

Distribution limited

WHC-99/CONF.206/5

Paris, 12 July 1999

Original : French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION**

**TWELFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION  
CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL  
AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II  
28 - 29 October 1999**

**Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda for the General Assembly: Ways and means to ensure a  
representative World Heritage List**

## **SUMMARY**

At its twenty-second session, the World Heritage Committee inscribed this item on the provisional agenda of the twenty-third session of the Bureau. This document informs the General Assembly of the implications of the Global Strategy and the evolution of its issues. It was examined and approved by the Bureau at its twenty-third session (Paris, 5-10 July 1999).

**Action requested:** The General Assembly shall examine and approve the draft resolution adopted by the Bureau, in pages 10 to 13 of this document.

## **I. Introduction to the Global Strategy for a representative World Heritage List**

**1.1** Since the adoption of the *World Heritage Convention* in 1972, innumerable discussions have been conducted as to the means of ensuring the representative nature of the World Heritage List. Since 1979 and progressively afterwards, disparities and imbalances have been underlined and notably the large number of inscriptions of cultural properties compared to the proportionally smaller number of natural properties, and a predominance of western European monumental architecture in comparison to non-monumental architectural heritage of other regions. The need to strengthen the protection of past and continuing interactions between humans and the environment has also been stressed. Since 1979, **the Committee** has evoked the need to improve the representative nature of the List. It has sought to strengthen the evaluation criteria for assessing the outstanding universal value by means of comparative studies of cultural heritage and has recommended to States Parties to establish tentative lists of cultural properties. At the same time, the List grew substantially and the imbalances previously referred to above have become more evident.

The advisory bodies participated in this discussion. In 1982, the **IUCN** World Commission for Protected Areas (WCPA) established a tentative inventory for natural properties of World Heritage value. Nine meetings were thus organised on the specific themes and regions up to 1987. From 1987 to 1993, **ICOMOS** in co-operation with the States Parties, contributed to the development of a Global Study which was based upon different comparative factors such as culture, themes, type, style, epoch, etc... This study, based on historic and aesthetic classifications that have little relation to the diversity of cultural heritage or living cultures, was qualified as functional typology. The Committee considered it necessary to find other means to guarantee that the List reflect the cultural, intellectual, religious and sociological diversity of humankind at a time when the notion of heritage was itself undergoing a much wider interpretation.

### **Expert Meeting on the «Global Strategy » and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List, 1994**

**1.2** In June 1994, the expert meeting organised by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, established a methodology to remedy the existing disparities of the List and to suggest new modifications to the criteria for *cultural* heritage. The expert group defined a non-typological approach, to be called Global Strategy, and proposed the adoption of a thematic methodology to redress the geographical, temporal, and spiritual imbalances of the List. The expert group also identified the following areas or themes whose investigation in their broad anthropological context would have high potential to complete gaps in the representivity of the List:

#### **HUMAN CO-EXISTENCE WITH THE LAND**

- Movement of peoples (nomadism, migrations)
- Settlements
- Modes of subsistence
- Technological evolution

#### **HUMAN BEINGS IN SOCIETY**

- Human interaction
- Cultural co-existence
- Spirituality and creative expression

The **Committee** adopted the report of the expert group at its eighteenth session in December 1994, as well as the recommendations in favour of new revisions of the criteria for inscription of cultural properties. It also extended the scope of the Global Strategy from cultural heritage to include natural and mixed properties.

### **1.3 The inclusion of cultural landscapes in the World Heritage List**

Concurrent with the development of the Global Strategy, but also with a view to a less restrictive definition of heritage, the World Heritage **Committee** defined the notion of cultural landscapes. At its sixteenth session in 1992, it adopted three categories of World Heritage cultural landscapes and modified the cultural criteria justifying the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List, so as to ensure the recognition of « the combined works of nature and man » of « outstanding universal value » defined in Article 1 of the *Convention*. Cultural landscapes are inscribed on the List on the basis of cultural heritage criteria. Eight regional thematic meetings were organized between 1993 and 1999 concerning the application of the three categories in different regions and cultures of the world.

