

Distribution limitée

CLT-92/CONF.003/10  
30 juin 1992

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES  
POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE  
MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial

Seizième session

Siège de l'UNESCO, 6-10 juillet 1992  
Salle XVI

Point 13 de l'ordre du jour provisoire: examen des éléments  
d'une stratégie pour l'avenir

La préparation d'une stratégie pour l'avenir s'appuie sur les conclusions du rapport d'évaluation présenté sous le document CLT-92/CONF.003/9, qui ont fait l'objet d'une présentation et d'une discussion approfondie par un petit groupe d'experts venant des Etats parties, de l'UICN, de l'ICOMOS et de l'ICCROM, réunis à Washington DC, Etats-Unis, du 22 au 24 juin dernier, à l'invitation du gouvernement des Etats-Unis. Le résumé des discussions et les principales recommandations de cette réunion sont présentées en annexe de ce document.

En outre, les membres du Bureau se souviendront que le Comité, lors de sa quinzième session, tenue à Carthage, Tunisie, en décembre 1991, a souhaité que la préparation de cette stratégie pour l'avenir soit menée en liaison à la suite donnée à la résolution adoptée par la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO le 6 novembre 1991. Le Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO a examiné cette question, à sa 139ème session tenue à Paris du 18 au 27 mai 1992, à l'initiative de l'Italie. Le Conseil a estimé qu'il convenait pour le moment de se concentrer sur l'amélioration du système existant plutôt que d'entreprendre une révision du texte de la Convention. Conformément à la résolution de la Conférence générale, un rapport sur les moyens de renforcer l'action de l'UNESCO en matière de sauvegarde du patrimoine mondial est en cours de rédaction par le Secrétariat et sera soumis par le Directeur général à la

prochaine session du Conseil exécutif, au mois de novembre. Le Conseil exécutif a décidé d'attendre la soumission de ce rapport pour décider de créer ou non un groupe consultatif d'experts sur cette question. La décision du Conseil exécutif figure en annexe II du présent document.

Les membres du Bureau sont invités à examiner les recommandations faites par les experts réunis à Washington et à faire part de leurs commentaires et propositions. Sur la base de ces commentaires et des recommandations de Washington, le Secrétariat préparera un projet de stratégie qui sera adressé à tous les Etats parties pour commentaires. Si nécessaire, le Secrétariat réunira un petit groupe d'experts fin octobre/ début novembre, pour compléter le document à soumettre au Comité. Il est en outre proposé que le Bureau se réunisse deux jours avant le Comité, à Santa Fé, avec un certain nombre d'experts invités, pour finaliser le projet de stratégie.

Ce document sera ensuite adopté par le Comité. Après son adoption, il devrait faire l'objet d'une édition destinée à une large diffusion auprès des responsables politiques, de la presse, et des bailleurs de fonds, afin de mobiliser davantage ces différents acteurs en faveur de la Convention.

REUNION D'EXPERTS POUR LA PLANIFICATION STRATEGIQUE DE LA  
CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Une réunion d'experts du patrimoine mondial s'est tenue à Washington D.C., du 22 au 24 juin 1992, pour élaborer les éléments d'une stratégie visant à renforcer la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial au cours des dix prochaines années. La réunion a été organisée par le Centre de l'UNESCO du patrimoine mondial, récemment créé, et a été accueillie par le Département de l'Intérieur des Etats-Unis. Vingt experts venant d'Etats parties, des organes consultatifs du patrimoine mondial (ICCROM, UICN et ICOMOS) y ont participé à titre personnel, ainsi que le Centre du patrimoine mondial. La liste des participants figure en Annexe I.

La réunion a été ouverte par Madame Salisbury qui a accueilli les participants en sa qualité de Sous-Secrétaire adjoint pour les Pêcheries, la Faune Sauvage et les Parcs du Département de l'Intérieur. Elle a souligné que la réunion fournirait des éléments destinés à contribuer au succès de la session du Comité du patrimoine mondial à Santa Fé, Nouveau Mexique, en décembre, et a exprimé le voeu que les discussions soient fructueuses et débouchent sur un rapport à soumettre au Bureau du patrimoine mondial.

Monsieur von Droste, Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, a transmis les voeux du Directeur général de l'UNESCO pour le succès de la réunion. Il a chaleureusement remercié les Etats-Unis et le Département de l'Intérieur d'avoir accueilli la réunion. Il a rappelé les initiatives antérieures des Etats-Unis concernant la Convention du patrimoine mondial et indiqué que le Vingtième anniversaire de la Convention fournissait une occasion pour évaluer sa mise en oeuvre depuis son adoption en 1972.

Monsieur Knute Knudson, Directeur adjoint du personnel du Département de l'Intérieur, s'est joint à la réunion pour lui transmettre les voeux du Secrétaire du Département de l'Intérieur.

La réunion a élu Mme C. Cameron comme Présidente et a désigné MM. L. Pressouyre et A. Turner comme Rapporteurs.

La réunion a décidé d'organiser son emploi du temps selon les thèmes suivants :

1. L'examen de la Convention du patrimoine mondial et de ses liens avec d'autres instruments juridiques ;
2. La structure de mise en oeuvre de la Convention (Comité, Secrétariat, Organes consultatifs) ;
3. La mise en oeuvre de la Convention (Liste, Fonds, Gestion, Promotion).
4. Le rôle de l'Assemblée générale

Il a été demandé à M. Beschaouch d'introduire chacun de ces thèmes sur la base du projet d'évaluation préparé pour le Comité du patrimoine mondial. Les discussions ont également tenu compte des recommandations présentées dans un certain nombre de documents disponibles pour la réunion :

- (a) Proposition commune Canada/Etats-Unis pour améliorer la mise en oeuvre de la Convention ;
- (b) Propositions de l'ICOMOS ;
- (c) Propositions de l'UICN ;
- (d) Résolutions de la vingt-quatrième session de la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO et de la 139ème session du Conseil exécutif pour renforcer l'action de l'UNESCO pour la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel.

Un résumé des discussions et des principales recommandations de la réunion est présenté dans les sections du rapport ci-dessous.

#### I. LA CONVENTION ET SES LIENS AVEC D'AUTRES CONVENTIONS ET RECOMMANDATIONS INTERNATIONALES

##### Résumé de la discussion

La Convention du patrimoine mondial est l'instrument le plus universel parmi toutes les Conventions relatives à la conservation du patrimoine culturel et naturel ; toutefois, tous les Etats membres de l'UNESCO ne l'ont pas encore ratifiée, puisqu'elle compte à ce jour 125 Etats parties. Le Secrétariat doit donc continuer à promouvoir l'adhésion des Etats qui ne l'ont pas encore fait.

Le Groupe a été d'accord pour estimer que la Convention était satisfaisante dans la mesure où la clarté de ses dispositions s'alliait à une certaine souplesse laissée au Comité pour sa mise en oeuvre ; la rédaction et la révision périodique des Orientations permet donc d'adapter l'application de la Convention au fur et à mesure que de nouveaux problèmes sont rencontrés dans cette application.

En outre, la Convention permet au Directeur général de l'UNESCO d'intervenir quand le besoin s'en fait sentir, en temps de paix comme en temps de guerre, et de telles interventions se sont avérées dans de nombreux cas positives. Ce n'est donc pas le cadre juridique qui est insuffisant, mais plutôt les moyens que ces interventions impliquent.

La Convention de La Haye prévoit des mécanismes compliqués qui rendent son application difficile. Une révision de ces mécanismes serait certainement utile, afin de rendre cette application plus simple et plus efficace.



La Convention du patrimoine mondial doit être replacée dans le contexte plus large des autres textes, Conventions et Recommandations, qui portent sur la conservation du patrimoine ; les liens avec les différents instruments en question doivent être renforcés pour assurer le respect de l'ensemble des dispositions qui régissent cette conservation.

### Recommandations

Tous les efforts devraient être mis en oeuvre pour que les Etats qui ne le sont pas encore deviennent parties à la Convention.

Il n'y a pas lieu de réviser la Convention, mais plutôt de revoir périodiquement les Orientations.

Les liens entre la Convention du patrimoine mondial et les autres conventions (Convention de La Haye, de Genève, Convention de Ramsar, CITES, Convention sur la diversité biologique, etc.) devraient être renforcés, notamment en recommandant aux Etats parties à la Convention du patrimoine mondial d'adhérer également à ces Conventions et en organisant des concertations entre les Secrétariats.

## II. LES ORGANES DE MISE EN OEUVRE

### Recommandation générale

Les trois piliers qui permettent la mise en oeuvre de la Convention, à savoir le Comité, le Secrétariat et les Organes consultatifs doivent jouer pleinement leur rôle, de façon équilibrée.

#### 1. Le Comité

##### Résumé de la discussion

Deux considérations principales ont été au centre des discussions :

- comment assurer un bon niveau d'expertise au sein du Comité pour qu'il soit à même de traiter des questions scientifiques et techniques qui lui sont soumises ;
- comment mieux gérer l'emploi du temps du Comité.

En ce qui concerne le premier point, il convient de s'assurer que tous les Etats membres du Comité assistent à ses sessions et s'y font représenter par des experts, comme ils y sont tenus par la Convention. Une aide du Fonds du patrimoine mondial doit être prévue pour faciliter la participation des experts. En outre, le Groupe a estimé que le Comité devrait faire davantage appel à une expertise extérieure en cas de besoin, comme l'y invite la Convention. L'appel à cette expertise

permettrait également dans certains cas de pallier des déséquilibres en matière de représentation d'aires culturelles ou géographiques au sein du Comité.

La deuxième question évoquée par le Groupe tendait à mieux répartir le travail au sein du Comité, pour éviter de surcharger le Bureau, et à constituer des groupes pour examiner certaines questions particulières, étant entendu que le Bureau resterait chargé de l'examen des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La proposition d'instituer des procédures de débat qui puissent déboucher plus facilement sur un vote répond au souci de mieux cerner et refléter les positions de chaque Délégation. Le Groupe a toutefois souligné qu'il faudrait éviter que le recours au vote ne politise inutilement les débats, car cette procédure n'est pas toujours adaptée à des discussions d'ordre scientifique et technique.

Enfin, l'idée d'instituer un cycle bi-annuel, qui présente incontestablement des avantages du point de vue de l'aménagement du temps du Comité, a été jugée par le Groupe comme soulevant aussi nombre de difficultés, en particulier pour traiter des questions d'urgence. Ces difficultés devraient être étudiées soigneusement avant qu'une décision à cet égard soit prise. Cette question a été rediscutée par le Groupe au point concernant la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

### Recommandations

Afin d'assurer le respect de l'Article 9.3 de la Convention visant à ce que les Etats membres du Comité soient représentés par des experts, le Groupe recommande :

- que les Etats communiquent à l'avance au Secrétariat les noms et qualités de leurs représentants et que le Secrétariat leur rappelle, le cas échéant, leurs obligations à cet égard ;
- que la participation des experts, non seulement des PMA mais de tous les pays en développement, soit facilitée en tant que de besoin par un appui du Fonds ;
- que, conformément à l'Article 10.2 de la Convention, le Comité invite à ses réunions des organismes publics ou privés ou des personnes privées qui assisteront aux sessions du Comité à titre d'observateurs et renforceront l'expertise du Comité. Ces observateurs, choisis en tenant le plus grand compte de la nécessité d'une représentation équitable, au sein du comité, des différentes aires culturelles et naturelles, seront consultés sur des questions particulières.

Afin d'améliorer le fonctionnement du Comité, le Groupe recommande :

- que soient établis des Groupes de travail spécifiques pendant les sessions du Comité, afin d'examiner des questions telles que le budget, le suivi de l'état de conservation des biens, les demandes d'assistance internationale, les révisions des Orientations, et que ces Groupes de travail fassent rapport au Comité ;
- que des réunions du Bureau sortant soient organisées avant chaque session ordinaire du Comité, en recherchant la participation des membres du Bureau sortant qui ne seraient plus membres du Comité ;
- que soient instituées, au sein du Comité, des procédures de débat plus rigoureuses, qui permettent à chaque membre du Bureau d'exprimer sa position, y compris éventuellement par le recours au vote, sans que soit toutefois abandonnée la recherche du consensus ;
- que soit appliquée plus strictement la règle selon laquelle le représentant d'un Etat ne doit pas intervenir pour appuyer une proposition d'inscription émanant de son pays ;
- que soit éventuellement considérée la possibilité d'alléger l'ordre du jour du Comité par l'institution d'un cycle bi-annuel : Le Comité serait ainsi amené à traiter en alternance prioritairement une année les inscriptions sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et, l'autre année, les questions de gestion. Les cas d'urgence feraient néanmoins l'objet d'une inscription régulière à l'ordre du jour.

## 2. Le Secrétariat

### Résumé de la discussion

Le Groupe a estimé que la création du Centre constituait en elle-même un renforcement du Secrétariat. Il a souligné que le Centre devait bénéficier de tous les moyens et de toute la souplesse nécessaire pour lui permettre de gérer le Fonds du patrimoine et pour attirer de nouvelles ressources, y compris des fonds bilatéraux.

Le Groupe s'est référé d'une part, à la situation précaire du Budget régulier de l'UNESCO et, d'autre part, aux règles générales de gestion des fonds extra-budgétaires pour estimer qu'il convenait d'assurer au Centre un pourcentage fixe du Fonds pour couvrir une partie des dépenses de personnel.

### Recommandation

Le Groupe s'est félicité de l'établissement du Centre de l'UNESCO pour le patrimoine mondial qui permettra d'une part, d'améliorer la cohésion du Secrétariat et, d'autre part, de renforcer ses moyens.

Le Groupe recommande que l'assistance temporaire au Secrétariat, accordée jusqu'ici par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial, soit remplacée par une assistance permanente financée par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial sur la base d'un pourcentage fixe ; le Groupe suggère que ce pourcentage soit décidé par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de sa prochaine session, dans une fourchette de 10% à 15%, conformément à la règle générale de gestion des fonds extra-budgétaires dans le système des Nations Unies.

Le Groupe recommande également que le Centre soit doté par le Directeur général de l'UNESCO de tous les moyens nécessaires pour assurer son bon fonctionnement et que les Etats parties à la Convention soient encouragés à détacher, à titre d'experts associés auprès du Centre, du personnel compétent pour le renforcer.

### 3. Les organes consultatifs, ICOMOS, UICN et ICCROM

#### Résumé de la discussion

Le Groupe a discuté de la notion de patrimoine qui doit de plus en plus être considérée comme partie du processus de développement durable et n'être plus limitée au patrimoine culturel d'une part, naturel d'autre part. Une telle conception va au-delà de la notion de sites mixtes ou de paysages et implique une vision plus large, surtout après les débats et les conclusions de la Conférence de Rio.

Le Groupe a estimé que l'UICN disposait d'un réseau, à la fois étendu et diversifié et rassemblait l'expertise nécessaire mais que tel n'était pas encore le cas pour l'ICOMOS. L'insuffisance des moyens de cette organisation, qui l'empêche de mener à bien un certain nombre des tâches que le Comité souhaiterait lui confier, comme les études comparatives, a également été évoquée. En ce qui concerne l'ICCROM, son rôle en matière d'élaboration de doctrines de conservation a été souligné, ainsi que sa capacité à servir la Convention en matière de documentation et de recherche et, comme c'est déjà le cas, de formation.

Le Groupe a également souligné le rôle que peuvent jouer soit d'autres organisations, comme l'ICOM, notamment pour ce qui est de la doctrine en matière de musées de sites, soit également les différents services de l'UNESCO, auquel le Centre devrait être amené à faire appel.

#### Recommandations

Le Groupe s'est félicité de la qualité du travail fourni par les deux organisations chargées de l'évaluation des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Le Groupe a souligné que l'on ne devait plus envisager séparément patrimoine culturel et patrimoine naturel mais qu'il convenait de promouvoir une philosophie commune qui intègre la dimension

humaine du patrimoine et la composante environnement. Il a recommandé au Centre de prendre toutes mesures dans ce sens.

Le Groupe a recommandé que tous les moyens soient mis en oeuvre pour renforcer les structures et l'expertise de l'ICOMOS et de l'UICN. En ce qui concerne l'ICOMOS, le Groupe a recommandé que les Etats parties soient encouragés à soutenir plus vigoureusement les Comités nationaux et l'ICOMOS à rechercher une meilleure représentation des différentes disciplines concernées en se référant notamment à l'exemple de l'UICN.

Le Groupe a recommandé que soit recherchée une meilleure participation de l'ICCROM à la mise en oeuvre de la Convention dans des domaines autres que celui de la formation.

En particulier, le Groupe a recommandé que s'établisse entre le Centre et les trois Organisations un réel partenariat, pour les questions de technique mais aussi de doctrine de la conservation, et que ces organisations ne soient plus considérées comme de simples pourvoyeurs de services.

Enfin, le Groupe a recommandé au Centre de dresser la liste des ONG et des institutions avec lesquelles il serait souhaitable de renforcer ses liens et qui pourront également être consultées par les Comités sur des questions particulières, conformément à l'Article 10.1 de la Convention.

### III. LA MISE EN OEUVRE DE LA CONVENTION

#### 1. La Liste du patrimoine mondial

##### Résumé de la discussion

Le Groupe a examiné les moyens de limiter le nombre d'inscriptions sur la Liste tout en assurant que les lacunes que la Liste comporte encore soient peu à peu comblées. S'il n'a estimé ni possible ni souhaitable de fixer une limitation en nombre à la Liste, le Groupe a toutefois examiné les différents moyens de ralentir le rythme des inscriptions et d'assurer en même temps un examen plus rigoureux de ces inscriptions.

Pour combler les lacunes que comporte la Liste, le moyen le plus simple reste d'encourager l'élaboration des listes indicatives. Toutefois, celles-ci comportent le risque d'encourager les particularismes nationaux et les politiques identitaires, au détriment parfois du patrimoine des minorités culturelles. En outre, certains pays ne sont pas en mesure d'établir ces listes. Il appartiendra au Centre de veiller à éviter ces risques en encourageant des concertations régionales et en apportant plus systématiquement une assistance préparatoire aux pays qui en ont besoin.

L'obligation d'avoir établi une liste indicative avant de proposer l'inscription d'un bien doit être considérée avec souplesse ; elle ne devrait pas être appliquée lorsque l'inscription d'un bien est urgente, ni en matière de patrimoine naturel.

Le Groupe a souligné les limites de l'Etude globale, notamment en ce qui concerne les cultures irréductibles aux grilles de lecture de l'histoire de l'art, pour lesquelles il est nécessaire de définir une approche novatrice.

Pour ce qui est des critères, le Groupe a estimé qu'il faudrait convoquer une réunion d'experts, chargée en particulier de revoir la formulation des critères dans les Orientations, à la lumière des difficultés rencontrées dans leur application et de l'évolution de la notion de patrimoine. En outre, les notions d'intégrité et d'authenticité ne devraient pas être interprétées de façon trop limitative, ce qui risque d'exclure pour la première le processus d'anthropisation et, pour la seconde, toute une catégorie de biens construits en matériaux périssables, donc évolutifs, ou délibérément reconstruits périodiquement.

### **Recommandations**

Le Groupe a recommandé que l'on ne fixe pas de nombre limitatif à la Liste mais que soit encouragée l'élaboration de listes indicatives, en particulier en fournissant plus systématiquement une assistance préparatoire aux pays qui n'ont pas encore établi de telles listes.

En ce qui concerne les propositions d'inscription présentées chaque année, le Groupe n'estime pas nécessaire d'en limiter le nombre. Toutefois, pour tenir compte des difficultés pour le Comité d'y répondre par une évaluation plus solide et un examen plus rigoureux, le Groupe suggère que soient étudiées plusieurs solutions qui peuvent être complémentaires : exiger de la part des Etats des dossiers plus complets et le respect des délais fixés par les Orientations, adresser aux membres du Comité toute la documentation disponible, laisser plus de temps aux évaluateurs en repoussant la date annuelle du Bureau et éventuellement adopter pour l'ordre du jour du Comité un cycle bi-annuel (voir Recommandations sur le Comité).

Le Groupe a recommandé que soit étudiée la possibilité d'une clause selon laquelle il serait procédé à une revue périodique des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, afin d'évaluer après une période déterminée si les sites répondent toujours aux critères qui ont valu leur inscription.

Pour assurer une meilleure représentativité de la Liste, le Groupe recommande que le Centre étudie avec les experts compétents les lacunes que la Liste comporte et les moyens d'y remédier.

Le Groupe recommande également que soit entreprise une évaluation critique des critères du patrimoine culturel et naturel ainsi que de ceux d'authenticité et d'intégrité en vue de leur éventuelle révision.

Enfin, le Groupe recommande que soit précisées à l'occasion de chaque inscription les caractéristiques qui justifient l'inscription du bien sur la Liste et qui doivent en conséquence guider les principes de sa gestion ultérieure.

## 2. La Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril

### Résumé de la discussion

Le Groupe a estimé que cette question comportait des aspects très différents selon les cas. Ainsi, le cas de Dubrovnik avait montré la nécessité pour le Comité de pouvoir, devant l'urgence, inscrire un bien sans que l'Etat concerné le demande et sans que le Comité soit saisi d'une demande d'assistance au titre du Fonds. Mais, à l'inverse, une concertation avec l'Etat concerné en cas de mise en péril s'était avérée indispensable dans le cas du Parc de la Garamba au Zaïre pour permettre que l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril serve à mobiliser un financement pour la conservation. Dans la plupart des cas, en réalité, l'inscription sur la Liste en péril devrait être utilisée pour rechercher ces financements et un effort d'explication auprès des Etats serait nécessaire pour qu'ils considèrent l'inscription de ce point de vue.

Le problème se pose en outre lorsque l'Etat concerné, tout en souhaitant l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, n'envisage pas de faire appel à l'assistance au titre du Fonds telle qu'elle est prévue, c'est-à-dire à une assistance financière. Dans de tels cas, le Groupe a estimé qu'il faudrait avoir une conception plus large de la notion d'assistance, qui devrait couvrir aussi la pression que le Comité peut exercer en mobilisant l'opinion publique par le fait d'inscrire un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril.

### Recommandations

Le Groupe estime que l'inscription sur la Liste en péril ne devrait pas être considérée comme une sanction mais comme le constat d'un état nécessitant des mesures de sauvegarde et comme un moyen de mobiliser des ressources à cette fin. Le Groupe recommande en conséquence au Centre de promouvoir cette notion auprès des Etats.

Le Groupe recommande toutefois que la possibilité d'inscrire un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, sans demande préalable de l'Etat concerné, soit transcrite dans les Orientations.

L'assistance prévue à l'Article 11.4 de la Convention devrait pouvoir inclure des messages du Comité attirant l'attention sur les dangers potentiels ou déclarés que court le site. Le paragraphe 56 des Orientations sera modifié dans ce sens.

### 3. Retrait d'un bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial

#### Résumé de la discussion

La question de savoir si le retrait de la Liste devait pouvoir être effectué sans le consentement de l'Etat concerné a été discutée. D'un côté, le fait de pouvoir appliquer cette procédure d'exclusion a incontestablement un pouvoir de menace vis-à-vis de l'Etat qui ne respecte pas ses engagements. Toutefois, l'exclusion d'un bien ne devrait être considérée qu'en dernier recours, ce qui justifie qu'elle ne puisse intervenir qu'en consultation avec l'Etat concerné, comme le prévoient les Orientations. Le Groupe a réévoqué la possibilité de mettre au point une revue périodique des biens pour évaluer si le site répond toujours aux critères qui ont valu son inscription. L'exclusion d'un bien de la Liste serait alors l'une des conséquences possibles des résultats d'une telle revue périodique, qui impliquerait que soit définies avec précision les valeurs de patrimoine mondial de chaque site.

#### Recommandation

Le Comité devrait étudier les modalités du retrait d'un bien de la Liste lorsque les caractéristiques qui ont motivé l'inscription ont disparu.

### 4. Le suivi de l'état de conservation

#### Résumé de la discussion

La question du suivi a donné lieu à un assez long débat. Ce que le Comité appelle depuis plusieurs années le suivi, terme d'ailleurs inadapté, recouvre en fait des notions assez différentes. Lorsqu'une menace précise pèse sur un bien, le suivi doit être ponctuel et servir à alerter le Comité, afin qu'il agisse auprès des autorités concernées et tente de trouver avec elles une solution au problème. Lorsque la situation s'est améliorée, le Comité est informé du résultat de son action. Cette conception du suivi est celle qui prévaut dans les rapports que présente l'UICN à chaque session du Comité. Elle a permis de nombreux résultats positifs.

Toutefois, le Groupe a estimé qu'il fallait aller au-delà de cette conception pour mettre en place un système continu de concertation sur le terrain, avec des experts de la région, en mobilisant également les chercheurs et les populations locales. Ce système de partenariat devrait peu à peu être mis en place et déboucher sur des rapports périodiques sur l'état des biens produits par le Centre du patrimoine mondial. En outre, le suivi ainsi conçu devrait déboucher sur la formulation de projets de restauration, de mise en valeur ou de gestion.



En revanche, le Groupe a été d'accord pour estimer qu'il était inutile de demander aux Etats de produire des rapports nationaux, bien que cela soit prévu par la Convention, les rapports de ce type ne reflétant le plus souvent pas les problèmes réels des sites.

Enfin, le Comité devrait systématiquement vérifier que ses recommandations au moment de l'inscription ont été suivies d'effet et que l'Etat, qui demande une assistance au titre du Fonds, dispose de données suffisantes sur l'état de conservation du site.

### Recommandations

Le Comité devrait systématiquement s'assurer que les recommandations faites au moment de l'inscription ont été suivies d'effet.

Par ailleurs, toute demande d'assistance au titre du Fonds devrait être assortie d'un diagnostic sur l'état de conservation du bien.

En outre, le Groupe estime que la conception du suivi devrait être modifiée : il ne doit pas être conçu comme un mécanisme d'inspection périodique mais comme un processus de coopération continu, impliquant les acteurs locaux, dans un contexte régional et comportant des actions de sensibilisation et de recherche.

Le Groupe demande au Centre de produire un document sur l'état du patrimoine mondial en commençant par la région d'Amérique latine pour laquelle un exercice de suivi selon ces lignes a déjà été entrepris.

## 5. Le Fonds du patrimoine mondial

### Résumé des discussions

L'ensemble du fonctionnement du Fonds a été remis en cause. Tout d'abord, le Groupe a estimé que les rapports fournis par les Etats qui bénéficiaient d'une assistance au titre du Fonds devraient être détaillés et faire l'objet d'un examen par le Comité (dans un Groupe de travail). Ensuite, l'utilisation du Fonds devrait plus systématiquement servir à la formulation, avec les responsables concernés, de projets susceptibles de recevoir des financements d'autres sources bi ou multilatérales. Le saupoudrage devrait être évité.

Enfin, le niveau du Fonds est très évidemment insuffisant et le Centre devrait s'efforcer de mener systématiquement une politique de recherche de financements affectés à des projets, comme la Convention l'y autorise. Ainsi, les ressources du Fonds ne devraient pas provenir uniquement des contributions nationales, comme c'est le cas actuellement, mais de fondations et d'organismes publics ou privés.

## Recommandations

Une meilleure collecte de fonds devrait être menée par le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Cette collecte doit comporter plusieurs aspects : relance systématique des Etats parties pour qu'ils s'acquittent de leur contribution ; recherche de contributions affectées à des projets spécifiques de la part de fondations privées ou d'autres sources publiques ou privées.

Des rapports plus précis, selon des standards définis, devraient être demandés aux Etats qui bénéficient d'une assistance.

Enfin, le Fonds devrait être plus systématiquement investi dans la formulation de bons projets, susceptibles d'attirer des financements dans de petits projets ponctuels. Pour ce qui est de la formation, elle devrait concerner de préférence, mais pas exclusivement, des responsables de la gestion de sites du patrimoine mondial.

## 6. La promotion

### Résumé de la discussion

Le Groupe a souligné que la promotion comportait deux aspects bien distincts, mais complémentaires : l'information générale et la recherche de financements par une politique de "marketing". Le Groupe a estimé qu'en matière d'information générale, beaucoup avait été accompli ces dernières années, notamment grâce à la production de matériel diversifié et l'utilisation de canaux existants pour diffuser l'information. Un effort vers le public plus spécialisé devrait toutefois être mené, notamment en apportant un soutien à des publications scientifiques et en alimentant plus systématiquement en informations sur la Convention les organismes professionnels.

Le Groupe a en outre estimé que la politique de promotion devrait être axée davantage sur la collecte de fonds pour la sauvegarde des sites, en mettant sur pied une politique de "marketing". Le Centre organisera une consultation avec des spécialistes de la communication pour développer une telle politique.

Enfin, le Groupe a rappelé que le Comité avait souhaité que soit examinée la question des impacts du tourisme sur les sites et que le Secrétariat avait commencé à travailler sur ces questions, conjointement avec l'OMT et le PNUE.

## Recommandations

Toutes les activités promotionnelles concernant la Convention devraient, au sein de l'UNESCO, être de la responsabilité exclusive du Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui en référera au Comité.

Un rapport sur l'état des biens du patrimoine mondial montrant les effets de l'inscription sur la conservation devrait, dans la mesure du possible, être publié par le Centre sur une base bi-annuelle.

Le Comité devrait consacrer plus de temps, lors de ses sessions, à la discussion des questions concernant la promotion, qui devraient être examinés par des spécialistes.

Les Etats parties devraient promouvoir la Convention, en particulier sur les sites du patrimoine mondial, par la production de publications, de plaques, etc., qui expliquent au public et aux populations concernées les valeurs qui ont justifié l'inscription du site. Les Etats parties devraient également promouvoir la création et l'action d'associations en matière de sauvegarde des sites culturels ou naturels.

Le Centre du patrimoine mondial devrait mener une réflexion approfondie sur l'impact du tourisme sur les sites du patrimoine mondial.

#### IV. L'ASSEMBLEE GENERALE

##### Résumé de la discussion

Deux questions ont été évoquées sous ce point. Comment éviter que les élections ne soient soumises, même informellement, à la répartition par groupes politiques ? Comment faire pour que l'Assemblée générale se penche aussi sur l'état de la mise en oeuvre de la Convention, afin que tous les Etats parties soient davantage associés à cette mise en oeuvre ?

##### Recommandation

Le Groupe recommande que l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties se tienne le plus tôt possible au cours de la Conférence générale et que le Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial y fasse une présentation du rapport que le Comité adresse à la Conférence générale.

Cent trente-neuvième session

139 EX/Décisions  
PARIS, le 16 juin 1992

DECISIONS ADOPTEES PAR LE CONSEIL EXECUTIF  
A SA 139e SESSION

(Paris, 18-27 mai 1992)

(...)

4.7 Culture

4.7.1 Révision de la Convention concernant la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel (139 EX/29 et 139 EX/36)

Le Conseil exécutif,

1. Rappelant la résolution 26 C/3.9, qui engage notamment tous les Etats membres à redoubler d'efforts pour assurer une meilleure mise en oeuvre des instruments existants et à renforcer l'action de l'UNESCO pour la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel,
2. Ayant pris connaissance de la proposition faite par l'Italie concernant la révision de la Convention sur la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel, telle qu'expliquée dans le document 139 EX/29,
3. Considérant qu'il conviendrait pour le moment de se concentrer sur l'amélioration du système déjà existant pour la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel,
4. Notant que le Directeur général étudie attentivement la question et qu'un rapport sera soumis au Conseil exécutif à sa 140e session,
5. Prenant note avec intérêt de la proposition, formulée par l'Italie et appuyée par plusieurs Etats membres, tendant à la création d'un groupe consultatif d'experts qui, avec le concours du Comité du patrimoine mondial, aiderait le Conseil à examiner le rapport du Directeur général,
6. Décide de reporter l'adoption d'une décision finale en la matière à sa 140e session.

## WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

### PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

#### BACKGROUND

The United States and Canada were early proponents of the concept of a mechanism to recognize and act for the protection of unique natural and cultural properties constituting a world heritage, and actively participated in negotiation and adoption of the World Heritage Convention in 1972.

U.S. and Canadian participation in and support for the Convention has been constant since its adoption, and includes two terms each on the World Heritage Committee.

The last twenty years have been a period of growth and evolution for the Convention. There is no doubt now that the concept responds to a clearly recognized need in world conservation issues. It is structured as the only global conservation treaty that addresses site conservation, both through obligations and commitments expressed in its text, and by assistance capabilities.

The Convention is an international legal and policy extension of the national park systems idea, and as such, is easily understandable in its common sense approach to the conservation of heritage values on a global scale. Its concentration on protecting unique and irreplaceable heritage sites provides a barometer not only of national and international commitment, but also of the likelihood for success in more general areas of environmental conservation.

The Convention's provisions represent a careful balance between needs, opportunities, and political and economic constraints. It recognizes the primacy of the national governments' commitment and responsibility to ultimately assure site protection. At the same time, its provisions allow for formal expressions of the weight of international visibility and consensus and for bringing these to bear on national decisions. It has the ability to offer, through its provisions, positive incentives and reinforcement to its members, as well as the pressure of international opinion as expressed by the World Heritage Committee.

This carefully crafted balance has appealed to the community of nations. Perhaps twenty years ago it would have been difficult to imagine the rapid growth of its membership. The originators of the concept would also perhaps be pleased to see a growing number of issues in which actions taken in the name of the Convention have been largely responsible for effectively addressing threats to sites and influencing proposals that would have resulted in new threats.

Of course, the nature of threats to sites have changed and, regrettably, intensified since 1972. However, the Convention has shown a remarkable resiliency in its ability to be adapted to these changes. The key seems to be the simplicity of the concept and its purposes, and the balance that exists in its provisions.

In many areas, the Convention has performed admirably. It continues to be highly regarded internationally.

Based on its experience of the workings of the Convention, and its observations of Committee proceedings, the United States and Canada believe the Convention still responds to a clear priority need, and that it has within its current provisions the capability to grow in effectiveness and recognized importance. We believe that most major deficiencies in its performance to date have been due to a lack of political will on the part of the Committee, and to procedural aspects of the Committee's work that diminish opportunities for decisive action.

The United States and Canada do not believe changes in the Convention text are warranted or advisable at this time, based on the experience of the last twenty years.

Summarized below is a tentative listing of specific procedural changes identified in recent bilateral meetings by U.S. and Canadian representatives which, in the opinions of both countries, would significantly improve the performance of the Convention, acting through its General Assembly and its Committee.

The general areas of improvement considered most important are:

- Improvement of the technical competence of the Committee and the substance of its work, through its membership, procedures, and performance of its Secretariat.
- Assurance of the continued integrity of the World Heritage List, through adjustments of criteria, management of workload, and more efficient meeting procedures.
- Strengthening of site monitoring and formal ties between documented threats and priorities for Committee action.

-Improvement of public information regarding documented threats and public notice of Committee actions.

Undoubtedly, there are other areas for potential improvement. The United States and Canada hope the following listing will prompt other evaluations by members, and that, together with formally scheduled reviews during 1992, consensus might be obtained for the discussion and adoption of specific operational and policy changes by the Committee in December.

#### 1. Role and effectiveness of the Committee

##### Recommendation:

- Renew and strengthen efforts to assure that experienced conservation professionals serve on national delegations.

##### Discussion:

The Committee is established as a professional, technical organization under the Convention. Its international image, and its ability to address increasingly complex issues depends primarily on the participation of qualified natural/cultural conservation specialists, as required in Article 9, Section 3 of the Convention. Funding is available to support attendance by such persons from LDC's, and the Secretariat should be required to so inform eligible members.

##### Recommendation:

- Establish specialized <sup>permanent</sup> Subcommittees among Committee members to address specific agenda issues during Committee meetings; e.g. budget, assistance, monitoring, nominations, for recommendations to the Bureau and/or Committee. Each Bureau member would Chair a selected Subcommittee, to be composed of Committee members not on the Bureau.

##### Discussion:

The growing workload of the Committee has led to increasing authority of the Bureau to decide major issues. The Committee is beginning to function as a silent rubber stamp on many important decisions. Specific functional roles for all members would enhance participation, improve the image of the Committee, and assist in completing the annual meeting agendas.

Recommendation:

NOTE: Agreement was not achieved on the following point prior to the Strategic Planning Meeting, and it should be considered a U.S. recommendation.

-Abandon informal Committee procedures which attempt to assume consensus on issues and return to regular Parliamentary procedures.

Discussion:

Committee consensus on major issues is a desirable goal. By definition, it would be appropriate for determinations of outstanding universal value. However, meetings conducted on the basis of assumed consensus place the onus for objections on individual members. Their objections may be quite valid, but they take on a negative impression by diverging with the assumed consensus (which often does not exist). Many members are therefore reluctant to intervene.

When it addresses procedural matters of the Committee, the Convention specifies decisions taken by a 2/3 majority. The adoption of regular parliamentary procedures will provide a neutral set time period for debate, followed by a vote. This will encourage active participation of more members, strengthen the substance of the meetings and assist in completing the annual agenda.

Recommendation:

-Amend Rules of Procedure (Rule 16) to strengthen their requirements of the Chairman to prohibit advocacy of nominations and/or assistance proposals by representatives of the concerned government during Committee and Bureau session, as also presently required by Paragraph 50 of the Operational Guidelines.

Discussion:

Although addressed in the Operational Guidelines as a "should not" clause, this principle is increasingly violated. More time has recently been taken up by members of the Committee and/or Bureau defending their own proposals. This is an unseemly practice for the Committee's image. It places such members at an unfair advantage over other member nations, who are not privileged to use the Committee for their own self interests. The practice also introduces elements of stridency into discussions that are not healthy for the Committee, which should be able to openly and objectively discuss all technical questions.



We believe that the Convention stands as one of the most credible and effective programs with which UNESCO is associated. In fact, rather than burdening ongoing programs, the World Heritage Convention has supplemented many non-related UNESCO program areas by providing funding to International Campaigns, technical assistance that has been planned under the MAB Program, and a series of public information materials giving prominent credit to UNESCO.

The Convention deserves formal acknowledgement and acceptance within UNESCO's programming and more sustained support.

## 2. Assuring the integrity of the World Heritage List

### Recommendation:

- Limit the number of annual site nominations for consideration to a number which will not dominate the Committee's agenda, and specifically could be fully reviewed and discussed within 1-2 days.

### Discussion:

The Committee, Secretariat, and the advisory organizations have been increasingly overburdened with processing, review, and action on site nominations. 40-60 submissions per year has been the average. This not only taxes the ability of all levels to give thorough consideration to each nomination, it also dominates more and more of the annual meeting agenda. This prevents the Committee from giving adequate attention to monitoring and other "management" aspects of its work.

We suggest the Committee adopt firm limits on the number of nominations to be reviewed each year and the following priorities for their selection:

- States never having submitted a nomination
- States having no designated sites
- States having refrained from submitting nominations for the longest number of years
- Cultural or natural heritage themes that are currently non- or underrepresented on the WH List

### Recommendation:

Inscriptions of sites should be deferred until there is tangible evidence of States Parties' commitment to protect the sites. Inscription should really mean that the property is at the service of humanity.

#### Discussion:

World Heritage designation is a means to protection. However, the Convention alone can not assure protection, when the will of the national government is not clearly expressed in the nomination for site protection. Properties should never be inscribed without tangible evidence of a commitment from States Party to protect. Evidence should particularly include recognition by the State at its highest levels that the site is of national heritage significance, and enactment of national legal and regulatory measures to exercise protection to the fullest extent of means available.

#### Recommendation:

-Except in exceptional circumstances, require the submission of national indicative inventories for both natural and cultural sites as a precondition for consideration of nominations in either category.

#### Discussion:

The record of member governments in submitting national inventories is mixed. By no means all members have done so. In many cases, only cultural sites are listed. The Operational Guidelines, para. 7, require the submission of cultural inventories before a cultural nomination will be eligible for review. The Guidelines currently do not require the same for natural properties.

The Convention, in Article 11, section 1, calls for the submission of national inventories, and in section 2, calls on the Committee to establish the World Heritage List "on the basis of the inventories submitted". From its terms, the Committee would appear to violate the Convention when it acts to review a nomination in the absence of a national inventory for both types of property.

The inventories are one answer to the Committee's long search for solid comparative analyses. The inventories are the member governments' own assessment of their internationally significant heritage. The inventories would fill the role envisioned for the current global study, by revealing similar properties, when specific nominations are under review and allowing comparisons to be drawn by the Committee.

Recommendation:

- Issue the above as a professional publication titled the "World Heritage Registry".

Discussion:

This would further awareness of the Convention and provide a lesser form of international attention and recognition to significant properties, for properties which do not, in the view of the Committee, represent outstanding universal value as defined in the Convention and by the Committee.

As such, it would more closely realize the original intent of the Convention to encourage protection of heritage at all levels of significance. A World Heritage Registry would also lessen some of the pressure for additions to the World Heritage List, by formally conferring international recognition on sites of lesser significance, and creating public awareness of them.

Recommendation:

- Require payment of all mandatory contributions as a precondition for consideration of nominations from the respective government.

Discussion:

The Committee has already acted to require this in connection with assistance requests submitted by member governments. The same requirements for consideration of nominations, we believe, is a fair condition. It would act as an incentive for governments to honor their financial obligations, and would also serve as a means of further managing the workload of nomination review and action.

The Convention acknowledges the primacy of national responsibility for heritage protection. Demonstrated willingness of members to honor their financial obligations under the Convention is a reasonable basis on which to assess the level of national commitment to the Convention's purposes.

Recommendation:

- Nominations deferred by the Bureau pending supplemental information and/or further study (Category D of the Guidelines) may not be eligible for further action in the same calendar year.

#### Discussion:

This simply corrects the original intent of the Committee when it adopted the 4 categories of action for the Bureau. Category D represents properties for which a complex question or series of questions is raised, requiring further review beyond the ability of the Committee to absorb in the same year. The lines between these categories have been blurred recently, with last minute reports and actions presented to the Committee and its new Bureau for immediate action. It unacceptably speeds the process, and does not allow for thorough consideration of supplemental materials before a decision is expected.

### 3. The List of World Heritage in Danger

NOTE: Agreement was not reached on specific wording for the following two recommendations in time for the Strategic Planning Meeting, and they should be considered U.S. positions for purposes of the meeting.

#### Recommendation:

- Amend Operational Guidelines (Para. 56; item (iv)), by adding, "assistance may take the form of messages of concern and statements of principle issued by the Committee which call public attention to a potential or imminent threat, and may be requested by any Committee member".

#### Discussion:

The current wording reflects the previous concern of the Committee only with threats arising primarily through circumstances beyond the control of the member nation, and for which technical and financial assistance would be decisive. Increasingly, it is recognized that threats often arise as a direct result of policies or actions of the member nation.

The Committee can provide valuable assistance and fully exercise its role in site protection by marshalling international community awareness through addition of sites to the endangered List. The Committee should be in a position to act quickly and decisively to take this action when circumstance warrant, even when it may be an action opposed by the member nation.

#### Recommendation:

- Amend Committee's Operational Guidelines (Para. 56) to omit item (v),

**Recommendation:**

**-Regularly schedule Bureau and/or Subcommittees to meet 1-2 days prior to each regular Committee session.**

**Discussion:**

The Bureau will continue to be pivotal in the Committee's work. There are many developments in pending business that occur between the regular June Bureau meeting and the December Committee, sometimes calling for re-evaluations of earlier Bureau decisions. Also, the new Bureau elected at the beginning of each Committee often lacks the background of previous Bureau decisions. This would allow for final reconsiderations by the old Bureau before new officers are elected, and perhaps reduce the number of concurrent Bureau meetings during the Committee session.

**Recommendation:**

**- Provide copies of all nomination, and other working documents, including copies of maps delineating boundaries, evidence of existing legal commitments for site protection, and IUCN/ICOMOS technical reviews to all Convention States Parties not later than May 1 of each year, as currently required in the Operational Guidelines for Bureau members. Amend Operational Guidelines to require automatic postponement of discussion of items for which documentation is not received on the above schedule.**

**Discussion:**

In its first 5-6 years, the Committee received these materials as standard practice. When it was suspended, we were told that the greater number of nominations, and lack of funds/personnel at UNESCO, made it impracticable to continue. We strongly disagree. Although there are occasional variations, typical nomination documents continue to average not more than 10 pages. Their reproduction and distribution would not place an unreasonable burden on the Secretariat. Copies in either French or English would be acceptable. IUCN/ICOMOS reviews are prepared in advance of the June Bureau and should be similarly distributed.

Nominations and other working documents are not now distributed prior to the meetings. They are available during Committee meetings but the pace of these sessions makes it difficult to review and absorb the documents at that time.

The tendency has been to keep this information in as close a circle as possible for as long as possible. We believe that all Committee members are entitled to receive this information early in the annual process. All members are in a position to have specialists at the national level review and advise on each

proposal. The result would be a significantly better prepared Committee, and the product would be more informed Committee decisions.

**Recommendation:**

- A standing Subcommittee of the Committee should negotiate with IUCN/ICOMOS the technical terms of contracts for their services in each coming year, the results to be recommended to the Committee. Final agreements are to be approved by the Chairman. Allocate resources from the WH Fund, as necessary, to support site visits by IUCN/ICOMOS in reviewing nominations.

**Discussion:**

The Committee often adopts positions requiring action by the advisory agencies. Frequently, these have not been accurately reflected in contracts subsequently concluded between them and UNESCO for their annual work. Inclusive task orders should be reviewed and adopted by the Committee, and should be incorporated as the basis for contracts concluded at a later date.

Site visits have more often been accomplished by IUCN in connection with natural area nominations. These visits have clearly resulted in more accurate and considered assessments, as well as more objective determinations of management problems and potential threats. ICOMOS, as well as IUCN, could effectively utilize their international membership networks to accomplish this goal in order to control financial support requirements.

**Recommendation:**

A full fledged World Heritage Secretariat should be created to combine support for both the cultural and natural heritage. It should be adequately funded for its work from the UNESCO regular budget.

**Discussion:**

Two Secretariats service the Convention, one for culture and one for nature. Neither has adequate staff/funds to carry out support functions. By the nature of this structure, there is also competition between the two sectors, which affects the convention and the Chairman.

Since the Committee began, UNESCO has requested, and received, from the World Heritage Fund "temporary assistance" to maintain a Secretariat function. Under Canadian leadership, the Committee requested a draw down plan to eliminate this reverse support practice.

#### Discussion:

As discussed, many threats do not relate to traditional situations involving an assistance grant to the State Party. Adoption of the above amendment would make the requirements for cost estimates of necessary assistance unnecessary.

#### 4. Delisting

##### Recommendation:

- Amend the Operational Guidelines (Para. 43) to include; "Public notice of the removal of a property from the WH List, together with the reasons for the action, will be issued by the Committee".

##### Discussion:

While every effort should admittedly be made to avoid this action, and it is in a sense an admission of failure, the potential action of delisting would become a more powerful influence in decisions affecting site protection if it were widely publicized. Just as the honor of World Heritage designation is a matter of public interest, the actions that may lead to delisting will also be of public interest, and will sensitize governments and the public to the array of threats to site integrity that should be considered in public policy decisions.

It will also reinforce impressions of the serious nature of World Heritage designation in promoting site conservation.

#### 5. Technical Assistance Requests

##### Recommendation:

- The Committee set forth clearer principles for allocations from the Fund.
- The Committee fix a ceiling on the percentage of the Fund to be allocated without discussion and approval by the full Committee.
- All funding requests be reviewed by qualified scientific and technical advisors prior to Committee approval.
- Projects should be presented in their entirety, not split, so that the Committee may see the full implications of funding requests.

-The Committee to systematically enforce its resolution to fund requests only from States whose contributions to the Convention are paid up. The Secretariat is to indicate on each funding request the financial standing of the requesting State.

- For recurring requests (e.g. French Africa training course), independent evaluations of the effectiveness of previous sessions should accompany requests for additional funding.\_

- Require mid-term, and final, financial and technical reports from recipients of assistance grants as a means of more accurately documenting the effectiveness of the Convention.

#### Discussion:

The Committee has access to adequate records to show amounts of assistance granted, the recipient, and the objectives. We have never seen records to document results.

In all major granting organizations, the concept of mid-term and final financial and technical reports is made a major part of the grant terms. In many cases, the mid-term report is a precondition for the release of a final 1/2 of the total grant.

Current records do not adequately demonstrate the effectiveness of assistance grants. In the case of requests that are submitted annually, such as regular training courses, there is no basis on which the Committee can decide whether support should be continued.

In all cases, the Committee should have documented results to judge the effectiveness of its work. These reports will also be important to national authorities in supporting continued financial contributions, and to the public at large in establishing the reputation of the Convention.

#### Recommendation:

- Publish summaries of the above biannually for public distribution.

#### Discussion:

See public awareness below.

#### Recommendation:

- Limit assistance grants to direct applications to designated WH Sites. In the case of training, provide individual support only to WH Site management personnel and only to general courses whose



content is directly applicable to WH Site management issues, and with at least one half of participants drawn from WH Site staffs.

**Discussion:**

It is widely stated that the Convention's financial resources are not sufficient to the task of preserving the World Heritage Sites. The United States and Canada agree this is true.

It is all the more apparent then that assistance from the World Heritage Fund should be granted exclusively to projects that directly address World Heritage Site conservation issues.

In the last twenty years, it has been said that requests received do not reflect a true picture of the needs of these sites internationally. And so more generic assistance requests are considered, since the Committee is reactive to requests for assistance as submitted by member nations. We believe the need is far greater than the record of requests and the resources of the Fund.

We believe the answer lies in the more effective linking of monitoring reports to assistance actions of the Committee. It is not credible that member nations whose properties are endangered by circumstances beyond their control would not take advantage of World Heritage Fund assistance if they were advised of its availability, and assisted in the procedure of submitting requests.

## **6. Public Awareness**

**Recommendation:**

- Develop a model marketing program for Secretariat and members in order to increase awareness, donations and grants, and volunteer support.

**Discussion:**

It is not reasonable to assume that, based solely or even primarily on national governments' contributions, the World Heritage Convention will have the resources to fully address its responsibilities.

As noted above, the commitments of national governments for their own programs is decisive.

At least as important, in our view, is the building of broad based public awareness and support. The World Heritage is a

concept that immediately meets with overwhelming positive interest among the public. It is an attractive cause, representing high ideals of international cooperation and goodwill. It is difficult to find expressions of opposition to the concept.

This positive image should be promoted, and effective approaches made to a variety of contributors of time and money, both at the national and international levels. Experience with similar approaches for national parks show that people will mobilize and give freely to a cause they believe in.

**Recommendation:**

- Issue a professionally published Annual Report to document the Committee's work and its effects on world conservation.

**Discussion:**

This is another idea to establish and enhance a corporate identity for the program. The audience would be member governments, private conservation organizations, and other international organizations. It would provide a professional summary of the Convention's work and accomplishments, and heighten its identity.

**7. Miscellaneous**

**Recommendation:**

- Strengthen the substantive role and agenda of the biannual General Assembly of States Parties and lengthen its regular sessions.

**Discussion:**

The General Assembly of States Parties has been limited primarily to election of new Committee members and setting the percentage amounts for mandatory contributions of members.

However, with a longer session, it could be a useful forum to deal with more substantive issues. It provides the opportunity for more influence to be exercised in matters affecting the Convention. It could take positions in matters that are difficult for the Committee, or in which the Committee would benefit from a greater show of international opinion.

## World Heritage Convention Evaluation

DRAFT

Notes prepared by ICOMOS for Washington Meeting. June 22-24/92.

### Introduction

The views expressed in the following paper were developed in late May and early June 1992 following the invitation issued by UNESCO to attend the World Heritage Convention Strategic Plan Meeting in Washington. They represent ideas explored within ICOMOS' Executive Committee (which includes 26 elected and co-opted professionals in the field, and its past Presidents) and in response to draft papers prepared for the twenty year evaluation of the Convention by Mr. Beschtausch, on behalf of the World Heritage Committee, by the American Government, by Christina Cameron of the Canadian government, by the Government of Italy (for consideration by UNESCO's Executive Board) and the Government of the Netherlands (concerning possible revision of the Hague Convention).

1. Choice of means to improve the performance of the convention  
ICOMOS is of the view that any choice of mechanism to improve the performance of the Convention must respond to a full and clear understanding of the problems experienced in applying the Convention. ICOMOS is not convinced that all possible means to improve the effectiveness of the Convention within its procedural framework have been exhausted. And therefore ICOMOS would be reluctant to endorse efforts to revise the Convention, without having satisfied itself that all possible avenues of least intervention for improvement have been tried and failed. ICOMOS believes substantial improvements can be made within existing procedures without the risks entailed by a new or revised Convention.

### 2. The Effectiveness of the Convention

The goal of the Convention is to conserve the common heritage of humanity, and in so doing to inspire improvements in the appreciation and care extended to all aspects of global cultural heritage. Criticism directed to the convention focuses usually on three areas:

- a) the integrity of the listing process: are the same criteria applied to all?
- b) the effectiveness of care provided after inscription: has inscription improved the conditions of care? when threats develop, has inscription provided new support, new arguments for conservation?
- c) the effectiveness of the Convention in times of conflict.

Discussion could also focus on:

- d) **providing models for conservation:** the extent to which the Convention and the List have provided exemplary models of conservation and the extent to which such have been shared with the global conservation community.
- 

a) **The integrity of the listing process**

Criticism exists which suggests the List has occasionally admitted sites of inferior quality. ICOMOS, while aware of differences of opinion, is not convinced indefensible errors have been made.

Evaluation is a complex and difficult process. It demands an objectivity which is never fully attainable, given the cultural prejudices and perceptions all participants in the process inevitably carry with them. There will always be differences of opinion at some level or other of discussion.

Nevertheless, ICOMOS believes that the quality of the choices made for the List can be improved by:

- i) **regular review of the criteria and their interpretation.** This happens often in informal discussion, but it should be possible to build a kind of jurisprudence (or evidence base) for their application; ICOMOS is interested in building such a reference base for decision-making; ICOMOS is also taking responsibility in 1992 to advance the discussion of cultural landscapes and the feasibility of a seventh cultural criterion. ICOMOS believes a regular review process, defining frequency, goals and participation, should be elaborated in the Guidelines.
- ii) **improving the quality of the nomination dossiers.** ICOMOS is often asked to review dossiers which do not meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines; this makes evaluation difficult, potentially costly and frequently slow given the need to pass requests for further information through UNESCO to the proposing governments.
- iii) **improvement of the base of comparative data.** Here efforts must focus on encouraging governments to complete and update tentative lists, and in supporting ICOMOS' efforts to further the global study.

- iv) ensuring adequate time and funds for review by ICOMOS. ICOMOS is asked to provide evaluations to UNESCO within a shorter period of time than governments (such as the U. S. and Canada) have suggested they need to review the evaluations. ICOMOS is also asked to visit all proposed sites, though neither time nor funds for such visits are available.
- v) ensuring adequate time for discussion within the Committee. These decisions are important and require careful reflection; they should not be rushed or rubber-stamped.

ICOMOS believes these improvements can be achieved incrementally and quickly and that efforts in these directions are already underway. ICOMOS does not believe that the quality of evaluations made at present is such as to require drastic intervention limits on numbers; a moratorium on inscription; higher standards of inscription than in the past.

b) The effectiveness of care provided after inscription

This is an area of genuine weakness within the Convention. A key concern seems to be the degree of tangible commitment made by governments to sites once inscribed. The prestige of inscription is sought, often aggressively, and yet once achieved often defended much less aggressively. ICOMOS believes that an integrated, systematic and comprehensive approach to monitoring (see Section 5 on Monitoring) will go far in improving care given sites.

At the same time ICOMOS believes great improvements could be made if the Committee, UNESCO and the advisory groups were enabled to play a direct counselling role in the first five or so years after inscription. Many opportunities exist:

- development of orientation programmes for site managers, to explain the Convention and its implications, and to explore potential problem areas;
- development of counselling programmes or site-specific training sessions to address problems identified during orientation;

- assistance in redrafting management plans, to incorporate the qualities described during inscription;
- development of training tools (e.g. management guides on specific topics, to assist in day-to-day review of problems);
- symposia on common thematic or regional problems.

These initiatives, soft as they may be, would probably go beyond the degree of intervention in sites considered desirable or reasonable by the Convention. Nevertheless, without sites agreeing to give away sovereignty (which seems unlikely), ICOMOS believes some form of benign intervention by UNESCO and the advisory groups, focused on improving the advice available to sites, would be helpful.

Many of these initiatives require new investment. Perhaps that investment should be provided by sites or their governments, as evidence of tangible commitment to preservation. Some of these initiatives are happening without investment by the Committee (e.g. ICCROM Management Guidelines for World Heritage sites; the Management Guide for World Heritage Towns written by ICOMOS' Secretary-General with support from the Canadian Government).

The above initiatives are site-specific. The need for such initiatives should not divert attention from the need to maintain general awareness training (e.g. through the scholarships provided to ICCROM).

#### c) Effectiveness of the Convention in times of conflict

Both the World Heritage Convention and the Hague Convention have proved ineffective in defence of Dubrovnik or cultural heritage in the recent Gulf War. From legal and jurisdictional points of view, the Conventions have separate and distinct goals and operating frameworks. Nevertheless, ICOMOS believes that there is much to gain from a technical conservation viewpoint by reviewing them together.

The two Conventions are often described as the "peace-time convention" and the "war-time convention". This is very much an oversimplification and not useful in practice. In times of conflict, good will disappears and the best intentions of peace-time (e.g. the flagging of important monuments) appear to simply provide

opportunities for malice (e.g. the use of such flags as targets for artillery.) It seems likely that the effectiveness of both Conventions would be increased by focusing on peace-time measures which would improve readiness for conflict conditions (e.g. military command structures to protect heritage; inventories; precautions/preparatory measures prior to conflict; remedial/stabilization/site repair measures after conflict etc.

Achieving these goals requires measures which would:

- study means to improve the two Conventions, by analyzing them together. (ICOMOS, in discussions with the Dutch Government, has been asked to assist in carrying out a feasibility study of means to improve the Convention, for the benefit of UNESCO. ICOMOS's participation is likely to take the form of a round-table on these issues in October/November, 1992).
- development of tools to assist those on site in times of conflict (ICCROM and ICOMOS are in the early stages of collaboration in development of a Disaster-Preparedness Manual for World heritage sites).

#### d) Providing models for conservation

Much of the promotional efforts accompanying the Convention over the last fifteen years have succeeded in bringing the List to reasonable degrees of public appreciation. Yet, in the professional sphere, most attention has gone to reporting on problems with sites and their preservation.

ICOMOS believes that the List contains many success stories and that much more could be done to identify these and share their lessons with the global heritage community.

### 3. Adequacy of ICOMOS evaluation procedures for nominations

Criticism has been directed to ICOMOS evaluations — much of it indirect, some direct as with Christina Cameron's notes for this meeting. ICOMOS finds open and direct criticism useful in order to be able to properly address perceived and real problems.

a. Distinguishing between evaluations and presentations

ICOMOS believes it would be useful for the Committee to distinguish between the process of evaluation that goes on inside ICOMOS and the presentation of the results of that process. Over the past 15 years, ICOMOS has generally entrusted presentations to one individual, an ICOMOS World Heritage Co-ordinator whose job it is to synthesize and present arguments made for or against inscription. While individual presentations are necessarily idiosyncratic, reflective of an individual's communication preferences and presentation style, ICOMOS recognizes the need to introduce more explicit structure to its presentations and has begun the process this year. ICOMOS 1992 evaluations for the Bureau will attempt to separate comments on site qualities, from those concerned with authenticity and management; presentations for the Committee in December 1992 will also include notes on comparative analysis where possible.

ICOMOS maintains that the integrity of its internal process remains strong, and that its evaluations offer the Committee high degrees of objectivity and consistency. Committee members should be aware that the conclusions presented within the ICOMOS evaluation document presented in 1991 represented consensus achieved among twenty experts of different disciplines and regions, achieved in two week-long meetings.

b. Evaluation visits to sites proposed for evaluation

In the same vein, criticism is often extended to ICOMOS' inability to visit all sites nominated, in the year of nomination, without recognizing the degree to which most sites have been previously visited by experts. In 1992 for example all but 2 of the 26 sites looked at had been recently visited by those involved in evaluation - most at least by 3 or 4 or more ICOMOS professionals. While this level of personal contact is useful, in respect of sites' intrinsic qualities and their claim to universal cultural importance, it does not fully overcome the need to ensure sites are visited in their contemporary context, in order to assess their current state of authenticity and the degree to which adequate management/legal measures are in place at the moment of nomination.

The desired level of site visitation cannot be achieved without significant increases in funding.



c. Adequacy of ICOMOS funding

The Beschaouch document makes reference to the perception that ICOMOS lacks funds adequate to do its job. It goes on to suggest that greater reliance on partners could reduce the need for funds. ICOMOS disagrees strongly with this conclusion. Committee members may be unaware of the degree to which ICOMOS works with and through partners such as IFLA, ISPRS, TICCIH, and is continuing to develop relations with other groups like DOCOMOMO. The relationship with TICCIH for example, is focusing in 1992 on completion of a thematic study on industrial heritage, begun in 1988. With or without partners, ICOMOS is dangerously under-funded, in relation to Committee's expectations re services. ICOMOS experts receive no fees for their contributions to discussions; ICOMOS elected officers (such as the President and Secretary-General) contribute hundreds of hours in preparation for meetings on world heritage, again entirely without recompense; nevertheless, in spite of well-appreciated increases in ICOMOS' 1991 and 1992 contracts (each \$50,000 more than the previous year), budgets approved in both years have still required ICOMOS to reduce by 1/2 or 1/3 its proposed programme of support for world heritage activity.

At present, to begin to meet expectations of the World Heritage Committee with respect to comparative studies and evaluations, ICOMOS depends on funds from governments who will agree to support a proposed venture. Raising these funds is not easy for ICOMOS, or the best use of its scarce professional time.

Unlike IUCN, ICOMOS is an organisation without external funding. While the present administration is examining means to develop an endowment fund, for the present, ICOMOS' sole strength is the expertise, passion and commitment of its members. To gain full advantage of this potential, without any doubt, ICOMOS requires substantial increases in the present levels of funding.

d. Adequacy of comparative data for evaluations

After a number of exploratory contributions to the development of a global study inside the UNESCO Secretariat, ICOMOS has agreed in 1992 to take on a larger role in development of an enabling framework for such study, and the initiation of component studies within the framework (such as the pueblo study carried out in April 1992).

ICOMOS would simply like to note for the Committee the practical limitations to development of such studies:

- i) component studies where complete, as with those studies of the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world initiated by UNESCO, have achieved little more than repetition of information already published and well-known to scholars; comparative data on authenticity of sites and adequacy of legal/management measures is lacking;
- ii) full agreement on the component elements of a global study will be extremely difficult to achieve;
- iii) funds adequate to complete all component studies in a reasonable period of time (10-15 years) are well beyond the capacities of the Committee's present funding base.

While ICOMOS efforts in this respect will slowly improve the comparative information available, states should be encouraged to complete and up-date tentative lists, and to develop regional agreement around their contents.

e. Adequacy of time for review of ICOMOS/IUCN nominations

Both the American and Canadian proposals have stressed the need to ensure Committee members have adequate time to review nomination evaluations passed to them. Without any doubt, this is a desirable goal. It should not nevertheless be achieved at the expense of the time available for review of the nominations. The current schedule, outlined in the Operational Guidelines, provides for dossiers to be passed by UNESCO to ICOMOS by November 1. For ICOMOS to be in a position to transmit evaluations (in two languages), to the World Heritage Bureau in late April, and given its own internal schedule, it must complete its assessments by the end of February. In fact, to have nominations in a state for review for ICOMOS' Bureau (late February), preliminary work must be completed by the end of January; subtracting time for Christmas and New Year holidays, only about two months within an annual cycle is available for ICOMOS to examine submissions.

If the 12 month cycle does not permit adequate time for evaluation and review by members of the Committee, then perhaps consideration should be given to:

- i) adopting a two year cycle for evaluation, providing at least 50% of that time for study of the dossier;

this would of course require revision of the entire process.

- ii) moving the World Heritage Bureau meeting to September or October, providing at least 6 months out of 12 for evaluation.

f. Limits on proposals for inscription

Both American and Canadian papers have suggested means to reduce the number of nominations reviewed in years to come: the American paper suggested a quota system; no more than 5 cultural or natural sites each year; the Canadian paper, a 5 year embargo on nominations of any kind.

ICOMOS while recognizing the need to maintain the integrity of nominations listed, would suggest the need to resist changes which would: 1. penalize countries who have recently signed the Convention; 2. penalize types of newly appreciated heritage such as industrial heritage; 3. create two lists of different perceived worth (pre 199X — post 199X).

If restrictions in numbers or time appear necessary, then perhaps these should be directed to countries or site types already well represented on the list; in any case, a moratorium on inscriptions must be preceded by a coherent and well designed study plan to address perceived defects in the listing process so that the time gained is well utilized.

4. Working with the Operational Guidelines

The Operational Guidelines are meant to assure consistency in day-to-day management of the Convention, the nominations submitted to it and the on-going monitoring of sites on the list. For the Guidelines to be effective, they must be regularly reviewed, and once agreed, observed by all parties, in both letter and spirit.

Christina Cameron's draft note on the Convention describes unclear procedures re allocations inside the World Heritage Fund. ICOMOS has no direct knowledge of these points, but can suggest the following with respect to procedures surrounding nominations:

- a) Both the American and Canadian proposals insist that time-lines for NGO's should be respected to provide

adequate time for review by governments. As stated previously, ICOMOS agrees with this point, but wishes to ensure adequate time for review of dossiers is also provided. (See 3(e).)

The Guidelines also provide for UNESCO to supply NGO's with complete files by November 1. In 1991, burdened by an unusually large number of potential cultural dossiers, UNESCO was only able to indicate definitively to ICOMOS which dossiers were to be studied in early March, more than 4 months after the deadline. If the Guidelines are to be applied, they should apply to all.

- b) ICOMOS agrees very much with the proposal in the American notes to maintain the distinction between proposals "referred" by the Bureau for missing information, and those "deferred" awaiting reformulation. In 1991, four of June's Bureau referrals had become deferrals by the Committee's December meeting in Carthage, and four deferrals had become referrals.

These reversals mock the authority of the Committee, and make it virtually impossible for ICOMOS to meet suddenly imposed expectations for review.

- c) ICOMOS believes it would be useful to avoid conclusions which lie outside the Guidelines for which no precedent exists, such as the decision in December for two cultural sites to "begin the process of inscription". ICOMOS can't usefully assist if the "rules of the game" are not known, or are changed without discussion. ICOMOS (and IUCN) need to be working within the full confidence of UNESCO.
- d) ICOMOS is called upon to examine dossiers submitted by countries without tentative lists, contrary to the requirements of the Guidelines. ICOMOS complies but is uncomfortable doing so.

ICOMOS feels it would be useful, in line with one of the proposals in the American evaluation of the Convention to maintain a working group on the Guidelines, and to meet annually to consider needs for adjustment, extension and application of the Guidelines. ICOMOS believes once agreement on needed improvements is reached, then all parties should carefully observe Guidelines.

## 5. Monitoring

Much attention has been paid by states party to the Convention, by UNESCO and by the advisory bodies to the need for "monitoring".

ICOMOS believes that monitoring is only a small part of what is needed to ensure sites are cared for properly in the long term, and that monitoring should not be discussed without reference to the other parts of this larger picture.

ICOMOS believes the following:

- a) the monitoring activity requires an explicit reference base — i) thorough documentation of the site at the time of inscription, and ii) a clear understanding of the values for which the site was inscribed, and the elements, traditions and patterns which embody these values (Note — Christina Cameron's call for a "heritage character statement" for sites is one expression of the latter idea). In other words, good monitoring depends on a clear output for the evaluation process.
- b) monitoring should build on the reporting obligations of governments described in article 29 of the Convention; such reports may not be equally useful, complete or reliable; nevertheless they could, and should, provide an information base for the monitoring activity.
- c) effective monitoring requires an integrated system, within which a variety of approaches may be uniquely tailored to the specific needs and circumstances of regions and site types; no one approach will work. ICOMOS has frequently called upon individuals within its 4,500 members to carry out monitoring work. And currently, ICOMOS is encouraging its national committees (established in 65 countries) to take on formal responsibility for systematic annual monitoring of sites; to date, about 5 committees, including England and Canada have embarked on the development of such programmes. But ICOMOS Committees do not exist in all countries party to the Convention; nor are all Committees likely to interpret or accept the monitoring mandates in consistently valid fashion. Indeed some committees, given the links of their members to government, will not adopt such an approach. A complete system requires complementary efforts from ICOMOS, its partners, ICCROM and its network, the UNESCO Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP, member states and others. At present, without such a system in place, monitoring will remain sporadic, ad hoc and unrepresentative. ICOMOS can take a lead in helping design a system, but requires assistance in implementation.
- d) effective monitoring must be both systematic and comprehensive. At present monitoring activity tends to be focused on flagrant examples of abuse or potential abuse of sites. Addressing controversial or highly visible

threats to site values is important, both for the preservation of the site itself and the integrity of the Convention.

But in such cases, the attention often comes too late to undo damage, and diverts attention from daily wear and tear, unsupervised modernization, and modest unsympathetic alterations, the long term accumulation of which is much the greater threat to the integrity of sites and their values. Systematic and comprehensive approaches to monitoring would look at sites at predictable frequencies, use common standards, anticipate unsympathetic development before crises are reached, and provide sufficient time and detachment to permit study of viable alternatives.

- e) effective monitoring must lead to improvement of the situations described. Monitoring is not policing — it should result in positive action, not negative recriminations or blaming.

Two forms of positive monitoring output can be envisioned:

1. analysis of sites by regions and/or groups to detect patterns of abuse or difficulty, which can, taken together, alert the Committee to broad needs, and themselves become the object of special attention (colloquia, dedicated technical assistance programs etc.);
2. ongoing and updated expressions of training needs in the care and management of sites.

ICOMOS believes that the monitoring objectives identified above can be met by many monitoring systems — a properly funded professional inspectorate administered by ICOMOS, for example. But the first step must be recognition and acceptance of the characteristics of that system.

Herb Stovel, Secretary-General, ICOMOS

UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTER

**Provisional Agenda for the World Heritage Strategic Planning Meeting  
22-24 June 1992 ~ Washington, D.C.**

---

*U.S. Department of the Interior ~ 1849 C Street, Northwest (C Street Entrance) ~ Room 5160*

---

**MONDAY, 22nd JUNE 1992**

- 8:30 AM      ***Check-In at C Street Entrance ~ Receive Identification Badge***  
*(Badge should be worn at all times each day of the meeting)*
- 9:00 AM      **REGISTRATION (Room 5160)**
- 9:30 AM      **MEETING CONVENES (Room 5160)**
1. Welcome by the Host  
(Ms. Jennifer Salisbury, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior  
for Fish and Wildlife and Parks)
  2. Aims and Objectives of the Meeting  
(Mr. Bernd von Droste, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre)
  3. Elections of Chairperson and Rapporteur
  4. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda  
  
*Coffee/Tea Break*
  5. Presentation of the Draft Evaluation of the Implementation  
of the World Heritage Convention  
(Mr. Azedine Beschouch, Chairman of the World Heritage Committee)
  6. Presentations of Experiences in the Implementation of the Convention  
on the National Level (USA, Canada, France, Australia, and others)
- 1:00 PM      ***U.S.- Hosted Lunch for Participants ~ Secretary's Dining Room (Room 5149)***

**MONDAY, 22nd JUNE 1992 (Cont'd)**

**2:00 PM                SESSIONS RESUME (Room 5160)**

7. Presentation of Experiences in the Implementation of the Convention on the International Level (IUCN, ICOMOS)

*Coffee/Tea Break*

8. General Discussion: Elements for Improving the Evaluation Document and Adoption of the Major Outline of Issues to Guide Discussion of Recommendations for Changes
9. Chairperson's Summary on the Day's Proceedings

**6:00 PM                Adjourn for the Day**



UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE  
Provisional Agenda for the World Heritage Strategic Planning Meeting  
22-24 June 1992 ~ Washington, D.C.

*(Enter Department of the Interior ~ C Street Entrance ~ Show Identification Badge)*

**TUESDAY, 23rd JUNE 1992**

**10:30 AM            MEETING RECONVENES (Room 5160)**

**10. Framework of A Future Strategy**

- I.     Criteria and Identification of Cultural and Natural World Heritage**
- II.   State of Conservation of Listed Properties and Monitoring**

*Coffee/Tea Break*

- III.   The Role and Functions of the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Bureau**
- IV.   The Secretariat: UNESCO's World Heritage Centre**

**1:30 PM            U.S.-Hosted Lunch for Participants ~ Secretary's Dining Room (Room 5149)**

**2:30 PM            SESSIONS RESUME (Room 5160)**

- V.    International Assistance, Improvement of Safeguarding and Training Programmes**
- VI.   The Role of the Advisory Bodies**

*Coffee/Tea Break*

***TUESDAY, 23rd JUNE 1992 (Cont'd)***

VII. Promoting Awareness for the Work of the Convention

VIII. The Role of States Parties and the World Heritage Convention  
(Legal, Scientific, Administrative, Financial, Educational,  
Management Training, Awareness Building and Promotion)

5:30 PM Adjourn for the Day

6:30 PM *Vans Will Pick Up Participants at their Hotels for Transport to  
Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts ~ Vienna, Virginia*

7:30 PM *U.S.-Hosted Reception/Picnic for Participants ~ Wolf Trap Farm Park*

8:30 PM *Performance ~ BALLET NACIONAL de CARACAS ~ "Coppelia"*

10:30 PM *Van Transport to Hotels*  
(Approx.)

*(Enter Department of the Interior ~ C Street Entrance ~ Show Identification Badge)*

**WEDNESDAY, 24th JUNE 1992**

- 8:45 AM      *Assemble in Department of the Interior Lobby ~ C Street Entrance ~ to Board Van for National Park Service Escorted Tour of Washington, D.C. Monuments*
- 9:00 AM      *Van Departs via C Street*
- 10:30 AM     *Return to Department of the Interior*
- 11:00 AM     **MEETING RECONVENES (Room 5160)**
11. Summary of Results of the Discussions and Statements  
                 by the Chairperson
12. Review of Draft Document on Recommended Changes
- 1:30 PM      *Lunch*
- 2:30 PM      **SESSIONS RESUME**
13. Continue Review of Draft Document on Recommended Changes
- CLOSURE OF MEETING**
- 4:30 PM      *Van Departure from Department of the Interior Enroute to the Resources for the Future Building*
- 5:00 PM      *IUCN/US Hosted Reception for Participants  
Resources for the Future Building ~ Rooftop Terrace  
1616 P Street, Northwest*
- 6:30 PM      *Van Returns Participants to Hotels*

WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING

Secretary's Conference Room

United States Department of the Interior

Invited Participants

|                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mr. Azedine Beschaouch    | Tunisia                      |
| Mrs. Licia Vlad Borelli   | Italy                        |
| Mrs. Christina Cameron    | Canada                       |
| Mr. Salvadore Diaz-Berrio | Mexico                       |
| Mr. Walter Lusigi         | Kenya                        |
| Mr. Mancoto me Mbaelele   | Zaire                        |
| Mr. Sylvio Mutal          | Peru                         |
| Mr. Jeff McNeely          | Switzerland (IUCN)           |
| Mr. Jef Malliet           | Italy (ICCROM)               |
| Mr. Leon Pressouyre       | France                       |
| Mr. Herb Stovel           | Canada (ICOMOS)              |
| Mr. Jim Thorsell          | Switzerland (IUCN)<br>(IUCN) |
| Mr. Andy Turner           | Australia                    |
| Mr. Bernd von Droste      | UNESCO                       |
| Ms. Mireille Jardin       | UNESCO                       |
| Ms. Mechtild Rossler      | UNESCO                       |
| Mr. Gerard Bolla          | France                       |
| Ms. Edith Brown Weiss     | USA                          |
| Mr. James Chamberlin      | State Dept.                  |
| Mr. Ray Wanner            | State Dept.                  |

Invited Observers

|                    |           |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Ms. Terry Morton   | US/ICOMOS |
| Mr. Elliot Carroll | ICOMOS    |
| Mr. Byron Swift    | IUCN/US   |
| Mr. John Waugh     | IUCN/US   |

MR

FROM STRENGTH TO STRENGTH: WORLD HERITAGE IN ITS 20TH YEAR

Discussion paper prepared for  
World Heritage Strategic Planning Meeting  
Washington D. C. , 22 - 24 June, 1992

By  
Jim Thorsell  
Senior Advisor - Natural Heritage  
IUCN- The World Conservation Union



## 1. INTRODUCTION

The process of defining where the most outstanding natural areas are found in the world is a noble task. It is the task undertaken through UNESCO's World Heritage Convention and it can be said to have begun in 1978 when the first four sites were placed on the World Heritage List. Today the natural list numbers 96 areas, including 14 that have also been inscribed for their cultural values.

As one who has had the enviable job of coordinating IUCN's annual technical presentations to the World Heritage Committee for the past 8 years, I will present several discussion points on some of the trends and issues facing World Heritage as it enters the 20th Anniversary of its signing. I do this in the spirit of identifying some of the key issues that merit discussion in this strategic planning workshop. I would acknowledge that more formal overviews have been presented at other IUCN meetings such as the Bali Congress in 1982 by David Hales, at the 1988 General Assembly by Michel Batisse, by Harold Eidsvik at the 1990 General Assembly in Perth and by Bernd von Droste recently during the World Parks Congress in Caracas.

## 2. TRENDS

First, let us look at some of the evolutionary aspects of the Convention as it has matured over the years. Three particular trends are apparent:

2.1. Increasing rigour with evaluation. In 1983 at the 7th Session of the Committee, outgoing chairman Ralph Slatyer of Australia noted the progressively more important roles played by the two advisory bodies, IUCN and ICOMOS. At the same time he called for them to "raise their standards even higher in the evaluations". IUCN has in fact strengthened its procedures since then by five means:

- instituting a wider input of outside reviewers (over 100 experts acted in this role in the 12 nominations received in 1991);
- conducting field inspection of most new nominations (undertaken in 46 of the most recent 59 nominations);
- taking greater advantage of the capabilities of WCMC's information services;
- routing recommendations on new nominations through an IUCN Headquarters panel; and
- suggesting issues where management needs attention which the Committee then relays back to the State Party.

