

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.201/9  
15 April 1995  
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION  
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Nineteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

3-8 July 1995

Item 11 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the Operational  
Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage  
Convention

- A. Chapter I Section C: CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (DEFINITION OF AND CRITERIA FOR CULTURAL PROPERTIES)
- B. Chapter I Section F: GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS (ROLE OF THE ADVISORY BODIES IN THE EVALUATION OF NOMINATIONS)
- C. Chapter IV Section A: DIFFERENT FORMS OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND (DEADLINES FOR PRESENTATION OF REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BUREAU AND THE COMMITTEE)
- D. Chapter IV Section A: DIFFERENT FORMS OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND (AUTHORITY OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND THE BUREAU TO APPROVE REQUESTS)

A. Chapter I Section C: CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (DEFINITION OF AND CRITERIA FOR CULTURAL PROPERTIES)

A.1. BACKGROUND

Following the decisions of the World Heritage Committee in 1992 and 1993 to include cultural landscapes in the World Heritage List and in the context of the global strategy for a representative World Heritage List, two thematic study meetings were held in 1994:

- 'Heritage Canals' (Canada, 15-19 September 1994)
- 'Routes as a Part of our Cultural Heritage' (Spain, 24-25 November 1994).

In 1995, two **regional** thematic study meetings were held in the Asia-Pacific region:

- 'Regional Thematic Study Meeting on Asian Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes' (Philippines, 28 March to 4 April 1995)
- 'Identifying and Assessing World Heritage Cultural Landscapes (Associative Landscapes)' (Australia, 26 to 28 April 1995).

The detailed reports of these four meetings can be found in Information Document WHC-95/CONF.201/INF.4.

The expert meetings resulted in some specific recommendations to revise the Operational Guidelines, particularly the following aspects:

- the role of the local people in the nomination process (paragraph 14);
- criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List (paragraph 24 (a));
- explanatory notes on cultural landscapes.

Furthermore, it was pointed out at the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee that paragraph 24 (b) (ii) on legal protection and management contained some discrepancies.

In view of the above, the Bureau is requested to consider the following proposals for revision of the Operational Guidelines.

## A.2. PROPOSED REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

### A.2.1. The role of the local people in the nomination process

The Heritage Canals expert meeting recommended to change paragraph 14 of the Operational Guidelines as follows: delete sentence 1 since it contradicts sentence 2. Sentence 2 may be understood to supersede sentence 1 and to more accurately reflect the current public circumstances of nomination.

Following the recommendation of the expert meeting, the Secretariat proposes to revise paragraph 14 as follows:

*14. Participation of local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site, but should not prejudice future decision-making by the Committee.*

### A.2.2. Criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List

The Heritage Canals expert meeting recommended to change paragraph 24 (a) as follows:

24. (a) (i) (unchanged)
- (ii) add "**or technology**" after "landscape design", the paragraph to read as follows:
- exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town-planning and landscape design or technology; or*
- (iii) (unchanged)
- (iv) add "**or technological ...**" i.e. "**architectural or technological ensemble**", the paragraph to read as follows:
- be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; or*
- (v) (unchanged)
- (vi) (unchanged).

During the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, held in Thailand in December 1994, the Delegate of Lebanon mentioned several problems of syntax in the formulation of criterion b(ii) of paragraph 24 of the Guidelines. Thus, the following modifications are proposed:

24. (b) (ii): **proposed modifications:**
- (ii) have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes. The

existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level **and/or** a well-established traditional protection [and/or] **as well as of** adequate management mechanisms is therefore essential and, as is clearly indicated in the following paragraph, must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws **and/or of this traditional protection** [and/or] **as well as these** management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of cultural sites, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.

**New wording:**

(ii) have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level and/or a well-established traditional protection as well as of adequate management mechanisms is therefore essential and, as is clearly indicated in the following paragraph, must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws [and/or] of this traditional protection as well as of these management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of cultural sites, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.

**A.2.3. Explanatory paragraphs on cultural landscapes**

The Heritage Canals expert meeting recommended that the definition of a canal be included in the Operational Guidelines. The Secretariat recommends to insert a new paragraph 41 after paragraph 40, which would read as follows:

*A canal is a human-engineered waterway. It may be of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history or technology, either intrinsically or as an exceptional example representative of this category of cultural property. The canal may be a monumental work, the defining feature of a linear cultural landscape, or an integral component of a complex cultural landscape.*

The expert meeting on **Routes as a Part of our Cultural Heritage** recommended to include the notion of specific long linear cultural landscapes in the Operational Guidelines as a new paragraph after the existing paragraph 40, which would read as follows:

*A heritage route is composed of tangible elements of which the cultural significance comes from exchanges and a multi-dimensional dialogue across countries or regions, and that illustrate the interaction of movement, along the route, in space and time.*

**A.3. ACTION BY THE BUREAU**

The Bureau is requested to:

- take note of the results of the four expert meetings and to recommend to the Committee to consider them as future references in the evaluation and examination of nominations of properties falling in the categories of canals, heritage routes, rice culture and its terraced landscapes and associative landscapes;
- examine the revisions of the Operational Guidelines proposed in Section A.2. above and to formulate recommendations thereupon to the World Heritage Committee.

