

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.202/7
Paris, 10 May 2000
Original : English / French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fourth session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, (Room IV)
26 June - 1 July 2000

Item 5 of the Provisional Agenda : Information on Tentative Lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural sites to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List

SUMMARY

The Bureau examines the nominations and makes its recommendations thereon to the Committee under the following four categories:

- a) properties which it recommends for inscription without reservation;
- b) properties which it does not recommend for inscription;
- c) properties that need to be referred back to the nominating State for further information or documentation;
- d) properties whose examination should be deferred on the ground that a more in-depth assessment or study is needed.

Nominations are examined in English alphabetical order, with Mixed and Cultural nominations following nominations for Natural properties, and new nominations preceeding those deferred or referred from earlier Committee or Bureau sessions. In some cases the original names of certain properties have been modified, following the evaluation missions and discussions with the States Parties concerned. States Parties may, at any time, express their views on the change in name of properties.

At its twenty-second session, 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." This debate is reflected in Section IX, paragraphs 1 to 21 of the Report of the twenty-second session of Committee (Annex I).

Summary

The twenty-fourth session of the Bureau will review eighty-seven nominations. Of these sixteen are for natural sites, six are mixed properties, and sixty-five are nominated for cultural criteria. Sixty-one nominations are new; twenty are nominations which have been deferred or referred from previous sessions of the Bureau or Committee; five are nominations to extend a site; and one is a renomination under additional criteria.

For those nominations which were deferred or referred from previous sessions, explanatory notes taken from the previous reports of the Bureau or Committee have been appended, recalling the earlier conclusion.

Identification Number	Name of Property	State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention
----------------------------------	-------------------------	--

A. Nominations of natural properties to the World Heritage List

A.1 New nominations

966	Ischigualasto Provincial Park/ Talampaya National Park	Argentina
967	Noel Kempff Mercado National Park	Bolivia
998	Jaú National Park	Brazil
999	Pantanal Conservation Complex	Brazil
1000	Fernando de Noronha Marine National Park	Brazil
964	Kopački rit	Croatia
991	National Park of Abruzzo	Italy
1012	Kinabalu Park	Malaysia
1013	Gunung Mulu National Park	Malaysia
953	Lena River Delta	Russian Federation
1007	The Cape Floristic Region - Phase 1: Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment	South Africa
1017	Central Suriname Nature Reserve	Suriname

A.2 Deferred nominations for which additional information has been received

898 The High Coast Sweden

The nomination was deferred by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1999), following comments concerning the need for better documentation of the values of the marine portion of the area, the relation to the proposed Quark World Heritage nomination and integrity issues.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.208/8

A.3 Extension of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

98 Bis Plitvice Lakes National Park Croatia

725-858 Bis Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst Hungary / Slovakia
(Extension to include the Dobšinská Ice Cave
(Slovakia))

A.4 Renomination of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List to include additional criteria

672 Bis Ha Long Bay Viet Nam

B Nomination of mixed properties to the World Heritage List**B.1 New nominations**

1001 Mount Qincheng and the Dujiangyan China
Irrigation System

994 Curonian Spit Lithuania/Russian Federation

992 Shey Phoksundo National Park Nepal

985 Drakensberg Park alternatively known as South Africa
oKhahlamba Park

B.2 Deferred nominations for which additional information has been received

917 Greater Blue Mountains Area Australia

In July 1999, the Bureau had recommended deferral for the natural part of this mixed nomination and did not recommend inscription according to cultural values. The Bureau requested additional information addressing issues relating to the natural heritage values and integrity of the nomination. The twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1999) noted that the Government of Australia provided the World Heritage Centre with this supplementary information on 7 October 1999. At its twenty-third session in November/December 1999, the Committee noted the States Party's intention to provide additional detailed supplementary material to enable the Bureau to fully consider the nomination at its twenty-fourth session in Paris in June/July 2000, and to prepare recommendations for the World Heritage Committee's twenty-fourth session in December 2000. This supplementary information relating primarily to natural heritage values was received by the Centre on 27 January 2000.

In its letter of 29 February 2000, the State Party noted that no new information concerning cultural values of the site was being presented and consequently that a new cultural evaluation would not be required.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.204/15, WHC-99/CONF.208/8 ,
WHC-99/CONF.209/22

908 Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) Italy

The twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1999) noted the ICOMOS recommendation that this property does not meet any cultural criteria and that the nominated area had no integrity as it was made up of fragmented components.

The Bureau decided to defer this nomination and to review it at a forthcoming Bureau session as a natural site. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to prepare a management plan for the property. On 14 April 2000, the World Heritage Centre received the additional information requested by the Bureau, which was submitted to IUCN for evaluation.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.208/8

C. Nominations of cultural properties to the World Heritage List

C.1 New nominations

979 City of La Plata, Foundational Urban Plan Argentina

995 The Jesuit Block and the Jesuit Estancias of Córdoba Argentina

960 The Monastery of Geghard and the Upper Azat Valley Armenia

1011	Echmiatsin and the Archaeological Site of Zvartnots	Armenia
970	The Wachau Cultural Landscape (the Wachau Region including the abbeys of Melk and Göttweig and the historic centre of Krems)	Austria
958	The Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower	