-third session of the Bureau, the deliberations at the twenty-third session of the Committee, the outcomes of the evaluation of International Assistance and in line with the resolution adopted by the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties.

Action required:

(a) The Bureau may wish to endorse the report of the Expert Meeting.

(b) The Bureau may also wish to agree on the overall approach and process of revising the *Operational Guidelines* as suggested in **Section 2. H** of the Report of the Expert Meeting by adopting the following recommendation:

"The twenty-fourth session of the Bureau recommends that the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee,

1. endorse the report of the Expert Meeting,
2. adopt the proposed New Outline for the *Operational Guidelines* (**Section 3** of the Report),
3. consider the recommended changes to the content of the *Operational Guidelines* contained in **Section 4** of the Report. These include:
 - (i) the merging of the cultural and natural criteria as proposed by the Amsterdam meeting and discussed at subsequent Bureau and Committee sessions (Recommendation 4d),
 - (ii) further review of the proposed changes to Paragraph 65 of the *Operational Guidelines* (Recommendation 5),
 - (iii) revision of Paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines* (Recommendation 6g) and,
 - (iv) proposals to change Paragraphs 113-116 of the *Operational Guideline* (Recommendation 8).
4. consider that restructured *Operational Guidelines* will provide the framework for including the results of the work of the Task Force on Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List and the Working Group on the Representativity of the Committee, as well as any changes resulting from future strategic frameworks adopted by the Committee. Therefore, revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* should be considered in the context of the conclusions of,
 - (a) the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Committee (WHC-2000/CONF.202/8),
 - (b) the Working Group on Equitable Representation of the World Heritage Committee (WHC-2000/CONF.202/9),
 - (c) the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List(WHC-2000/CONF.202/10),
 - (d) the Report on the Evaluation of International Assistance provided under the World Heritage Fund (C3E) (WHC-2000/CONF.202/13)
 - (e) Synthesis report of the Meeting on "Cultural Landscapes: Concept and Implementation", Catania, Italy, 8-11 March 2000 (WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.10) and,
 - (f) Expert Meeting on Authenticity and Integrity in the African context, Great Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe, 26-31 May 2000.

**INTERNATIONAL EXPERT MEETING ON THE REVISION TO THE
OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

**UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE
IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM AND IN COLLABORATION
WITH ENGLISH HERITAGE**

**CANTERBURY, UNITED KINGDOM
10 - 14 APRIL 2000**

FINAL REPORT



An electronic version of this report is available at <http://www.unesco.org/whc/canterbury/index.html> in English and French.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing in this document shall be construed to nullify or otherwise negatively affect the current *Operational Guidelines* (WHC.99/2 March 1999) or any past actions of the World Heritage Committee or its Bureau. Furthermore, any proposed changes to the *Operational Guidelines* identified in this document will not become operational until adopted by the World Heritage Committee.

Table of Contents

	page
DISCLAIMER	
1. SUMMARY	1
2. REPORT OF THE EXPERT MEETING	
A. Background to the Expert Meeting	2
B. Aim of the Expert Meeting	3
C. Objectives of the Expert Meeting	3
D. Opening session and adoption of the Agenda	3
E. Review of the effectiveness of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> from the points of view of a State Party, Site Manager and Advisory Bodies	4
F. Plenary discussion of target audience, users and purpose of <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	7
G. Working groups review of previous proposals for revision of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> and identification of gaps, duplications and inconsistencies and analysis of options for each section of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	8
H. Recommended process for consideration of the Report of the Expert Meeting by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau	10
I. Closure of the Expert Meeting	10
3. PROPOSED NEW OUTLINE FOR THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES	12
I. INTRODUCTION	12
II. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	13
III. PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES	15
IV. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE	17
V. ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF THE <i>WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION</i>	18
4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO THE CONTENT OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES	20
5. ANNEXES	
ANNEX I List of Participants	
ANNEX II Address by Alan Howarth, C.B.E., MP Minister for the Arts	

- ANNEX III Commentaires préliminaires par M. Abdelaziz Touri, Président
du Comité du patrimoine mondial
- ANNEX IV Opening remarks by Mounir Bouchenaki, Director, UNESCO
World Heritage Centre
- ANNEX V Agenda
- ANNEX VI Analysis of information on International Assistance presented
in the existing *Operational Guidelines*
- ANNEX VII Proposed new text on International Assistance for the revised
Operational Guidelines

1. SUMMARY

The International Expert Meeting on the revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* was approved by the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee in 1999. The aim of the Expert Meeting was to propose an overall revision of *the Operational Guidelines*. The Expert Meeting was asked to report on its work to the twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Bureau (see **Section 2 A to C** of this Report).

The Expert Meeting was held in Canterbury, England, from 10 to 14 April, 2000. It was organised by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and English Heritage with funding provided by the United Kingdom Government and the World Heritage Fund. The Expert Meeting was attended by cultural and natural heritage experts from States Parties from different regions of the world, a representative of the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM) and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. A List of Participants is included as **Annex I** to this report.

The Expert Meeting worked with reference to the Task Force for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List and the Working Group on the Equitable Representation of the World Heritage Committee. Members of both the Task Force and the Working Groups participated in the Expert Meeting in their capacity as experts.

The Expert Meeting recommends to the Bureau that the *Operational Guidelines* be restructured in a logical way, returning to the fundamental principles of the *World Heritage Convention*. The *Operational Guidelines* should be simplified, streamlined and presented in a user-friendly form with much existing and new supporting material to be moved to annexes and other documentation (see **Section 2 D to G** of this Report).

The Expert Meeting proposes a new overall framework for the *Operational Guidelines*, introducing for the first time a consolidated section on the Protection and Conservation of World Heritage Properties. It recommends (see **Section 3** of this Report) to the Bureau that the new outline of the *Operational Guidelines* should be:

- I INTRODUCTION
- II ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
- III PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES
- IV INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE
- V ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

The Expert Meeting also recommends a number of changes to the content of the *Operational Guidelines* in line with some of the recommendations of the Task Force and Working Groups (see **Section 4** of this Report).

Following an analysis of the existing provisions of the *Operational Guidelines* (see **Annex VI**), the Expert Meeting reviewed the text of the *Operational Guidelines* relating to International Assistance and proposed a new draft revised text (see **Annex VII**). With the agreement of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee this text was immediately transmitted to C3E who are carrying out the evaluation of International Assistance.

2. REPORT OF THE EXPERT MEETING

A. Background to the Expert Meeting

At its twenty-third session (July 1999) the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee welcomed the invitation by the Observer of the United Kingdom to host an international expert meeting in early 2000 to consolidate proposals to revise and reorganize the *Operational Guidelines* in early 2000.

At the twenty-third session of the Committee in November/December 1999, the Expert Meeting was formally constituted and asked to present the results of its meeting to the Bureau in June 2000 (Paragraph VI.16 of the 1999 Committee Report).

The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Committee of the aims, objectives and expected outcomes of the Expert Meeting as set out below. At that time a Meeting Announcement and Provisional Agenda were circulated to all members of the Committee. The Observer of the United Kingdom "indicated that the meeting would not re-write the *Operational Guidelines* but instead work on proposals to reorganise them to ensure a more user-friendly version" (Paragraph XIII.7 of the 1999 Committee report).

Following lengthy discussions (see section XIII of the 1999 Committee report) the Committee also decided "to refer the subject of a unified set of criteria" and the possibility of revisions to Paragraphs 65 (Procedure and timetable for the processing of nominations) and 68 (Reactive monitoring) to the Canterbury Expert Meeting.

At the twenty-third session of the Committee in November/December 1999, a **Task Force on the implementation of the Convention** was also created. And, as follow-up to the 12th General Assembly (October 1999) Resolution on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List, two Working Groups of the Committee were established in January 2000 – a **Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee** and a **Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List**.

The Task Force and two Working Groups of the World Heritage Committee are currently preparing reports which are likely to include a number of proposed revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*. Other recommendations made by the Task Force and Working Groups could, if adopted by the Committee, require modifications to the *Operational Guidelines*.

The reports and recommendations of the Task Force, Working Groups and the report of the Expert Meeting in Canterbury will be discussed at the twenty-fourth session of

the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO Headquarters, 26 June to 1 July 2000). In turn, the Bureau will prepare recommendations for submission to the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, Australia 27 November to 2 December 2000).

B. Aim of the Expert Meeting

The aim of the Canterbury Expert Meeting was to propose an overall revision of the *Operational Guidelines* in order to make them streamlined and user-friendly.

C. Objectives of the Expert Meeting

The objectives of the meeting were:

- (1) to identify and define the target audiences for the *Operational Guidelines*,
- (2) to review previous proposals for revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*,
- (3) to identify gaps, duplications and inconsistencies in the *Operational Guidelines* according to four themes, namely,
 1. Identification / evaluation / nomination / inscription
 2. Management / monitoring / reporting / in-Danger listing / deletion
 3. International Assistance
 4. Raising Awareness of World Heritage including on-site presentation,
- (4) on the basis of (1) to (3) above, to recommend a new structure, content and format for the *Operational Guidelines*,
- (5) to make recommendations on the future presentation of the *Operational Guidelines* to make them more user-friendly,
- (6) to suggest any necessary additional work (along with a timetable and allocation of responsibilities); and
- (7) to prepare a report containing specific recommendations for consideration by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in 2000.

D. Opening session and adoption of the Agenda

The Principal of Canterbury Christ Church University College, Professor Michael Wright welcomed participants to the Expert Meeting. Mr Nigel Pittman (Department of Culture, Media and Sport, United Kingdom) then declared the meeting open and delivered the welcoming speech by the Honourable Alan Howarth, Ministry for Culture (see **Annex II**). The President of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Abdelaziz Touri followed by making introductory remarks referring to some of the key background to the meeting (see **Annex III**). The response by Mr Mounir

Bouchenaki, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre is included as **Annex IV**.

The Expert Meeting then adopted the agenda (see **Annex V**) and agreed by acclamation that the Rapporteur for the meeting would be Ms Karen Kovacs (United States of America). The opening session of the Expert Meeting was chaired by Mr Nigel Pittman. All other sessions of the Expert Meeting were chaired by Dr Christopher Young (English Heritage).

E. Review of the effectiveness of the *Operational Guidelines* from the points of view of a State Party, Site Manager and Advisory Bodies

State Party

Dr Christina Cameron (Canada) gave the views of a State Party on the effectiveness of the *Operational Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* had begun as a statement of principles to advise the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies on the application of the *Convention*. Over time they had become a general reference document. The process for modifying the *Guidelines* was quite flawed. Over the years, the results of expert meetings and other revisions had been fed in on an *ad hoc* basis. The result was that there were long sections on certain specific issues (eg 20th century cities) meaning that the *Guidelines* were becoming unbalanced. The lack of time for discussions of revisions in meetings of the Committee had also contributed to this. There was a need for a regular review cycle, including time for proper discussions of policy by the Committee.

Dr Cameron then looked at the effectiveness of the *Operational Guidelines* for a State Party in the international context. The *Guidelines* were hard to work with because:

- They were not organised in a logical sequence
- There was too much detailed information in some areas and too little in others
- Information was hard to find so that some good instructions (eg Paragraph 63 on the production of a Statement of Significance) were not followed up
- The *Guidelines* were not followed in some cases (eg bringing in external experts when necessary)
- They were internally inconsistent
- Some areas needed expansion and clarification (eg Paragraph 68 on reactive monitoring, Paragraph 80 on In Danger listing)
- A training programme on the use of the *Guidelines* is needed
- There needs to be clearer definition of terms which could be moved to a glossary

In the national context, the *Guidelines* also had problems:

- The language was difficult to use
- Frequently out-of-date versions were in use
- There was little advice for site managers
- The rules on how extensions to sites should be dealt with were unclear

- It was unclear what was needed for a comparative study of a site proposed for inscription
- There needed to be a better review cycle for revision of the *Guidelines*

In conclusion she said that the Canterbury Meeting should:

- Restructure the *Guidelines* in a logical order
- Identify the gaps and propose new sections for the *Guidelines*
- Edit the *Guidelines* substantially
- Put much of the material into background papers or annexes
- Develop a formal process for modification of the *Guidelines*

Site Manager

Dr Christopher Young (English Heritage) addressed the Expert Meeting as the former Manager of Hadrian's Wall, one of the United Kingdom's World Heritage properties. He referred to the *Operational Guidelines* as an extremely frustrating document especially if applied to a large, multiple ownership site such as Hadrian's Wall. He recalled that when English Heritage needed to prepare a management plan for the site he began by looking at Article 5 of the *Convention* and at the *Operational Guidelines*. He noted that whilst Paragraph 24(b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines* referred to the objective of management there was no guidance as to how to prepare a management plan in the *Guidelines*. This pointed to the fact that the *Operational Guidelines* concentrate almost primarily on the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Dr Young commented that more guidance was required from the World Heritage Committee as to how to manage World Heritage properties.

Advisory Bodies

The representative of IUCN addressed the group with some short and general remarks. He used an analogy about “baking” to describe the World Heritage Committee’s approach toward the *Operational Guidelines*, referring to a “reluctance to take the cake out of the oven”. He said IUCN prefers the “big bang” theory as opposed to the “many small changes” theory used by the *Convention*, asserting that the “many small changes” theory simply leads to confusion. IUCN would prefer to see quick and effective change. He introduced the acronym KISFOR, which stands for "Keep It Simple and Focused on Results" to illustrate the point that the *Operational Guidelines* should be clear, concise and easy to use. IUCN believes that in revising the *Guidelines*, the group should target the main users and not try to be everything to everyone. He also mentioned that the revisions should focus on “application” of the guidelines, particularly regarding key issues like the number of nominations presented. Specific recommendations included:

- The need to integrate the criteria for natural and cultural nominations
- A stronger link between integrity and authenticity

- A shift in the focus from nominations to management and the need for the *Operational Guidelines* to reflect such a shift - specifically for sustainability and the conservation of biodiversity
- More frequent use of serial nominations
- More effective use of the tentative lists

Lastly, the representative from IUCN stated that the Expert Group should aim to present their proposed changes to the *Operational Guidelines* to the Committee in Cairns, Australia in November/December 2000.

The representative from **ICCROM** asserted that ICCROM's perspective was perhaps a bit different than that of the other Advisory Bodies because their role is generally post inscription. That being said, he noted that criticism should be directed at the lack of implementation of the *Operational Guidelines* by the Committee as much as at the *Operational Guidelines* themselves.

ICCROM believes that most of the problem with the *Operational Guidelines* derives from the fact that they are a static object aimed at a moving target and therefore, should be flexible to accommodate change without always changing themselves. He went on to say that the *Guidelines* should steer the process in a more logical process following a "conservation cycle". He noted that linkages are needed throughout the whole system. He also asserted that the *Guidelines* need to emphasize more strongly post inscription responsibilities such as management. He concluded by saying that in addition to identifying gaps and inconsistencies in the *Guidelines*, that the Expert Group should also address the following issues:

- How any changes to the *Operational Guidelines* identified by the working group would be implemented
- The form of any new vehicle and any necessary training that may result,
- The fact that the underlying substantive questions that the *Operational Guidelines* seek to answer are not clear.

The representative from **ICOMOS** agreed that there is a serious need to streamline the *Operational Guidelines* and said that the *Guidelines* should not be the place for highly detailed information. He further stated that the *Operational Guidelines* should not be too prescriptive and should be more flexible. He felt there should be a format for continual evolution.

Plenary discussion

The expert from the United States of America cautioned that when using annotations and annexes in guidelines, the Expert Group should be careful to ensure that all such documents be incorporated by reference and specifically given equal authority. She used the example of CITES to show what can happen when the annotations become unruly.

The Representative from the Ramsar Convention Secretariat agreed that the *Operational Guidelines* should not try to be everything to everyone. He contrasted the

Operational Guidelines with guidelines produced for the Ramsar Convention. He stated that Ramsar is replacing its previous user manual with information packs geared for specific audiences. He also mentioned that Ramsar uses its website extensively in this regard and acknowledged that the World Heritage Centre's website could perform several of the functions discussed, particularly with regard to information dissemination to the public at large and new practitioners. Lastly, he added that *Guidelines* that include case studies on implementation are particularly useful.

The representative from Brazil noted that if the Committee chooses to use the Internet to disseminate information to the public that it will be critical to make sure that the web site is updated accordingly. ICCROM noted the importance of maintaining paper guidelines as some countries are not well connected to the Internet.

Finally, IUCN highlighted four emerging themes for restructuring the *Operational Guidelines* that had emerged during the discussion:

1. simpler and easier guidelines
2. a more logical flow
3. a stronger post inscription focus
4. flexibility for the future

F. Plenary discussion of target audience, users and purpose of *Operational Guidelines*

The Discussion Paper produced by the World Heritage Centre (see <http://www.unesco.org/whc/canterbury/index.html>) identified potential target audiences as:

- The World Heritage Committee
- The World Heritage Bureau
- The World Heritage Centre
- States Parties
- Managers and Owners of World Heritage Property
- UNESCO Divisional and Regional staff
- Other Convention Secretariats
- The tourism industry
- Trainers and Educators
- Academic staff and researchers
- The general public

It was noted that the range of potential audiences was very wide and that it was not possible to meet all their needs from one document. The expert from Hungary suggested that the *Guidelines* should concentrate only on the first five groups as they are the primary bodies involved in the implementation of the *Convention*:

In discussion of this proposal it was argued that the *Guidelines* should concentrate on Groups 1 to 4. The other groups required different kinds of information. Site

managers in particular would require much more than could be contained in the *Guidelines*. It was pointed out that Site Managers were central to the application of the *Convention* which was largely site-based.

It was also noted that the form of the *Guidelines* was significant in this context. The representative of ICOMOS suggested that the *Operational Guidelines* should be a slim document setting out the main principles and supported by other documents. The expert from Canada said that the *World Heritage Convention* was about sites and properties and must state general principles for site managers. The expert from Japan said that the main purpose of the *Guidelines* was to advise the Committee and the Bureau. The Chairman of the Committee said that Site Managers must be included in the target audiences since they were responsible for the day-to-day running of the sites. The expert from Australia said that Article 6 of the *Convention* clearly made the inclusion of site managers essential. The expert from Zimbabwe said that this would become more so with the introduction of Periodic Reporting.

In summary, the Expert Meeting noted that there is currently a broad range of users of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Expert Meeting concluded that the revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* should be made for the key users, namely, States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, members of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau, the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM), the UNESCO Secretariat and partners in site management. It was recognised that partners in site management would require additional guidance supplementary to that provided in the *Operational Guidelines*.

G. Working groups review of previous proposals for revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and identification of gaps, duplications and inconsistencies and analysis of options for each section of the *Operational Guidelines*

The Expert Meeting analysed the present *Operational Guidelines* (WHC.99/2 March 1999) in working groups according to the following themes:

- Introduction (proposals made by Christina Cameron (Canada))
- Identification/evaluation/nomination/inscription (Chair: Dawson Munjeri (Zimbabwe) and Rapporteur: Nobuko Inaba)
- Management /monitoring/reporting/in-Danger listing/deletion (Chair: Kevin Keeffe (Australia) and Rapporteur: José Pedro de Oliveira Costa (Brazil))
- International Assistance (Chair: Janos Jelen (Hungary) and Rapporteur: Ahmed Fahmy (Egypt))
- Raising Awareness of World Heritage including on-site presentation (discussed by all working groups and in plenary)

Following discussions in each of the working groups, the Expert Meeting found many inconsistencies, gaps and internal contradictions in the *Operational Guidelines*. The Expert Meeting decided that the existing *Operational Guidelines* do not meet all the needs of those implementing the *Convention* at the international, regional, national and site levels. The Expert Meeting also considered that there were a number of excellent provisions in the *Operational Guidelines* which were not implemented and

applied, often because they were not easily accessible within the *Operational Guidelines*. The Expert Meeting concluded that there was a need for a logical restructuring and expansion of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Expert Meeting also considered that restructured *Operational Guidelines* would provide the framework for including the results of the work of the Task Force on Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List and the Working Group on the Representativity of the Committee, as well as any changes resulting from future strategic frameworks adopted by the Committee.

The Expert Meeting concluded that the logical restructuring and expansion of the *Operational Guidelines* would require:

1. **returning to the fundamental principles established within the *World Heritage Convention***, taking into account the key functional elements within the existing *Operational Guidelines*
2. **reviewing the *Operational Guidelines* on a regular cycle**, linked to the Strategic Plan which the Committee may adopt and to Periodic Reporting cycles (six-year cycle)
3. **simplifying the *Operational Guidelines* by moving much of the supporting information to annexes and other supporting documents**
4. **clearing away accretions and rationalising the organisation of remaining provisions**
5. **editing and presenting the *Operational Guidelines* in clear and simple language, using tables, graphics and illustrations**
6. **providing a clear and comprehensive index to the *Operational Guidelines***
7. **publishing the *Operational Guidelines* in English and French as well as other languages (Spanish, etc)**
8. **producing illustrated guides to management and answers to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**
9. **ensuring a management system for the transitional period from the existing to the new *Operational Guidelines***

H. Recommended process for consideration of the Report of the Expert Meeting by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau

The Expert Meeting proposes that the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau recommends that the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee in December 2000,

1. adopt the proposed New Outline for the *Operational Guidelines* (**Section 3** of this Report) and,
2. consider the recommended changes to the content of the *Operational Guidelines* contained in **Section 4** of this Report. It is recommended that this be done in the context of the conclusions of,

- (a) the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Committee,
- (b) the Working Group on Equitable Representation of the World Heritage Committee,
- (c) the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List,

together with,

- (d) the Report on the Evaluation of International Assistance (C3E)
- (e) and the reports of the Expert Meetings of,
- (f) the report on the Meeting on “Cultural Landscapes: Concept and Implementation”, Catania, Italy, 8-11 March 2000 and,
- (g) Authenticity and Integrity in the African context, Great Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe, May 2000.

I. Closure of the Expert Meeting

On behalf of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr van Hooff thanked the government of the United Kingdom for their hospitality and for the arrangements made for the Expert Meeting.

In noting that there had been suggestions made over recent weeks that the meeting was premature and should be postponed, he commented that the discussions and outcomes of the meeting had demonstrated that the meeting was timely. He referred to the dynamic process required to revise the *Operational Guidelines* with the inputs of the Expert Meeting and the World Heritage Committee's Task Force and two Working Groups. Despite the legendary nature of the Expert Meeting, work would now have to temporarily stop whilst waiting for the twenty-fourth session of the Committee to reach a decision on the proposals for revisions to the *Guidelines*.

Mr van Hooff thanked the Chairperson of the Expert Meeting, Dr Christopher Young (English Heritage) and the Rapporteur, Ms Karen Kovacs (United States of America).

He also thanked Ms Annabel Benoit (English Heritage) for all of her assistance in organising the Expert Meeting in co-operation with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Finally he thanked the interpreters who had worked with the group throughout the meeting.

Dr Christopher Young closed the meeting by thanking all participants for their contributions to the Expert Meeting. He also thanked the interpreters and wished everyone a safe journey home.

3. PROPOSED NEW OUTLINE FOR THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

**Corresponding Paragraph Nos. of
the existing *Operational Guidelines*
(WHC.99/2 March 1999)
and need for new paragraphs**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE OF THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

Target audience and users of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	New
Principles and procedures to guide implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i>	4,5
Processes to support decision-making	4, 5

B. INTRODUCTION TO THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

Purpose	1, 2
General Principles	6

C. DEFINITION OF WORLD HERITAGE

“Outstanding universal value” [Note: reference to Article 12 of the <i>Convention</i> and comparison to national or regional importance]	New
Definition of World Heritage [Note: reference to Articles 1 and 2 of the <i>Convention</i>]	23 & 43

D. ROLES OF STATES PARTIES, ADVISORY BODIES, SECRETARIAT, PARTNERS IN SITE MANAGEMENT AND OTHER PARTNERS

States Parties	3
Ratification of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i>	New

Annex1: Model instrument for Ratification/Acceptance

Obligations under the <i>World Heritage Convention</i>	129-134
General Assembly of States Parties	126 (b-d)
World Heritage Committee	126 (e-f)
Bureau of the World Heritage Committee	126 (e)

Advisory Bodies	New
ICCROM	
ICOMOS	
IUCN	
Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee	New
[Note: World Heritage Centre and other sectors and field offices of UNESCO]	
Partners in site management	New
Other Partners	139
Other Conventions and Recommendations	139
Other Organisations	139

II. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

A. CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Combined cultural and natural heritage criteria for the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List	New, 18, 24 & 44
[Note: merging of the criteria as suggested in Table II of the Amsterdam report, 1998]	
General introduction to integrity and authenticity	New
New Annex 2: Authenticity and integrity in relation to the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> [Note: with text from <i>The Nara Document on Authenticity</i> and La Vanoise recommendation concerning integrity]	

B. THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A BALANCED AND REPRESENTATIVE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Introduction to the Global Strategy for a Balanced and Representative World Heritage List	New
---	------------

New Annex 3: Typology of properties [**Note:** needs to be developed for both natural and cultural heritage, including the existing texts on towns, cultural landscapes (cross reference in text), as well as texts from Expert groups on canals, itineraries etc.]

Principles for comparative assessment	New
[Note: to be provided by the Advisory Bodies]	

[**Note:** awaiting outcomes of Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List]

C. TENTATIVE LISTS

Tentative Lists [**Note:** reference to Article 11 of *Convention*, 7 & 8
reference to comparative assessments above,
obligatory for cultural and natural properties - awaiting outcome of
Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List]

Annex 4: Standard Format for submitting a Tentative List

Regional harmonization of tentative lists **94(b) & New**
[**Note:** awaiting outcome of Working Group on the Representativity
of the World Heritage List]

D. NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Format and content of nominations **64**

Annex 5: Format for nomination of cultural and natural properties for inscription on the World Heritage List and **New** Standard requirements for format of nominations

Conditions of integrity, test of authenticity [Note: harmonize paragraph 24b and 44 b]	24b (i), 44b(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vii)
Justification arguments and comparative assessments	12
Management requirements [Note: to include reference to protection and management mechanisms and plans, buffer zones, legal protection]	17, 21 & 11
Joint nominations	16
Serial nominations	19 & 20
Phased nominations	New
Extensions	66
Re-nominations	New

New Annex 6: Provisions for protection and management of nominated and inscribed properties [**Note:** to include legal and/or contractual protection (legislation), traditional protection, management mechanisms, planning mechanisms, management and conservation planning, buffer zone (17), boundaries, Management and conservation planning, accessibility to the public (24b (i), 44b (v)(vi))]

New Annex 7: Revised procedure and timetable for the processing of nominations, [**Note:** including clear indications of deadlines for referral, deferral, re-nomination and rejection (65-67)]

E. EVALUATION OF PROPERTIES NOMINATED FOR INCLUSION TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

New Annex 8: Evaluation procedures of IUCN and ICOMOS**F. INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

Decision by the World Heritage Committee	57 & 63
Notification of inscription to the State Party	New
Advice to States Parties following inscription of a property on the World Heritage List	New
Publication of the World Heritage List	135-136

G. ARCHIVING AND DOCUMENTATION OF NOMINATIONS **New**

[**Note:** references to World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN documentation, web-pages and information available electronically, e.g. scanned nominations cross reference to section V of the *Guidelines* on information management)

III. PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**A. MANAGEMENT OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

Statement of World Heritage values	63 & New
Definition of Management	New & 72
Definition of the Management Cycle	New
[Note: including the conservation cycle]	
The Management Cycle	New
World Heritage Management Issues	New
Responsibilities of partners in site management	New & 56

B. PERIODIC REPORTING **77-79**

Definition	New
Authority	Art. 29
Objectives	Format p.2-3
Process description	72-75 & New
Format for Periodic Reports	77
<u>Annex 9: Process of Periodic Reporting and Format and explanatory notes</u>	
Reports	
Purpose of the Periodic Reports	71
State Party Periodic Reports	73
Regional State of the World Heritage Reports	74
Follow-up	New

C. REACTIVE MONITORING

Definition	68
Authority	Art. 11
Objectives	New
Process description	47-50 & New
	<u>New Annex 10: Process of Reactive Monitoring</u>
Reports	
Purpose of the Reactive Monitoring Reports	New
Follow-up	New

D. THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Definition	New
Authority	Art. 11
Objectives	New
Process description	86-93
	<u>New Annex 11: Inclusion on and treatment of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger</u>
Criteria and benchmarks for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger	80-85
Action plan [Note: including remedial measures, assistance, timeframes, monitoring]	86,87, 91
Monitoring of the implementation of the action plan	92
Removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger	93(ii)
[Note: see recommendation 7 in Section 4 of the Report below, legal counsel recommended]	

E. DELETION FROM THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Definition	46
Authority	Art. 11
Objectives	New
Process description	47-53
	<u>Annex 12: Deletion of a property from the World Heritage List</u>
Criteria and benchmarks for deletion of a property from the World Heritage List	46 & New
[Note: see recommendation 7 in Section 4 of the Report below, legal counsel recommended]	

IV. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

A. PRINCIPLES, POLICY AND PRIORITIES GOVERNING INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE New

Principles New

System of cooperation and assistance
 Primary purpose of international assistance
 International assistance is supplementary to national efforts
 Priority of emergency assistance
 Definition of policy and priorities by the World Heritage Committee

Policy New

Strategic allocation of resources
 Large scale international assistance and major operations

Priorities 91, 113-115 & 126

B. RESOURCING

Co-ordination of resources from all sources of support New World Heritage Fund 113, 122-125

Procedures for Application
Annex 13: International Assistance [Note: including application forms, deadlines, priorities and criteria for granting international assistance]

Conditions

Deadlines	112
Eligibility for receipt of international assistance	121

C. PLANNING FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Work Plan New Proactive approach New State Party requests 94-111

D.. IMPLEMENTATION

Contractual arrangements 117, 118 & 120 Delegation of authority 119

E. EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP New

V. ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

A. ACTION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL TO PROMOTE A GREATER
AWARENESS OF THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN UNDER THE
WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION **137-138**

B. PRESENTATION AND TRANSMISSION TO FUTURE GENERATIONS

Use of the World Heritage Emblem and the name
symbol or depiction of World Heritage sites **127-128**
Annex 2 & 3

Production of plaques to commemorate the inclusion
of properties in the World Heritage List **New**

C. EDUCATION, TRAINING AND RESEARCH **New**

D. DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT **New**

ANNEXES

- Annex 1 Model Instrument for Ratification/Acceptance
- Annex 2 Authenticity and integrity in relation to the *World Heritage Convention*
[**Note:** *Nara Document on Authenticity* and text from La Vanoise on integrity]
- Annex 3 Typology of properties [**Note:** needs to be developed for both natural and cultural heritage, including the existing texts on towns, cultural landscapes (cross reference in text), as well as texts from Expert Meetings on canals, itineraries etc.].
- Annex 4 Standard format for submitting a Tentative List
- Annex 5 Format for nomination of cultural and natural heritage properties for inscription on the World Heritage List and standard requirements for the format of nominations (include reference to the Expert Meeting on digital and cartographic guidelines for World Heritage nominations and state of conservation reports, London 1999)
- Annex 6 Provisions for protection and management of nominated and inscribed properties (to include legal and/or contractual protection (legislation), traditional protection, management mechanisms, planning mechanisms, management and conservation planning, buffer zone, boundaries, management and conservation planning, accessibility to the public)
- Annex 7 Revised procedure and timetable for the processing of nominations (including clear indications of deadlines for referral, deferral, re-nomination and rejection (with graphics))
- Annex 8 Evaluation procedures of ICOMOS and IUCN
- Annex 9 Process of Periodic Reporting and Format and explanatory notes
- Annex 10 Process of reactive monitoring
- Annex 11 Inclusion on and treatment of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger
- Annex 12 Deletion of a property from the World Heritage List
- Annex 13 International Assistance (including application forms for the Organisation of Training Activities, Requests for Emergency Assistance, Request for Preparatory Assistance, Technical Assistance, Educational, information

and promotional activities and information on deadlines and priorities and criteria for granting international assistance)

BIBLIOGRAPHY/SELECT READING LIST

WWW/INTERNET RESOURCES

LIST OF ACRONYMS

INDEX

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO THE CONTENT OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

1. It is recommended that the new **Section I** of the *Operational Guidelines* will include some existing text but will also require new text and a complete revision indicated in the new outline presented above (see **Section 3** of this report).
2. It is furthermore recommended that Paragraph 6 of the existing *Operational Guidelines* on General Principles be edited and simplified
 - a) to review the statement on the balance between cultural and natural properties and to relate it more closely to the text on representativity which should be based on the resolution of the twelfth General Assembly on this subject, and
 - b) that section (vi) (on World Heritage in Danger listing) should be divided into three parts dealing with properties under threat, properties where the threat has been mitigated, and properties whose values have been lost.
3. The working group which discussed identification, evaluation, nomination and inscription (new **Section II** of the *Operational Guidelines*) prepared a new draft revised text on the basis of the text previously prepared by the Secretariat and submitted to the twenty-third sessions of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau in 1999 (see WHC-99/CONF.209/INF.12). It was decided that the new draft revised text, which still requires substantial further revision, be kept in reserve pending the decisions of the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau and the World Heritage Committee as to how to proceed with the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*.
4. On the basis of the discussions of the working group which discussed identification, evaluation, nomination and inscription (new **Section II** of the *Operational Guidelines*), it was furthermore recommended that,
 - a) a concise text on the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List be included in the *Operational Guidelines*,
 - b) tentative lists be obligatory for both natural and cultural properties (this recommendation is similar to that made by the Working Group on Representativity of the World Heritage List),
 - c) tentative lists be harmonized (this recommendation is similar to that made by the Working Group on Representativity of the World Heritage List),
 - d) the cultural and natural criteria be merged as proposed by the Amsterdam meeting and discussed at subsequent Bureau and Committee meetings¹,

¹ Following the Amsterdam meeting it was proposed that the new criterion (viii) would include reference to "human interaction with the environment". IUCN is strong in its conviction that that

- e) in recognition of the importance of associative values, that the use of cultural heritage criterion (vi) should be discussed in light of the outcomes of the African meeting on authenticity and integrity (Zimbabwe 26 to 31 May 2000),
 - f) following an in-depth debate on the nomination process, that clarity is needed concerning:
 - referral (including deadlines)
 - deferral (to use same procedures and deadlines as for new nominations)
 - rejection
 - re-nominations
 - strict application of procedures and deadlines by the Secretariat
 - clear statements about transboundary, joint nominations, serial and phased nominations as well as extensions;
 - g) a possible restriction of numbers of nominations presented to the World Heritage Committee each year be applied (this recommendation is similar to that made by the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List).
5. The working group which discussed identification, evaluation, nomination and inscription (new **Section II** of the *Operational Guidelines*), reviewed the proposal made to the twenty-third session of the Bureau (July 1999) to change paragraph 65 of the *Operational Guidelines*. This proposal was that the ICOMOS and IUCN evaluations be provided to all States Parties concerned in advance of the Bureau meeting. The need for information to be provided to all States Parties was recognized. The working group recommended that the current text be retained, while the plenary considered that this suggestion should be further reviewed by the twenty-fourth sessions of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau.
6. Following the discussions of the working group which reviewed management, monitoring, reporting, in-Danger listing and deletion (the new **Section III** of the *Operational Guidelines*), it was recommended that,
- a) A section on management of World Heritage properties be included in the *Operational Guidelines*. This recommendation was made in recognition of the fact that management of properties is as important as inscription and in order to maintain the integrity of the List over time. It was also noted that the management of World Heritage properties requires extra skills due to the higher level of accountability and that site managers will require specific information to ensure that World Heritage values are preserved.
 - b) A statement of specific World Heritage values of a property should be a key element of a nomination dossier. This statement as written by the States Parties and as amended by the Committee on the advice of the

reference should be removed from draft criterion (viii) as IUCN is concerned at the confusion which would be created in bringing the human element specifically into this draft criterion when this seems far more appropriate to the criteria relevant to cultural landscapes - draft criteria (iii), (iv) or (v).

Advisory Bodies is the core statement on which the properties should be managed to protect its World Heritage values. It was also recognized that State Parties also may wish to protect other values. This statement of values will become the reference point for all subsequent management of the property (a revision and clarification of paragraph 63 of the *Operational Guidelines* will be needed).

- c) Management must be focused on the protection of the outstanding universal natural and cultural values as defined in the statement of values described in point 5 b) above. These values must be the focus of nomination, assessment, inscription, management, and be the reference point for a cycle of on-site monitoring, periodic reporting, and potential reactive monitoring, in danger listing, and deletion.
 - d) The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies should put a proposal to the Committee to prepare a set of short, well illustrated, easy to use guides to management of World Heritage properties.
 - e) In the Global and Regional Training Strategies and training activities under the World Heritage Convention, attention should be paid to training that focuses on post inscription processes and activities including management and periodic reporting.
 - f) The criteria for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be consistent with the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List and with the Statement of Values.
 - g) As to reactive monitoring, the next revision of the *Operational Guidelines* should reflect the need for the relevant section of the working documents on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties to be sent to the States Party concerned at the same time as this document is distributed to the members of the Bureau and the Committee (revision of Paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines*).
7. Discussions of the working group which reviewed management, monitoring, reporting, in-Danger listing and deletion (the new **Section III** of the *Operational Guidelines*) recommended that legal advice should be sought on several legal questions which need to be resolved in order to facilitate the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (existing sections I.E and III.C) with a degree of confidence. These include:

a) In-Danger listing,

- Is there authority under the *Convention* to include a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger without the consent of the State Party?
- Must the request for assistance referred to in the *Convention* and then elaborated in Paragraph 80 (iv) of the *Operational Guidelines* come from the State Party affected?
- Should Paragraph 89 of the *Operational Guidelines* be constructed to imply requirement for State Party “consent”? The language used in Paragraphs 86, 87, 88, 90 and 93 should also be considered in making this decision as it may be useful in indicating the intent of the drafters at the time.
- Depending on the answer from counsel the policy question may still exist: Is it desirable to require State Party consent for inclusion of properties of the List of World Heritage in Danger? If so then the *Operational Guidelines* must reflect that.

b) Deletion

- Is there authority under the *Convention* to delete a property from the World Heritage List?
 - If so, who has that authority? (Bureau or Committee?)
 - Must there be State Party consent?
 - Does the property have to first be on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a prerequisite for deletion?
8. The working group which reviewed the text relating to International Assistance in the *Operational Guidelines* proposed a new draft revised text for **Section III** after first having analysed the information on International Assistance presented in the existing *Operational Guidelines* (see **Annex VI**). With the agreement of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee it was decided that this text be immediately transmitted to C3E who were to present a progress report on their evaluation of International Assistance at UNESCO Headquarters on Friday 14 April 2000. The new draft revised text for Section III submitted to C3E is included as **Annex VII** of this report.
 9. It is recommended that the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies should prepare and submit to the Bureau, a consolidated summary of all documents that require production in order to supplement the *Operational Guidelines* (annexes, forms, training needs analysis and strategy, guides to management, etc.)

5. ANNEXES

ANNEX I	List of Participants
ANNEX II	Address by Alan Howarth, C.B.E., MP Minister for the Arts
ANNEX III	Commentaires préliminaires par M. Abdelaziz Touri, Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial
ANNEX IV	Opening remarks by Mounir Bouchenaki, Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre
ANNEX V	Agenda
ANNEX VI	Analysis of information on International Assistance presented in the existing <i>Operational Guidelines</i>
ANNEX VII	Proposed new text on International Assistance for the revised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>

List of Participants

AFRICA

Mr Dawson MUNJERI
Executive Director
The National Museums and Monuments
P.O Box CY 1485
Causeway, HARARE
Zimbabwe
Tel: 263 4 77 4208
Fax: 263 4 753 085
E-mail: natmus@utande.co.zw

Ms Esther J.C. KERARIO
National Environment Management Council
(NEMC)
P.O. Box 63154
DAR-ES-SALAAM
United Republic of Tanzania
Tel/Fax : 00 255 51 121334 (Office)
E-mail: ekerario@yahoo.com
magnus@simbanet.net

ARAB STATES

M. Abdelaziz TOURI
Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial
Directeur
Direction du Patrimoine culturel
Ministère des Affaires Culturelles
17, rue Michlifén
Agdal
RABAT
Maroc
Tel: 212 7 67 13 81
Fax : 212 7 67 13 97

Mr Ahmed FAHMY
UNESCO Cairo Office
8 Abdel Rahman Fahmy Street
Garden City
CAIRO 11511
Egypt
Fax: 00 20 2 3545 296
E-mail: uhcai@unesco.org

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Mr Kevin KEEFFE
Assistant Secretary
World Heritage and Wilderness
Environment Australia
Department of the Environment and Heritage
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Tel: 61 2 6274 1111
Fax: 61 2 6274 1123
E-mail: Kevin.Keeffe@ea.gov.au

Dr. Nobuko INABA
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties
Architecture Division
Cultural Properties Protection Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunka -cho)
3-2-2, Kasumigasiki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100-0013
Japan
Tel: 81-3-3581-4012
Fax: 81-3-3591-0278
E-mail: ninaba@bunka.go.jp

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Dr Christina CAMERON
Director General
National Historic Sites
Parks Canada
Department of Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy Street
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5
Canada
Tel: 1 819 994 18 08
Fax: 1 819 953 97 45
E-mail: Christina_Cameron@pch.gc.ca

Mme Catherine CARO
Administrateur civile - Adjointe au Sous-
Directeur des Sites et des Paysages - Ministère
de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de
l'Environnement
20, rue de Ségur
75302 PARIS Cedex 07
France
Tel: 01 42 19 19 35 / 01 42 19 19 02
Fax: 01 42 19 19 77
E-mail: catherine.caro@environnement.gouv.fr

H.E. Janos Jelen
 Ambassador
 Department of Culture, Science and
 Information
 Ministry for Foreign Affairs
 1027 Budapest
 Nagy Imre ter 4
 Hungary
 Phone: 00 361 458 3407/1173
 Fax: 00 361 458 1535
 E-mail: JJelen@kum.hu

Ms Karen T. KOVACS
 Counsellor and Special Assistant to the
 Assistant Secretary for Fish and
 Wildlife and Parks
 US Department of the Interior
 1849 C Street, N.W.
 Washington, DC 20240
 United States of America
 Tel. 1 202 208 4678
 Fax: 1 202 208 46 84
 E-mail : Karen_Kovacs@ios.doi.gov

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Thomas HASSALL
 42 Rewley Road
 OXFORD OX1 2RQ
 United Kingdom
 Tel: 44 1865 205 266
 Fax: 44 1865 205 267
 E-mail: tom@hassalls.free-online.co.uk

Mr Nigel PITTMAN
 Department. for Culture, Media and Sport
 2-4 Cocurpur St.
 LONDON SW1Y 5DH
 United Kingdom
 Tel: 44 171 211 6901
 Fax: 44 20 7211 6962
 E-mail: nigel.pittman@culture.gov.uk

Dr Christopher YOUNG
 Head of World Heritage and International
 Policy
 English Heritage, 23 Savile Row
 LONDON W1X 1AB
 England
 United Kingdom
 Tel: 44 171 973 3000
 Fax: 44 171 973 3249
 E-mail: chris.young@english-heritage.org.uk
christophyoung@email.msn.com

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN

Mr José Pedro DE OLIVEIRA COSTA
 Secretary of State for Biodiversity and Forests
 Ministry of the Environment
 Rue Flavio Queiros Moraes 82
 SAO PAULO 01249-030
 BRASILIA
 Brazil
 Tel: 55-61-317-1115
 Fax: 55-61-323 7936
 E-mail: cjuaj001@mma.gov.br

Mr Elias 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
 Peru
 Tel: 263 4 75 28 76/ 77 42 08
 Fax: 263 4 75 30 85
 E-mail: e.mujica@cgiar.org

ADVISORY BODIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR MONUMENTS AND SITES (ICOMOS)/CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS)

Dr Henry CLEERE
 Coordinateur du patrimoine mondial
 ICOMOS
 49-51 rue de la Fédération
 75015 PARIS
 France
 Tel: 33 1 45 67 67 70
 Fax: 33 1 45 66 06 22
 E-mail: cleere@icomos.org

Mr Giora SOLAR
 4 Paran Street
 Apartment 311
 JERUSALEM 97802
 Israel
 Phone/Fax: 972 2 581 0779
 E-mail: giorasolar@hotmail.com

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE
STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND
THE RESTORATION OF CULTURAL
PROPERTY (ICCROM) / CENTRE
INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA
CONSERVATION ET LA
RESTAURATION DES BIENS
CULTURELS (ICCROM)**

Mr Joe KING
ICCROM
Via di San Michele, 13
00153 ROME
Italy
Tel: 39 06 58 553 313
Fax: 39 06 58 55 33 49
E-mail: jk@iccrom.org

Mr Herb STOVEL
Coordinator
World Heritage Convention
ICCROM
Via di San Michele, 13
00153 ROME
Italy
Tel: 39 06 58553 316
Fax: 39 06 58 55 33 49
E-mail: hs@iccrom.org

**WORLD CONSERVATION UNION
(IUCN)/UNION MONDIALE POUR LA
NATURE (IUCN)**

Mr David SHEPPARD
Protected Areas
IUCN
Rue Mauverney 28
CH-1196 GLAND
Switzerland
Tel : 41 22 999 0001
Fax : 41 22 999 0015
E-mail : das@hq.iucn.org

**SECRETARIAT OF THE RAMSAR
CONVENTION ON WETLANDS**

Mr Dwight PECK
Executive Assistant for Communications
The Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran,
1971)
Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland,
Switzerland
Fax: +41 22 999 0169
E-mail: peck@ramsar.org

UNITED KINGDOM SECRETARIAT

Ms Annabel BENOIT
Assistant to the Head of World Heritage and
International Policy
English Heritage
23 Savile Row
LONDON W1X 1AB
England
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 171 973 3000
Fax: 44 171 973 3249
E-mail: annabel.benoit@english-heritage.org.uk

UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE

M. Mounir Bouchenaki
The Director
UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 PARIS 07 SP
France
Telephone: +33 1 45 68 15 71
Facsimile: +33 1 45 68 55 70
E-mail: m.bouchenaki@unesco.org

Ms Mechtild ROSSLER
Programme Specialist
UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 PARIS 07 SP
France
Telephone: +33 1 45 68 18 91
Facsimile: +33 1 45 68 55 70
E-mail: m.rossler@unesco.org

Ms Sarah TITCHEN
UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 PARIS 07 SP
France
Telephone: +33 1 45 68 14 04
Facsimile: +33 1 45 68 55 70
E-mail: s.titchen@unesco.org

Mr Herman VAN HOOFF
UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 PARIS 07 SP
France
Telephone: +33 1 45 68 18 69
Facsimile: +33 1 45 68 55 70
E-mail: h.van-hooff@unesco.org

ADDRESS BY ALAN HOWARTH, C.B.E., MP MINISTER FOR THE ARTS**Opening Comments**

I am very sorry that I cannot be with you today. The opportunity to visit a wonderful city such as Canterbury is one to relish, but unfortunately pressing business in London this week has had to take precedence.

In 1988, Canterbury Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's church comprised one of the UK's original group of World Heritage Site nominations. For three hundred years, Canterbury has been the seat of the spiritual leader of the Church of England. The World Heritage Site comprises the church of St Martin's, which preserves evidence of late Roman and Saxon construction, and is the building in which St Augustine and his followers first worshipped. The ruins of the Abbey of St Augustine, which reminds us of the evangelising role of the saint, includes the remains of the monastery where his monks lived and worshipped, and where Kentish Kings and early Archbishops were buried. And then there is the superb and World famous Christ Church Cathedral, with its breathtaking mixture of Romanesque and Gothic perpendicular styles, where Archbishop Thomas Becket was assassinated in 1170. The three components of the World Heritage Site together provide a visual record of the introduction of post - Roman Christianity to Britain.

For those of you paying your first visit to Canterbury, and indeed those of you who are familiar with the City, I am sure that once you can get away from your deliberations over the *Operational Guidelines*, you will find much to enjoy and inspire you in this wonderful City. And, if at any time you feel the need for some spiritual guidance or intervention in your deliberations, then - like pilgrims of old - perhaps you could not have come to a better place for it !

Support for UNESCO

The establishment of the Convention in 1972, was a prime illustration of UNESCO's creative thinking. UNESCO was ahead of its time in recognising the need to treat world heritage holistically, to cherish and protect it by engendering a universal sense of responsibility for the best, the most significant, places on earth. It was an ambitious programme in 1972, and its value and vision remain undiminished. The UK Government fully supports the ideals embodied in the Convention and will continue to do its best to take those ideals forward into the new Millennium.

Despite the UK's withdrawal from UNESCO in 1985, I am glad to say that we remained a party to the Convention, and proceeded with nominations in the late 1980s, as well as sponsoring the UK branch of ICOMOS to produce a very highly acclaimed set of monitoring reports on the condition of the World Heritage Sites in England.

As you know, we have been extremely active in our support for the Convention since we rejoined UNESCO, so quickly after coming into office in May 1997. We hit the ground running, to coin a phrase, and one of our first steps was to launch a review of our Tentative List of future nominations: over 500 bodies and individuals took part in a public consultation, leading to the publication in April last year of a list of 25 sites for possible

nomination over the next 5-10 years. The list took full account of UNESCO's wishes for a more representative World Heritage List, which already features many historic towns and cathedrals in Western Europe.

Accordingly, we focussed on the UK's particular contribution to world culture. The new Tentative List therefore comprises sites representing our industrial heritage - such as the Cornish Mining Industry and Arkwright's Mill at Cromford; our global influence - such as Chatham Dockyard and the Liverpool Waterfront; and sites representing the UK's unique natural heritage - such as the Dorset and East Devon Coast, the Cairngorm Mountains in Scotland, and the New Forest.

I am pleased to say that the new Tentative List, and the thoroughness with which it has been produced, have attracted some very kind comments from UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, and that we are getting requests for copies from other countries who are now conducting reviews of their Tentative Lists.

But inscribing sites on the World Heritage List is only the end of the beginning. We must continue by ensuring that they are cared for in a way that is worthy of their international significance and value. Indeed, UNESCO now requires that Management Plans should be drawn up for each site, to the very highest standards, in advance of nomination. Again, I am pleased to say that the Plan for Hadrian's Wall was highly commended as a model of its kind by the World Heritage Committee. Very impressive Plans have been completed for Avebury and Maritime Greenwich, and Plans are in progress for many other Sites, including Stonehenge, Greenwich, Canterbury, Durham, Fountains Abbey and Ironbridge Gorge. A key feature of these Plans is sustainability: the need to balance the impacts on sites arising from pressures such as tourism, with the need to ensure that the character and fabric of the Sites themselves are not eroded. I know this is an issue which will be of concern to you all.

Very importantly, the World Heritage Convention provides for help to be given to sites that are in danger, typically through environmental disaster, war, or where the host Government simply does not have the money or know-how. Examples of assistance in recent years from the World Heritage Centre include the archaeological site at Butrint in Albania, which was so badly damaged in the civil war, Bahla Fort in Oman and the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone in Peru. In this and other respects the Convention must surely represent one of the real international success stories of recent years. The UK has much expertise in heritage management and is now ready and eager to play a fuller international role in this area.

World Heritage Committee

We were naturally disappointed not to be elected to the World Heritage Committee at the recent elections. However, we felt it right to stand down in the third round of voting in favour of Egypt, to ensure a better balanced representation of countries from each continent on the Committee. We are committed to the Convention and will continue to send a full strength team, as Observers, to future meetings of the Committee and related fora. I will also take advantage of this opportunity to confirm that the UK will be a candidate again at the next elections, in 2001.

Importance of this Conference

Your Conference is of course one of several parallel activities arising out of the World Heritage Committee's recent concerns about the future directions of the Convention. Important work is in hand by Working Groups looking at representativity of the World Heritage Committee, and the need for a better balanced World Heritage List, and we are pleased to play whatever part we can in supporting these initiatives.

It is a privilege for the UK to be able to host this Conference, which hopefully will result in a new set of Guidelines which everyone can follow: this of course is especially important for those countries who are new to the Convention and who are keen to see their sites achieve formal international recognition. I am sure that your work this week will enable them, and indeed some much older hands, to find the process that bit easier. I am all in favour of making guidance and instructions as user friendly as possible. This does not mean that we should risk losing any essential requirements in the process - we are after all talking about protecting the World's most important sites - but there is undoubtedly much scope for making the Guidelines a much easier document to follow.

Concluding comments

To conclude, thank you all for taking time out from your busy schedules, and in some cases to travel very long distances, to support this Conference, and I am sure you will join me in thanking Christ Church College for hosting this event. I am looking forward to seeing a full report on the outcome.

**Commentaires préliminaires par M. Abdelaziz Touri
Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial**

Au nom du Comité du patrimoine mondial, je voudrais remercier les autorités du Royaume-Uni, en particulier l'Honorable Alan Howarth, Ministre de la Culture, et M. Nigel Pittman (du Département de la Culture, des Médias et des Sports du Royaume-Uni), d'accueillir cette importante réunion d'experts. En tant que Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial, je voudrais exprimer ma sincère reconnaissance pour les immenses efforts de votre Gouvernement et d'English Heritage. Je remercie également tous les participants d'avoir fait un long voyage jusqu'à Cantorbéry pour seconder nos efforts afin de renforcer la mise en œuvre de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*.

Cette réunion marquera une étape importante pour l'avenir de la mise en œuvre de cet important instrument international de conservation. En décembre 1999, le Comité du patrimoine mondial a décidé qu'il fallait organiser cette réunion internationale d'experts du patrimoine culturel et naturel pour faire une proposition, dans l'optique d'une révision d'ensemble des *Orientations*. Il a spécifiquement demandé que l'on traite des objectifs suivants :

- (1) identifier et définir le public à qui s'adressent les *Orientations*,
- (2) étudier les projets de révision antérieurs des *Orientations*,
- (3) identifier les lacunes, les répétitions et les incohérences des *Orientations*,
- (4) d'après les points (1) et (3) précités, recommander une structure, un contenu et un format nouveaux pour les *Orientations*,
- (5) formuler des recommandations sur la future présentation des *Orientations* pour les rendre plus facilement consultables,
- (6) suggérer tout travail supplémentaire qui s'impose (avec calendrier et répartition des tâches) ; et
- (7) préparer un rapport contenant des recommandations spécifiques pour examen à la vingt-quatrième session du Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial en l'an 2000.

Les *Orientations* devant guider la mise en œuvre de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* ont été rédigées en 1978 pour informer les Etats parties à la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* des principes qui doivent guider le travail des 21 membres du Comité intergouvernemental du patrimoine mondial. Les *Orientations* donnent aussi des indications sur le suivi et d'autres questions, essentiellement de procédure, liées à la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*. Les *Orientations* ont été révisées à maintes reprises au cours de ces dernières années et requièrent, de l'avis général, des remaniements substantiels et une révision approfondie.

Les *Orientations* constituent non seulement l'instrument de travail journalier du Secrétariat de la Convention, des organismes consultatifs et des membres du Comité et du Bureau, mais elles sont également utilisées par les responsables gouvernementaux et les gestionnaires de sites dans le monde entier.

Plus de vingt-cinq ans après son adoption par la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO, la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* de 1972 reste le seul instrument juridique international qui vise à protéger le patrimoine culturel aussi bien que naturel d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. C'est d'ailleurs ce que rappelle l'ensemble des définitions de la *Convention* en matière de patrimoine culturel et naturel. Par ailleurs, la notion de patrimoine est fondée sur le principe de "valeur universelle exceptionnelle". La *Convention* vise à assurer l'identification, la protection, la conservation, la mise

en valeur et la transmission aux générations futures d'une liste sélectionnée de lieux culturels et naturels qui ont été identifiés et évalués comme les plus exceptionnels au monde.

Depuis 1992, le Comité a adopté de nouvelles approches innovantes, tout en révisant les Orientations, en particulier avec

- l'introduction de la notion de paysages culturels
- l'adoption de la Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative et équilibrée
- l'intégration de la soumission de rapports périodiques, suite à la Résolution de l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties
- l'inclusion de nouveaux concepts de gestion (en particulier les régimes de gestion traditionnelle)
- et enfin, l'assistance aux Etats parties pour les activités éducatives.

Le Comité est confronté à de nouveaux défis : l'évolution de la notion de patrimoine, les demandes croissantes pour répondre aux problèmes de conservation par une bonne gestion et un développement durable, et la fixation de priorités et de stratégies pour l'assistance internationale.

Les critères pour le patrimoine naturel et culturel figurent dans les *Orientations* qui ont été au moins dix fois révisées et mises à jour depuis vingt ans. En reconnaissant l'évolution de la compréhension et de la perception du patrimoine mondial et de la "valeur universelle exceptionnelle" au cours du temps, le Comité a modifié à plusieurs reprises la formulation des critères de sélection. Depuis les premières réunions du Comité, la taille et la composition de la Liste du patrimoine mondial ont fait l'objet de sérieux débats. Tout récemment, une réunion d'experts s'est tenue à Amsterdam, aux Pays-Bas, en mars 1998, marquant une étape importante de l'histoire de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Les experts réunis à Amsterdam ont souligné que la *Convention* devait être considérée comme un document holistique associant le patrimoine culturel et naturel. Ils ont donc proposé un ensemble unifié de critères pour l'inclusion de biens naturels et culturels sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Les experts ont également fermement demandé que la mise en œuvre de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* assure la reconnaissance et la protection des interactions exceptionnelle entre les hommes et leur environnement naturel. De plus, les experts ont recommandé un renforcement de la gestion, du suivi et de la participation locale, afin d'assurer la crédibilité de la *Convention*.

Il est important de reconnaître toute l'importance qu'a pris le débat sur la signification et l'application des notions de "valeur universelle exceptionnelle", des "conditions d'intégrité" et du "test de l'authenticité" par rapport à la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*. Ces questions ont été débattues à presque toutes les sessions du Comité du patrimoine mondial et du Bureau.

Aujourd'hui, après presque trois décennies de sessions du Comité du patrimoine mondial, nous sommes confrontés à de multiples questions que posent les déséquilibres de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Il faut les analyser soigneusement pour éviter des conclusions hâtives. Le Comité du patrimoine mondial a tenu compte de nombreuses suggestions et réflexions de réunions d'experts. Ainsi, suite à une réunion d'experts sur les paysages culturels d'Afrique, une réunion sur l'intégrité et l'authenticité en milieu africain va se tenir au Zimbabwe en mai 2000. Cette réunion va se pencher sur le contenu de ces concepts pour la région africaine.

Le Comité a également adopté une approche dynamique et a créé lors de sa vingt-troisième session un Groupe d'étude sur la mise en œuvre de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*, présidé par Christina Cameron, du Canada.

En même temps, le Comité a suivi les suggestions et les conclusions des débats de la douzième Assemblée générale des Etats parties d'octobre 1999 sur :

- (a) "Les moyens d'assurer une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative", et
- (b) "La représentation équitable au sein du Comité".

Deux groupes de travail sur ces questions ont été créés en janvier 2000. Tout comme la présente réunion d'experts, ils soumettront leurs rapports à la vingt-quatrième session du Bureau en juin 2000.

Je suis heureux de noter que des représentants des trois groupes sont parmi nous, ici à Cantorbéry, pour assurer la liaison entre le travail de ces trois importants groupes et la présente réunion d'experts.

Comme vous le savez, la Liste du patrimoine mondial s'allonge de plus en plus vite et diverses suggestions sont faites pour limiter sa taille et le nombre de biens qu'un Etat partie peut proposer à l'inscription. D'autre part, il est frappant de constater que certains types de patrimoine de "valeur universelle exceptionnelle" et certaines régions et expressions de la diversité culturelle et naturelle du monde restent toujours absents de la Liste. Les *Orientations* peuvent être un bon instrument pour appliquer des mesures qui permettent de réduire ces déséquilibres.

Comme je l'ai déjà mentionné, un grand progrès a été fait ces dernières années avec l'adoption de la Stratégie globale, l'inclusion de la notion de paysage culturel et d'autres aspects innovants de la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*, comme la reconnaissance de régimes de gestion traditionnelle, acceptables pour les biens naturels aussi bien que culturels.

Il est cependant essentiel d'étudier attentivement toutes les recommandations pour rendre la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* plus cohérente et pour fournir des conseils et des propositions spécifiques au Comité du patrimoine mondial à cet égard.

En conclusion, je voudrais de nouveau souligner le grand défi que doit relever le Comité pour rendre les *Orientations* plus pratiques à utiliser et plus cohérentes.

C'est une immense tâche qui nous attend, mais, en tant que Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial, je suis sûr que nous allons progresser avec votre aide et fournir une vision globale qui permettra une révision des *Orientations*. Je voudrais vous assurer que le Comité du patrimoine mondial attend avec impatience vos suggestions et que vos propositions seront étudiées attentivement à la prochaine session du Bureau, ainsi qu'à la session du Comité en Australie en décembre 2000.

Je voudrais vous remercier personnellement de votre très grand soutien pour universaliser encore davantage la mise en œuvre de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*.

**Opening remarks by Mounir Bouchenaki, Director,
UNESCO World Heritage Centre**

Mr Chairman,
Principal,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Dear Colleagues,

On behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO and former Chair of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Koichiro Matsuura, I would like to thank the Government of the United Kingdom and Minister Alan Howarth, for their generous hospitality and vision in hosting this important Expert Meeting.

This is an historic gathering. It is the first Expert Meeting on World Heritage to be held in this country since its ratification of the *World Heritage Convention* in 1984 and since rejoining UNESCO in 1998. My particular thanks go to Nigel Pittman and to Christopher Young who have watched over the planning of this meeting from its original conception last July at the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in Paris. My thanks also to our local hosts here at Christ Church College and to Principal Michael Wright.

It is a great honour for us to have with us the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, my friend Mr Abdelaziz Touri.

Being here near the magnificent cathedral city of Canterbury one's mind inevitably turns to history and to thinking about "origins". It is here in Canterbury that we see the physical remains of some of the earliest origins of the Church of England. So, let us reflect on the origins of the subject of discussion at this Expert Meeting, the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

The first version of the *Operational Guidelines* were adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its very first session in Paris in June 1977 following the adoption of the *World Heritage Convention* by the UNESCO General Conference some five years earlier. In 1977 the Committee recognised that the *Operational Guidelines* would need "adjusting or expanding to reflect later decisions of the Committee". Furthermore the Committee described the *Guidelines* as being "of crucial importance, in that they provide a clear and comprehensive statement of the principles which are to guide the Committee in its future work."

Since that moment in time in 1977, a number of key factors have changed, indeed changed dramatically. Firstly, the *Convention* has become extraordinarily popular and universal with 158 States Parties having now joined together in a spirit of international co-operation for the protection of outstanding cultural and natural properties.

Secondly, in 1977 the World Heritage Committee was yet to inscribe a single property on the World Heritage List. In contrast we now have a total of 630 World Heritage properties inscribed on the List. These properties are located in an incredible variety of geo-cultural locations in a total of 118 different countries. The outstanding values of these properties are also diverse – with remarkable archaeological sites, areas of high biodiversity and magnificent architecture and landscapes included on the List. The conservation challenges facing these properties are daunting with a total of 27

properties now included on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In summary, the precious resource base which we are all trying to conserve has grown substantially and is increasingly threatened.

AS Mr Michel Parent was stating as former President of ICOMOS and member of the Committee which drafted the *World Heritage Convention*, the establishment of the World Heritage List is not an academic exercise. It is an international undertaking of a juridicial, technical and practical nature designed to mobilize active solidarity for the safeguard of the cultural and natural heritage.

This leads me to the third major difference between 1977 and now. It is the number of partners involved in the conservation of World Heritage properties – not only do we have the commitment of the 158 States Parties and the three Advisory Bodies of the World Heritage Committee (ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN) but we also have a multitude of other concerned actors, including other intergovernmental and non-governmental partners and an increasing interest and involvement in conservation by the general public. A measure of this interest can be seen in the almost 2 million "hits" we receive on the World Heritage Centre web site every month.

The fourth defining characteristic of our time, which is so different from 1977, is of course computer technology. Obviously this technology has already brought tremendous advances in our abilities to conserve our environment, through, for example advances in computerised remote sensing, GIS and photogrammetry techniques. But even more simply, computers now give us the opportunity to organise and present information in constructive and imaginative ways to huge and diverse audiences.

It is in this context that this Expert Meeting will begin its work to prepare a thorough revision to the *Operational Guidelines*. We need guidelines for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* that can address the needs of the signatories of the *Convention*, the extraordinary diversity of sites and the conservation challenges that they present. Furthermore the *Guidelines* need to be useful to a wide range of users – not only the World Heritage Committee but to our other partners working to protect World Heritage properties.

Over the last twenty-two years, as the need has arisen, new sections have been added to the *Guidelines*. For example, in the 1980s we saw long texts on “groups of buildings” added and in 1992 new text on “cultural landscapes” were included. At the same time other adjustments of the *Guidelines* were made, for example in 1998 greater emphasis on education was included in the section on International Assistance. The overall result is that the *Guidelines* are long, at times internally inconsistent, and lacking in clarity.

To achieve revision, I think that simplicity is the key. Clear instructions, presented in a logical fashion, are required. It is for this reason that I think this meeting hosted by the United Kingdom is likely to succeed, as this country has a long and distinguished record in the development of pragmatic approaches to conservation management and planning. As I mentioned earlier, the other thing that you have on your side is new technology and the ability to, therefore, structure, format and present the principles and procedures for conservation in a new, multi-dimensional form. The ability to cross-reference and to provide graphic examples is now easier to achieve using new computer applications.

I feel confident that with the diverse and exceptional expertise of this Expert Group, and with the assistance of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee, you will make a significant

contribution to the challenging task of revising the *Operational Guidelines*. You will be contributing to a much larger agenda of strategic reflection currently being undertaken by a Task Force and Working Groups of the World Heritage Committee and by an external review of the system of International Assistance provided from the World Heritage Fund and of the World Heritage Centre's Information Management System. It is my hope that in combination, your work and the work of these other groups will provide a new logical framework and up- to-date content for the *Operational Guidelines* for presentation to the next session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June. In turn the Bureau will make recommendations to the Committee that will meet in December.

I would like to close by thanking you all for your demonstrated commitment to the work of the *World Heritage Convention* and by wishing you all the best with your deliberations.

Thanks to all who contributed to this important event and in particular my colleagues in the World Heritage Centre.

Thank you.