## **II. Implementation of the Global Strategy from 1994 to 1998**

### **2.1 Definition and objectives**

The Global Strategy is a framework and methodology for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. It relies on regional and thematic definitions of categories of heritage which have outstanding universal value, to ensure a more balanced and representative World Heritage List. It encourages countries to become States Parties to the *Convention*, to prepare tentative lists and to harmonise them, and to prepare nominations of properties from categories and regions currently under-represented on the World Heritage List.

### **2.2 Regional and thematic implementation of the Global Strategy**

Every year since 1995, the **Committee** has approved the organization by the World Heritage Centre of regional and thematic Global Strategy meetings and studies. A list of background documents concerning these Global Strategy meetings can be found in Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.206/INF.5**. Most of the documents listed are available in English and French and may be consulted on the Centre's Web site: [www.unesco.org/whc/](http://www.unesco.org/whc/). Copies of all the listed documents in Information Document WHC-99/CONF.206/INF.5 are also available at the Centre upon request.

### **2.3 Expert Meeting, La Vanoise National Park, 1996**

An expert meeting on the evaluation of the general principles and criteria for nominations of *natural* World Heritage properties was held at the Parc National de la Vanoise in France, in March 1996. The group of experts noted the difficulties in defining « outstanding universal value » and emphasized the need to evaluate World Heritage value in a regional context. The group of experts recognized the relevance and usefulness of the Global Strategy approach to identify properties of World Heritage value and underlined the need to carry out a series of thematic studies on natural heritage. With regard to the balance of the List, the experts noted that it was not a question of numbers, but of the representivity of biogeographical regions or events in the history of evolution. The experts indicated that there is a nature-culture

continuum and that the inclusion of cultural landscapes solely under the category of cultural heritage was not coherent with the reality of this continuum.

## **2.4 World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 24-28 March 1998**

The **Committee** decided that there should be a more in-depth debate, and a « truly joint meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts» was organised in Amsterdam from 24 to 28 March 1998, to examine:

- (a) the application of the «conditions of integrity» versus the «test of authenticity»,
- (b) the question of a unified or harmonised set of criteria, and
- (c) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts.

At this World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Expert Meeting organised by the World Heritage Centre, in association with the Dutch Government, the experts stressed that the *Convention* should be seen as a holistic document uniting cultural and natural heritage, and to this end, proposed a unified set of evaluation criteria with integrity and authenticity provisions for the inclusion of properties on the World Heritage List. The experts also strongly urged that the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* should ensure recognition and protection of outstanding interactions between people and the «natural» environment.

## **2.5 Contribution of the advisory bodies - Thematic studies on natural and cultural heritage**

**2.5.1** IUCN's approach to the Global Strategy is the continuation on a phased basis and as funds are available, of an ongoing series of working papers covering all the earth's biomes as well as key topical issues. These global thematic studies constitute a working tool for the identification of categories of properties not yet represented in the World Heritage List.

**2.5.2** Since 1982, ICOMOS has used thematic and comparative studies to ensure a balanced and representative World Heritage List, and has classified these studies as *pre-emptive* and *reactive*. The *pre-emptive* studies are prepared in response to a perceived and anticipated demand. *Reactive* studies are those reports commissioned by ICOMOS when new nominations are received for which no comparative studies or in-depth analyses exist within the ICOMOS Bureau or its International Scientific Committees. Between 1994 and 1999, ICOMOS prepared twenty comparative studies.

## **III. Background to the present document**

**3.1** In 1998, the implementation of the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List (which was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in 1994) was debated at the meeting of the Consultative Body to the World Heritage Committee, and at the twenty-second sessions of the Bureau and the World Heritage Committee.

**3.2** The main focus of the discussion of the **Consultative Body**, encouraged by the progress achieved in the application of the Strategy in Africa and in the Pacific, was on the

means of accelerating the implementation of the Global Strategy. Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning a balanced List and the Global Strategy were discussed by the **Bureau**, and stressed:

*(i) communication methods to the States Parties of the objectives and thematic and regional approach of the Global Strategy; (ii) objectives to be set with regard to the regions and the sub-themes currently under-represented in the World Heritage List, and (iii) the means to share and increase available resources to States Parties in order to ensure the long-term sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties.*

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre:

*«...to prepare, in close co-operation with the Advisory Bodies, a prioritised action plan for the future implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List, to be submitted for the approval of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.»*