These procedures have tightened up the screening process considerably and the documentation that is available to the Committee is much more complete and credible. The "success" rate of new nominations accepted by the Committee over the past five years has been 29 inscriptions out of 54 nominations, or 54%. Many of those not inscribed are deferrals and could, however, eventually succeed. IUCN, of course, is always seeking to further refine procedures and suggestions from this meeting are welcome.

2.2. Greater attention to monitoring status of existing sites. Once again, 1983 was a watershed year when the Committee first received an alarming report from IUCN on the conservation status of an existing site. This set in motion an accelerated interest in becoming more aware of the conservation status of existing sites (i.e. Article 27 of the Convention). My WCMC colleagues have recently reviewed the technical aspects of monitoring (or "reporting" as the case may be). I would like to quickly summarize here a few of the achievements that subsequent interventions by the Committee to various States Parties have assisted in achieving. Some samples:

| <u>SITE</u>        | <u>THREAT AVERTED OR IMPROVEMENT REPORTED</u>                        |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Southwest Tasmania | Hydro dam construction and forestry activities halted                |
| Durmitor           | Hydro proposal halted                                                |
| Royal Chitwan      | Water diversion project halted                                       |
| Ichkeul            | Water diversion project modified                                     |
| Tongariro          | Ski development restricted, cultural input expanded                  |
| Ngorongoro         | Management resources (equipment) augmented, removed from Danger List |
| Kahuzi-Biega       | Road proposal re-routed                                              |
| Pirin              | Ski development modified, size expansion proposed                    |
| Dinosaur           | Given funding priority for visitor centre, management plan           |
| Giant's Causeway   | Legal status upgraded                                                |
| Huascarán          | Road and mining proposals modified                                   |
| Mt. Nimba          | Mining financing discouraged                                         |
| Iguacu             | Helicopter impact study underway                                     |
| Niokola Koba       | Road construction modified, EIA conducted                            |
| Doudj              | Water regime improved                                                |
| La Amistad         | Oil exploration plans withdrawn                                      |
| Selous             | Major new antipoaching programme, stock route cancelled              |
| Garamba            | Rehabilitation, reduced poaching                                     |
| Sangay             | Road construction halted                                             |
| Galapagos          | Tourism control policies introduced                                  |
| Pamukkale          | Tourism impact reduced, workshop held                                |
| Mt. St. Michel     | Tourism impact reduced, regional development reviewed                |



On the "downside", monitoring reports have identified sites that have lost much of their integrity and may no longer meet World Heritage criteria. I will return to this point later in this paper.

I would note here that IUCN's contract with the World Heritage Convention to provide these services has increased substantially and now covers WCMC's costs and two-thirds of the operation of a full time position of World Heritage coordinator at IUCN headquarters. This still is minimal compared to support provided for other international conventions (See Appendix 1).

2.3. Growing public awareness. World Heritage inherently should be a saleable popular commodity. Certainly in selected countries where controversy has surrounded World Heritage issues (Australia being the most evident example), it has reached to almost every man on the street. In many other countries, however (e.g. U.S.A. and Canada), awareness and use of the Convention could be termed "dormant".

Brisk sales of the National Geographic book on Our World's Heritage and the forecasts for the new Harper-McCrae venture Masterworks of Man and Nature are a reflection of the potential popular interest. Efforts in communications have failed, however, to attract significant interest from NGOs, particularly WWF, in promoting the Convention in the same way as CITES and Ramsar. How can greater interest be elicited?

### 3. CURRENT ISSUES

Now let me identify some of the major policy issues where discussion will centre during the evaluation of the Convention in 1992.

3.1. Representativeness. An objective in the Operational Guidelines is for the World Heritage List to be "universally representative". The list has a long way to go before this is achieved.

Item: Only 23% of all 358 sites on the list are natural. Should we be seeking a balance in the list or is this not a real issue?

Item: Fully 35% of all World Heritage sites are located in Europe. How can a wider range be sought?

Item: A number of countries are not yet party to the Convention, e.g. Japan, Papua New Guinea, Burma, Namibia, Botswana, and South Africa. How to promote their acceptance?

Item: Many major countries that have joined have not yet nominated natural sites -- e.g. in South America, Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, and Chile have none, Brazil has only one. How can nominations from these countries be encouraged?

Item: Because of the sovereignty question, legal mechanisms stand in the way of identifying World Heritage Sites in Antarctica. Is there a way forward on this?

3.2. World Heritage in Danger. Recent experience of the Committee has demonstrated that the current Operational Guidelines may be too restrictive and indeed make it very unlikely that the Danger List would be used as the tool for which it is intended. The hurdle is mainly a procedural one: before a site can be put on the Danger List the State Party must nominate the area and submit a

programme outlining the corrective measures that need to be undertaken. For sites that IUCN has recommended for the Danger List (e.g. Rio Platano, Manas, Mt. Nimba, Tai, Plitvice, Srebarna), no such programmes have been forthcoming (although they are pending for the latter two sites).

Clearly State Parties will have to consider if they view the Danger List as a "black list" or an early warning mechanism and clarify the procedures now outlined in the Operational Guidelines.

Perhaps one solution to this would be based on the experience of the European Diploma which awards diplomas that are renewable every five years. Michel Batisse suggested that World Heritage designations be reviewed every 10 years and I would endorse this but extend it for 20. This means that a rolling review of all sites would begin in 1998 and sites that no longer measure up could be dropped from the list.

3.3. The World Heritage Fund. Considering that the Convention purports to provide technical assistance to the world's most precious natural and cultural treasures, it is sobering indeed to observe its extremely modest budget of \$2.3 million (1991). This is augmented by the extra efforts of State Parties themselves and other leverage funds that sites generate from development assistance agencies. Apart from the effectiveness of its technical assistance efforts the Fund can be considered minimal indeed. It has been suggested that GEF could play a major role here but means to augment the Fund to a level matching its stature and potential need to be found.

3.4. Landscapes. Various referred to as "mixed sites" and "cultural landscapes" the middle ground between nature and culture continues to perplex the Committee and its advisory bodies. After an IUCN/ICOMOS working group report attempted unsuccessfully to find a solution, the Committee was of the opinion that, according to the Convention text, such properties can only be considered under cultural criteria. ICOMOS has thus taken the lead with some help from IFLA. IUCN has played only a supplementary role as, sensu stricto, our advisory role is limited to natural sites. Subsequent listing of mixed sites, however, has overlooked IUCN's concerns (e.g. Taishan, Pamukkale, Bandiagara, Mt. Athos).

To better accommodate and to allow wider scope within the Convention for a third category of sites, the Committee is still in debate over the issue with the majority seeming to prefer keeping to the existing Convention text. Some key questions that still need to be addressed are:

- How does one determine if the balance between natural and cultural values of a site is a "harmonious" one? Should, as in the case of biosphere reserves, a predominant portion of the site consist of a protected core?
- What is the most appropriate legal vehicle for recognition of exceptional cultural landscapes? Is the World Heritage Convention to remain selective or it should it be broadened to include such areas and thus play a wider role in sustainable development? Would the new Biodiversity Convention be relevant to cultural landscapes?
- With the greatest number of sites that might qualify as World Heritage cultural landscapes located in Europe, what are the implications to the current imbalance between natural and cultural sites and the concentration of existing sites on that continent? How "global" is the concern for such sites?

#### 4. CRITERIA FOR NATURAL SITES

It is generally accepted that the criteria, as spelled out in the Operational Guidelines need some revision. Not only are they inconsistent with the Convention text, but they are open to very broad interpretation (e.g. how do you assess natural beauty?) and could be applied to almost any site in the world! The associated conditions of integrity need review as well as some (e.g. migratory species) can simply not be assured. In sum, the criteria currently lack precision and the Secretariat has indeed provided a revised set for consideration this year.

In 1991 a Geological Site task force suggested two new geological criteria and proposed an initial list of 107 geological sites that they feel merit inscription. As my colleague Jeffrey McNeely has noted, how many more could be considered if other scientific disciplines also had occasion to propose areas of importance to them?

Suggestions on criteria amendments made during the recent World Heritage workshop held during the World Parks Congress in Caracas included:

- giving more weight to sites of exceptional biodiversity and reducing the attention to threatened species now given in criterion (iv);
- removing references to man and culture in (ii) and (iii) as being inconsistent with the legal text;
- clarifying criterion (i) on geological features. One suggested wording is: "Outstanding examples of geomorphological features (landforms) and the processes that created them (structural, erosional, depositional)"; and
- focussing criterion (ii) on biological evolution and criterion (iii) on the more subjective scenic/aesthetic/inspirational qualities of a particular place.

#### 5. ACTION POINTS

I would like to conclude by identifying six main actions for World Heritage in the next few years. These are to:

- encourage the missing countries to sign the Convention;
- promote nomination of key natural sites for inscription with a goal of at least 200 natural World Heritage properties by the year 2000;
- strengthen monitoring activities and support to existing World Heritage sites;
- stimulate increased contributions to the Fund;
- revise the operational guidelines to incorporate a "sunset clause" and to clarify the criteria; and
- accelerate the heritage activities of State parties and NGO's at the national level to reinforce efforts from the international level.

If a long term World Heritage Programme Strategy document is to be prepared, these and other actions could form part of it.

**BOX 7 Staffing and Funding for  
Secretariats of International  
Environmental Agreements, 1990  
(millions of dollars)**

| Agreement                                                              | Staffing <sup>a</sup> | Amount of<br>Funding |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Montreal Protocol                                                      | 4.0                   | \$2.30               |
| Nitrogen Oxides<br>Protocol                                            | 7.5                   | 1.83 <sup>b</sup>    |
| Basel Convention                                                       | 4.0                   | 0.68                 |
| London Dumping<br>Convention                                           | 5.0                   | 0.76                 |
| Convention on the<br>Prevention of<br>Pollution from Ships<br>(MARPOL) | 20.0 <sup>c</sup>     | 3.03                 |
| Convention on Trade<br>in Endangered<br>Species (CITES)                | 18.0                  | 2.46                 |
| International Whaling<br>Convention                                    | 13.0                  | 1.31                 |
| International Tropical<br>Timber Agreement                             | 20.0                  | 2.10                 |

- a. Staffing figures include administrative and clerical personnel and any part-time employees.
- b. The calendar year 1990 budget for the Environment Program of the Economic Commission for Europe was about \$1.83 million, a portion of which was used to fund secretariat services for the Air Pollution Convention and its protocols, including the Nitrogen Oxides Protocol. The figure shown does not include funding for overall administration and conferences.
- c. An official of the MARPOL secretariat, a subunit of IMO, estimated IMO's resources (staffing and funding) devoted to administering the agreement. Though the secretariat has only three permanent employees, the official estimated that IMO provided an additional 17 staff years of services.

Source: GAO's analysis of data from secretariats.

(Table taken from: Guerrero, Peter F. *International Environment: International Agreements Are Not Well Monitored*. United States General Accounting Office Report to Congressional Requesters. GAO/RCED-92-43. January 1992.)