AGENDA

DAY 1 (Monday 10 April 2000)

	Delegates arrive in Canterbury late afternoon/evening
15.00 – 18.00	Tea & coffee available in main reception of Canterbury Christ Church University College
19.00 – 21.00	Dinner

DAY 2 (Tuesday 11 April 2000)

08.00	Breakfast
09.00	Welcome speech by the Principal of Canterbury Christ Church University College, Professor Michael Wright
09.05	Opening of Expert Meeting by Mr Nigel Pittman (Department of Culture, Media and Sport, UK)
09.15	Welcoming speech by the Honourable Alan Howarth, Ministry for Culture, delivered by N. Pittman
09.20	Response by Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Director of the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO
09.35	Introductory comments by Mr Abdelaziz Touri, President, World Heritage Committee
09.50	Adoption of Provisional Agenda
10.00	Review of the effectiveness of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> from the points of view of State Party, Site Manager and Advisory Bodies
11.15	Coffee break
11.30	Plenary discussion of purpose of meeting, desired objectives and issues raised in pre-circulated papers and presentations
12.30	Lunch
14.00	Plenary discussion of target audience and purpose of <i>Operational Guidelines</i>
15.00	Coffee break
15.15	Working groups to review previous proposals for revision of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> and to identify gaps, duplications and inconsistencies and analyse options for each section of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> producing very clear recommendations for a new structure, content and format.
	The proposed themes of the Working groups are:
	Group 1: identification/evaluation/nomination/inscription
	Group 2: management /monitoring/reporting/in-Danger listing/deletion
	Group 3: International Assistance
17.30	End of formal business
18.30	Reception given by English Heritage at St Augustine's Abbey Museum
20.15	Dinner

DAY 3 (Wednesday 12 April 2000)

08.00	Breakfast
09.00	Working groups to continue discussion and produce recommendations
11.00	Coffee break
11.15	Working groups to continue discussion and finalise recommendations
12.30	Lunch
14.00	Plenary session
	Report back by each group (15 minutes) plus discussion of their conclusions
15.00	Coffee break
15.15	Plenary session
	Recommendations for the future presentation of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> to make them more user-friendly and suggestions for any necessary additional work (along with a timetable and allocation of responsibilities)
17.30	End of formal business
19.30	Formal Conference Dinner at St Augustine's Abbey, Old Dining Hall

DAY 4 (Thursday 13 April 2000)

08.00	Breakfast
09.00 – 12.30	Meeting of convenors of Working groups to produce final report and drafts for revised and reorganised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>
09.00 – 12.30	Remaining delegates to tour Canterbury World Heritage Site
	Visit to Cathedral and St Augustine's
12.30	Lunch
13.30 – 15.00	Remaining delegates to tour Canterbury World Heritage Site
	Visit to St Martin's
13.30 – 15.00	End of the Meeting of convenors of Working groups to produce final report and drafts for revised and reorganised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>
15.00 – 15.30	Coffee break
15.30 – 17.30	Final Plenary to discuss, agree and adopt final report
19.30	Dinner

DAY 5 (Friday 14 April 2000)

08.00	Breakfast
	Delegates depart in the morning

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION ON INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PRESENTED IN THE EXISTING OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

ANNEX VI

TYPE OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE, FORM NUMBER & PARAGRAPH NUMBERS IN THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES	BUDGET CEILING	DIR/WHC CAN APPROVE	CHAIR CAN APPROVE	BUREAU CAN APPROVE	COMMITTEE CAN APPROVE	DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION FOR EXAMINATION BY BUREAU AND COMMITTEE	ADVICE FROM ADVISORY BODIES REQUIRED BY OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES	REFERENCE TO DOCUMENT NUMBER	WORLD HERITAGE FUND DUES MUST BE PAID	REFERENCE MADE TO ARTICLES OF THE CONVENTION IN THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES	PRIORITIES DESCRIBED IN THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES
PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE WHC.99/9 (REV 11/02/99) PARAGRAPHS 94-95	30,000	NO	UP TO 20,000	UP TO 30,000		1 MAY 1 SEPTEMBER	NO MENTION	WHC/5	YES		PARAGRAPH 126 TENTATIVE LISTS & PREPARATION OF NOMINATIONS
EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE WHC.04/10/97 PARAGRAPHS 96-97	NONE	NO	UP TO 50,000	UP TO 75,000	MORE THAN 75,000	1 MAY 1 SEPTEMBER	116 "if deemed necessary by the Secretariat"	WHC/5	NO		
TRAINING ASSISTANCE WHC.04/10/97 PARAGRAPHS 98-102	NONE	NO	UP TO 20,000	UP TO 30,000	MORE THAN 30,000	1 MAY 1 SEPTEMBER	116 "if deemed necessary by the Secretariat" & Committee decision of 1996 re ICCROM as lead agency on training & that all cultural heritage training requests be reviewed by ICCROM	NO REFERENCE	NO		SUB-REGIONAL TRAINING
TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION WHC.04/10/97 PARAGRAPHS 103-110	NONE	NO	UP TO 20,000	UP TO 30,000	MORE THAN 30,000	1 MAY 1 SEPTEMBER	106 "The Secretariat can also ask for expert advice from the appropriate organization, 110 "after receiving the advice of ICCROM, ICOMOS or IUCN", 116 "if deemed necessary by the Secretariat", 117(b) "if deemed necessary by the Secretariat"	NO REFERENCE	YES	ARTICLE 22	PARAGRAPH 91 WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER
EDUCATION, INFORMATION & PROMOTION ASSISTANCE PARA. 111	10,000	UP TO 5,000	UP TO 10,000				NO MENTION	NO REFERENCE	YES	ARTICLES 17 & 27	

Proposed new text on International Assistance for the revised *Operational Guidelines*

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

I. General principles governing international assistance

A. Main principles

SYSTEM OF COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE

The purpose of international assistance under the *World Heritage Convention* is to provide the necessary resources for the protection of cultural and natural heritage when at the national level, because of the large scale of the task or insufficient means in the country where the property is located, adequate resources cannot be secured (Article 21(1) of the *Convention*).

The *World Heritage Convention* defines international assistance of the world cultural and natural heritage as “the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve and identify that heritage” (Article 7 of the *Convention*).

PRIMARY PURPOSE OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

The World Heritage Committee will consider requests from States Parties with respect to properties forming part of the cultural and/or natural heritage located in their territories and included or potentially suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List or the List of World Heritage in Danger (Articles 13.1, 19 and 20 of the *Convention*).

The Committee may support requests concerned with provision of professional expertise (studies, experts, training), equipment and financing (loans and grants) (Article 22 of the *Convention*).

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE IS SUPPLEMENTARY TO NATIONAL EFFORTS

International assistance will normally only be given to supplement national resources when and where these are insufficient (Preamble, Paragraph 8 of the *Convention*).

PRIORITY OF EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

“Requests based upon disasters or natural calamities should, by reasons of the urgent work which they may involve, be given immediate, priority consideration by the Committee” (Article 21(2) of the *Convention*).

DEFINITION OF POLICY AND PRIORITIES BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The Committee shall define a policy and priorities for international assistance (Article 13(4) of the *Convention*).

The General Assembly may define a policy.

B. Policy

STRATEGIC ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

The allocation of resources for international assistance by the Committee shall be reflected in its Strategic Plan to be drawn up by the Committee at least every six years.

LARGE SCALE INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE AND MAJOR OPERATIONS

Large scale international assistance and major operations should be undertaken in accordance with the World Heritage Committee’s Strategic Plan.

C. Priorities

Priorities shall be defined and updated regularly by the Committee and included as an annex to the *Operational Guidelines*. This process shall take place at least every two years and taking into consideration the results of the latest regional Periodic Reports by the World Heritage Committee.

[Until the priorities are established Paragraphs 91, 113-115 and 126 shall be used as the statement of priorities].

II. Resourcing

A. Distribution of resources from all sources of support

Distribution of resources from all sources of support for international assistance (including the World Heritage Fund and other sources, such as Funds in Trust) should be coordinated to ensure allocation in conformity with the provisions of the Strategic Plan and priorities of the Committee. Review of requests for funds

from all sources should normally be handled in a consistent manner, using common procedures and criteria.

All voluntary and obligatory contributions to the World Heritage Fund shall be distributed by the World Heritage Committee.

Donors of any other external contributions should be encouraged by the Committee and the Secretariat to coordinate their activities regarding the protection of World Heritage sites with the Committee and the Secretariat and inform the Committee of the results of such efforts.

B. World Heritage Fund

States Parties are encouraged to make contributions to the World Heritage Fund for the purpose of international assistance.

International assistance from the World Heritage Fund is likely to have a multiplier or catalytic effect as seed money for stimulating general interest in conservation, contributing to the advancement of scientific research and the training of specialized personnel.

III. Procedures for Application

A. Conditions

DEADLINES

The deadlines for application for international assistance will be determined by the Committee in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

[Deadlines shall be presented in an Annex, until these deadlines are reviewed Paragraph 112 shall be used.]

ELIGIBILITY FOR RECEIPT OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Only States Parties which are not in arrears of payment of their contributions to the World Heritage Fund for the preceding year are eligible to receive a grant of international assistance in the following calendar year, with the exception of emergency assistance.

B. Planning for international assistance

WORK PLAN

The Committee shall coordinate provision of international assistance through both proactive approaches and in response to State Party requests, within the framework of a Work Plan.

The Work Plan shall be designed by the Committee on a regular basis, but at least every two years, taking into consideration the results of the latest regional Periodic Reports.

Consideration of the implementation of the Work Plan will be a permanent item on the agenda of the Committee, and will include a list of property for which international assistance has been granted.

Budget ceilings and authority for approval for different types of assistance will be determined by the Committee and regularly reviewed according to the provisions and needs of its Work Plan.

All requests for international assistance shall be referred to the appropriate advisory body(ies) for professional review and evaluation.

PROACTIVE APPROACH

The Committee shall foster proactive approaches in planning further effective distribution of its resources for international assistance based on its Strategic Plan and Work Plan.

STATE PARTY REQUESTS

States Parties may initiate requests for regular and/or emergency international assistance [forms for application and criteria for assessment in annexes to be developed].

IV. Implementation

CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

When international assistance is granted to a State Party, an agreement will be concluded between the Committee and the State concerned (or its nominee), in conformity with UNESCO regulations for such agreements (see Annex).

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

The Committee may decide to delegate authority to the Chairperson or to a member of the Secretariat to sign such agreements on its behalf.

V. *Evaluation and follow-up*

A mechanism for tracking progress, evaluation and follow-up will be established to ensure the objectives of the Strategic Plan are fulfilled and updated.