**3.3** Document **WHC-98/CONF.203/12** *«Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List»* which was presented to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1998, included regional action plans for Africa, Asia, Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, prepared in the light of evaluations of activities undertaken in each of these regions from 1994 to 1998. The Committee approved a general action plan and activities by region for 1999. In its report the Committee took note of the difficulties encountered in the implementation of the Global Strategy and in particular:

- «(i) continuing imbalances of new categories defined in the Operational Guidelines and still under-represented on the List, such as Cultural Landscapes, Routes and Itineraries. It deplored the absence of natural sites in the Amazon Basin, the low representation of heritage of Arctic and Sub-arctic regions, as well as the lack of implementation of the natural part of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab States. On the other hand, it noted the continuing increase in the number of categories of sites already represented. It underlined that little consideration had been given to paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines which "invites States Parties to consider whether their cultural heritage is already well represented on the List, and if so to slow down voluntarily their rate of future nominations.*
- (ii) constraints faced by many States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List, and which have inadequate legal protection and management mechanisms, as well as insufficient human and financial resources for the preservation and conservation of their heritage. Many of these States Parties cannot present "Preparatory Assistance" requests because of their arrears to the World Heritage Fund. The Secretariat also voiced the concern expressed at African Regional and Sub-Regional Experts meetings regarding the level of "Preparatory Assistance" which is limited to US\$ 15.000 and is deemed insufficient for the preparation of nominations files.»*

**3.4** Furthermore, in the framework of discussions on the *«Follow up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee»*, **the Committee** was kept informed of the progress made in the reflection upon the following points: (a) the application of cultural

criteria (i) and (vi); (b) the test of authenticity; (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List; (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy. In its report,

*«On the question of the balance of the List, the Committee emphasized that it was less useful to simply refer to the numbers of properties on the List than to assess the expressions of cultural and natural diversity and of cultural and natural themes from different regions represented on the List. Whilst some delegates noted that there are obstacles to achieving representation on the List in some regions and countries (for example, because of lack of awareness of the Convention or of technical and financial capacity etc.) others referred to the high numbers of nominations being presented to the World Heritage Committee each year. A number of delegates noted that the decision by the Committee concerning nominations are sometimes disconnected from the implementation of the Global Strategy as had been seen by the high number of European sites the Committee had inscribed on the World Heritage List at its twenty-second session. It was also noted that the interests of national authorities might differ from the objectives of the Global Strategy in relation to the inclusion of properties on the List. Currently the work of the Convention is highly respected in many countries, but the pressures on the entire system are substantive.*

*In this context, the need was stressed to move from recommendations to action and to assess the issue from a political perspective, basically founded on two aspects: the urgency of meeting the legitimate expectations of a substantial number of countries to be assisted in presenting applications for their sites, and the need for some countries to self-contain their ambitions. The Delegate of France expressed concern about the useful discussions concerning the balance of the List and the decisions taken by the Committee, emphasizing that the credibility of the latter was at stake. He insisted upon the importance of avoiding the perpetration of this imbalance. The Delegate of Finland proposed a moratorium on inscriptions, in order for the Committee and the World Heritage Centre to focus more on preparing applications for countries that are underrepresented on the List.»*

The **Committee** adopted the following decisions:

- «1) The Committee thanked the Delegate of Italy (who had chaired the Consultative Body in 1998) and all the members of the Consultative Body for their productive work on the technical issues and paid tribute to the work of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in March 1998.
- 2) The Committee stressed the urgent need to establish a representative World Heritage List and considered it imperative to ensure more participation of those States Parties whose heritage is currently underrepresented on the World Heritage List. The Committee requested the Centre and the advisory bodies to actively consult with these States Parties to encourage and support their active participation in the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List through the concrete regional actions described in the Global Strategy Action Plan adopted by the Committee at its twenty-second session.
- 3) Given the purposes of the World Heritage Convention, the policy of the Committee regarding nominations should have two parts (i) the Committee should value all nominations from all States Parties, and (ii) the Committee