**B. Chapter I Section F: GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS (ROLE OF THE ADVISORY BODIES IN THE EVALUATION OF NOMINATIONS)****B.1. BACKGROUND**

Paragraph 45 of the Operational Guidelines describes the particular role of IUCN in the evaluation of nominations of natural properties for inscription on the World Heritage List, as well as four steps of the evaluation process. The Secretariat has redrafted this paragraph to replace it with a similar one that would describe the evaluation process of both cultural and natural nominations.

It is proposed to delete paragraphs 45 and 46, and to introduce a new paragraph under Chapter I Section F ('Guidelines for the evaluation and examination of nominations') before paragraph 59.

**B.2. PROPOSED REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

It is proposed to insert the following text before paragraph 59 under Chapter I Section F ('Guidelines for the evaluation and examination of nominations'):

"(...)

*xx. The evaluation of whether or not individual sites nominated by States Parties satisfy the criteria and the conditions of authenticity/integrity will be carried out by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) for cultural properties and by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) for natural properties. In the case of nominations of cultural properties in the category of 'cultural landscapes', as appropriate, the evaluation will be carried out in consultation with the World Conservation Union (IUCN). The evaluation will normally include:*

**Data assembly and internal review:**

*ICOMOS/IUCN reviews the nomination dossier, identifies which additional information is required and assembles data on the nominated and comparable properties. This may take the form of a standardized data sheet.*

**External review:**

*Expert advice is sought on the 'outstanding universal value' of the nominated property, with special reference to the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List (para. 24 (a) and para. 44 (a) respectively).*

**Field inspection:**

Expert missions are sent to evaluate the site and particularly to study the criteria relating to authenticity/integrity, protection, conservation and management (para 24. (b) and para. 44 (b) respectively).

**Panel review:**

Draft evaluations are prepared on the basis of the reports of the expert groups and subjected to a formal review by panels of experts.

**Reporting:**

ICOMOS/IUCN presents an evaluation report, which is an outcome of the four steps mentioned above, to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

ICOMOS/IUCN, taking into account the decisions of the Bureau and additional information that might have been received from the nominating State Party, presents a final evaluation report to the World Heritage Committee.

The report of the World Heritage Committee's session will include its decision, the criteria under which the nominated site has been inscribed, the justification of their application as well as any recommendation the Committee may wish to make on that occasion.

(...)."

**B.3. ACTION BY THE BUREAU**

The Bureau is requested to examine the revision of the Operational Guidelines proposed in Section B.2. above and to formulate recommendations thereupon to the World Heritage Committee.

**C. Chapter IV Section A: DIFFERENT FORMS OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND (DEADLINES FOR PRESENTATION OF REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BUREAU)****C.1. BACKGROUND**

Over the years, it has become practice that a great number of requests which are to be examined by the Bureau and the Committee, are submitted shortly before their sessions.

To facilitate the work of the Secretariat and the advisory bodies and to enable them to prepare the necessary documents well in advance of the sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, it is proposed to introduce strict deadlines for the submission of all requests for technical assistance, with the exception of requests for emergency assistance, at 1 May and 1 October respectively for examination at the following session of the Bureau. Following the stipulations in the Operational Guidelines, all large-scale requests (that is those exceeding US\$ 30,000) will then be submitted, with the Bureau's recommendation, to the following session of the Committee for decision-making.

It is proposed to delete paragraph 104, which only sets a deadline for large-scale technical cooperation requests, and to introduce the above deadlines in a new paragraph after paragraph 109.

### **C.2. PROPOSED REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

It is proposed to delete paragraph 104 and to insert after paragraph 109 the following:

"(...)

*xx All requests for international assistance which are to be examined by the Bureau, with the exception of requests for emergency assistance, should be submitted before 1 May and 1 October respectively for consideration by the following session of the Bureau. Large-scale requests (that is those exceeding US\$ 30,000) will be forwarded, with the Bureau's recommendation, to the following session of the World Heritage Committee for decision-making.*

(...)"

### **C.3. ACTION BY THE BUREAU**

The Bureau is requested to examine the revision of the Operational Guidelines proposed in Section C.2. above and to formulate recommendations thereupon to the World Heritage Committee.

#### **D. Chapter IV Section A: DIFFERENT FORMS OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND (AUTHORITY OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND THE BUREAU TO APPROVE REQUESTS)**

##### **D.1. BACKGROUND**

At present, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee has the authority to approve requests for preparatory assistance up to an amount of US\$ 15,000, and for training and international cooperation up to an amount of US\$ 20,000. The Bureau is authorized to approve requests for training and technical cooperation up to a maximum of US\$ 30,000.

These amounts have been in force since the conception of the Convention. In view of the worldwide increase in the costs of training and technical cooperation activities, the Bureau may wish to re-consider these ceilings and formulate recommendations thereupon to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

##### **D.2. ACTION BY THE BUREAU**

The Bureau is requested to consider if any change in the ceilings of requests that can be approved by the Chairperson and/or the Bureau is required and if proposals to this effect should be brought forward to the Committee at its nineteenth session.