- should strategically expend its resources to increase nomination of sites from parts of the world which are presently not represented or underrepresented.*
- 4) *The Committee asked that when the Bureau examines new nominations at its future sessions, it take into account the debate of the twenty-second session of the Committee on the establishment of a representative World Heritage List.*
  - 5) *The Committee requested the Centre to work with the advisory bodies to further develop the revision of Section I of the Operational Guidelines and submit them to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau should submit for adoption its recommendations to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.*
  - 6) *The Committee urged the advisory bodies to pursue further work on breaking down the themes into sub-themes, taking into consideration the recommendations of relevant expert meetings. Particular attention should be given to secure the highest level of scientific and technical consensus. The advisory bodies are asked to report on progress made and suggest any concrete decisions to be taken by future sessions of the Committee.*
  - 7) *The Committee requested that the Centre, in collaboration with the advisory bodies present a progress report on the implementation of the regional actions described in the Global Strategy Action Plan adopted by the Committee at its twenty-second session to the twenty-third session of the Committee.*
  - 8) *The Committee requested that an agenda item on «Ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List» be presented to the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in 1999. The twenty-third session of the Bureau is asked to prepare the agenda item for the General Assembly.»*

#### **IV. Increasing number of proposals for inscription**

During the biennial meeting of the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies in February 1999, ICOMOS and IUCN, alarmed by the high and increasing number of proposals for inscription to be examined during 1999 by the Bureau and the Committee, considered that this situation could only deteriorate and that it constituted a major challenge to the viability of the World Heritage Convention. They considered that the question should be tabled at the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties. IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM submitted their analyses of the situation and proposed corrective measures that could be integrated into a draft resolution.

They considered that the present rhythm of new nominations:

- i) constitutes a threat to the credibility of the World Heritage List. ICCROM, for its part, esteemed that this would be a real threat if the quality of the evaluations was not maintained;
- ii) requires that the advisory bodies be able to obtain additional financial and human resources;

- iii) implies, due to lack of time, a reduction in the activities that the advisory bodies devote to conservation reports, preparation of strategies and thematic studies, the evaluation of international assistance requests and the strengthening of existing capacities;
- iv) raises the problem of time management for Bureau and Committee sessions, unless the sessions are extended;

They also noted:

- i) the mediocre quality of the nomination dossiers;
- ii) the imbalance between the number of proposals of cultural and natural nominations;
- iii) that a certain number of countries already well-represented on the World Heritage List have submitted numerous proposals for 1999.

They recommended that the General Assembly request:

- i) the World Heritage Centre: to postpone until the following year all proposals for inscription which are not in conformity with the **Operational Guidelines**;
- ii) the World Heritage Committee: to identify, on the basis of the global and comparative studies, the categories of properties under-represented in the List, with regard to new inscriptions;
- iii) the States Parties: to take into account paragraph 6 (vii) of the **Guidelines**, according to which *«The Committee invites States Parties to consider whether their cultural heritage is already well-represented on the List, and if so, to slow down voluntarily their rate of submission of further nominations.»*
- iv) ICCROM recommended the establishment of a quota system on a regional basis with a pre-determined number of nominations to be examined each year.

At the request of the advisory bodies, the Centre has prepared *Table I*, which shows the number of nominations proposed and inscribed by category, since 1978. *Table II* indicates the distribution of World Heritage properties in States Parties. These tables which will be distributed to the General Assembly under reference WHC-99/CONF.206/INF.6 I (a, b, c) and 6 II. It should be noted that Table II indicates that, to this date, **two-thirds** of the States Parties have less than three properties on the List and that their heritage of outstanding universal value is thus under-represented. Furthermore, fifty percent of the sites inscribed on the List have been inscribed by twenty States Parties who continue to submit new proposals for inscription. It should be noted that a number of countries in 1999 (Belgium, France, Italy, Norway, Sweden and the United States of America) decided to provide funding to support the nomination processes and to strengthen the capacities of the under-represented regions such as Africa.

## V. Examination of the Document WHC-99/CONF.206/5 by the Bureau at its twenty-third session

In deciding, during its twenty-second session in December 1998 to inscribe this item on the agenda, the Committee wished to inform as many States Parties as possible of the aims of the Global Strategy's implications and the evolution of the issues. It also requested the Bureau to examine this working document during its twenty-third session.

At the opening session of the Bureau, the Chairperson communicated to the members and the observers as well as the advisory bodies copy of the note prepared by Belgium. In this note the Belgian Delegation considered it appropriate that the draft resolution prepared by the Secretariat be endorsed by the States Parties, and suggested the establishment of a working group to elaborate a consensual and pragmatic text which would involve all the States Parties. This working group was established and met five times under the chairmanship of the Rapporteur. Twelve States Parties participated in that group: Benin, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Republic of Korea (members of the Bureau), Canada, Finland, France, Zimbabwe (members of the Committee), Belgium and the United Kingdom (observers), and the Secretary General of ICOMOS. The working group made modifications to the draft resolution which had been prepared by the Secretariat whilst respecting its structure.

During the examination of item 10 of the Bureau's agenda, "Preparation of the Twelfth General Assembly of States Parties", the draft resolution prepared by the informal working group was discussed by the Bureau. Paragraph B i) d) that suggested a "moratorium of a pre-determined duration" was subject for debate. Italy, Greece, Romania and Thailand, whilst supporting the general philosophy of the text, expressed reserves and felt that the measure proposed was restrictive and not conducive to improving the representativity of the List. Moreover, the Delegation of Greece expressed its reserve regarding the entire draft resolution and felt that it required further elaboration before its submission to the General Assembly of States Parties. These delegations also raised a procedural point and queried whether a text that had not been examined and adopted by the Committee could be transmitted to the General Assembly. During the debate, the Delegations of Australia, Benin, Japan, Morocco, the United States of America and Zimbabwe, who are all members of the Committee, and the United Kingdom (observer) each underlined the voluntary character of the dispositions that figure in Article B i). The Chairperson confirmed that the Bureau had been mandated to examine the working document relating to agenda item 8 of the General Assembly of States Parties on "Ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List" and "judged that it should include a draft resolution". He did, however, emphasize that the text that will be submitted to the General Assembly should be the subject of a consensus and reflect the wish expressed in Kyoto to "move forward from recommendations to actions". In his concern to satisfy those States who had expressed reserves and which reflected the preoccupations which would be raised by the General Assembly of States Parties, the Delegate of Morocco proposed that the wording of item d) being the subject of debate, be modified. He suggested that the word "moratorium" be replaced by the word "suspension". The draft resolution prepared by the informal working group was adopted with the following revision to item d), which was accepted by the Italian Delegation: "decides, on a voluntary basis **a suspension of new nominations for inscription**" for pre-determined duration". The final text of the draft resolution adopted by the Bureau is annexed to the adopted report of the twenty-third session of the Bureau, and is attached to this document.

The Delegate of Canada then recalled that the debate to improve the representativity of the List was on-going since 1992, and that a very clear message should be given to States Parties. She

requested that the draft resolution be transmitted to all States. She recalled that Canada has, on a voluntary basis, spread out the preparation of its nominations for inscription and had only submitted one at a time over the last five years. She also drew the Bureau's attention to point c) of paragraph B, that could be implemented in the framework of bilateral co-operation and should not be submitted to bureaucratic constraints.

#### **VI. Action required**

The General Assembly shall examine and approve the attached draft resolution.

10 July 1999

**DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE  
BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (PARIS, 5- 10 JULY 1999)**

**PREPARED BY THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP CHAIRED BY THE  
RAPPOREUR (HUNGARY) AND COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS  
OF THE BUREAU (BENIN, ITALY, JAPAN, MOROCCO, REPUBLIC OF KOREA),  
THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE (CANADA, FINLAND,  
FRANCE, ZIMBABWE), THE FOLLOWING OBSERVERS (BELGIUM AND UNITED  
KINGDOM) AND THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF ICOMOS**

**THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

- **Considering** that the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, referred to here under as the 1972 Convention, is a general framework for international co-operation,
  - **Underlining** the importance of finding the correct balance between the various activities linked to the implementation of the Convention, in particular nominations of properties on the List, reporting on the state of conservation, training of specialists, and improving public awareness to safeguard the heritage of humankind,
  - **Noting** that the representative nature of the World Heritage List has been the subject of numerous debates by the World Heritage Committee since 1979,
  - **Recognizing** that since the adoption of the Global Strategy by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994 with a view to improving the representativity of the List, this objective has not been attained, despite the remarkable efforts of the Secretariat and States Parties concerned,
  - **Noting** that at present **two-thirds** of the States Parties have fewer than three sites on the List and that their heritage of outstanding universal value is still under-represented or not represented,
1. **Agrees** to give its full support for the implementation of the Convention, in the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List,
  2. **Recognizes** the interest of all the States Parties and the advisory bodies in preserving the authority of the 1972 Convention, by improving, through appropriate means, the representativity of the World Heritage List which must reflect the diversity of all cultures and ecosystems of all regions,
  3. **Endorses** the objectives of the Global Strategy while **reaffirming** the sovereign rights of the States Parties and the sovereign role of the General Assembly,

4. **Shares** the will expressed by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session in December 1998 "to move from recommendations to action" and to improve the representativity of the List, and therefore:

**A. Invites all the States Parties to:**

- i) Give the highest priority to the *"adoption of a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes"*, according to Article 5 of the 1972 Convention,
- ii) Take measures to redress the imbalance and improve the representativity of the World Heritage List, in order to reinforce the authority of the 1972 Convention,
- iii) Prepare or re-examine their tentative lists in the light of the methodology developed and regional and thematic definitions by focusing on categories of heritage which are still under-represented on the List,
- iv) Rigorously establish the outstanding universal value of properties when preparing the tentative lists,
- v) Give priority to the submission of nominations resulting from regional consultations in the categories under-represented that highlight notably the interaction between human beings and their environment and human beings in society, expressing the diversity and richness of living or past cultures.

**B. Invites the States Parties that already have a substantial number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List to:**

- i) Apply paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention:
  - a) by spacing voluntarily their nominations according to conditions that they will define, and/or
  - b) by proposing only properties falling into categories still under-represented, and/or
  - c) by linking each of their nominations with a nomination presented by a State Party whose heritage is under-represented, or
  - d) by deciding, on a voluntary basis, to suspend the presentation of new nominations,

and

to inform the Committee of the measures taken,

- ii) Initiate and encourage bilateral and multilateral co-operation with States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented in the List within the framework of the preparation of tentative lists, nominations and training programmes,
- iii) Give priority to the re-examination of their tentative lists within the framework of regional consultations and to the preparation of periodic reports.

**C. Invites the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List to:**

- i) Give priority to the preparation of tentative lists and nominations,
- ii) Initiate and consolidate at regional level, partnerships based on the exchange of technical expertise,
- iii) Encourage bilateral and multilateral co-operation so as to increase their expertise and the technical capacities of institutions in charge of the protection, safeguard and management of their heritage,
- iv) Participate, as much as possible, in the meetings of the World Heritage Committee.

**D. Invites the advisory bodies to:**

- i) Pursue their collaboration with the Secretariat for the preparation and co-ordination of regional consultations,
- ii) Pursue their programmes of thematic studies and the classification of the themes into sub-themes, on the basis of the tentative lists prepared by States Parties and the recommendations of the regional experts meetings,
- iii) Observe the greatest scientific rigour during the evaluation of the proposals for inscription, so that the decisions of the Committee can reflect more systematically the positive results of the implementation of the Global Strategy,
- iv) Develop mechanisms that would give experts of the regions under-represented on the List the necessary training to prepare and evaluate nominations and ensure the state of conservation of properties.

**E. Invites the World Heritage Committee to:**

- i) Continue its actions undertaken within the framework of the Global Strategy,
- ii) Provide the necessary resources from the World Heritage Fund to support the efforts of the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List, in order to increase the number of their nominations,
- iii) Adopt a regional and multi-year Action Plan for the implementation of the Global Strategy, as a follow-up to the Action Plan adopted in 1999,

- iv) Evaluate the progress in the implementation of the Global Strategy Action Plan with the participation of all States Parties and define, should the need arise, adjustment measures to fulfil its objectives.

**F. Invites the Secretariat of the Convention to:**

- i) Pursue its collaboration with the advisory bodies in the framework of regional consultations,
- ii) Support in particular the efforts of States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List in the preparation of their tentative lists and nominations,
- iii) Ensure that the human resources allocated to the implementation of the Action Plan are consistent with its objectives,
- iv) Submit to the General Assembly a progress report on the implementation of the regional and multi-year Action Plan.

**G. Invites the international community and more particularly the donor agencies to :**

- i) Support, in co-operation with the advisory bodies and the Secretariat, the protection of cultural and natural heritage and the implementation of the 1972 Convention,
- ii) Give priority to the actions directed towards the implementation of the Global Strategy, undertaken in States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List.

**The General Assembly invites all States Parties, the advisory bodies and the Secretariat to transmit this resolution to the concerned agencies.**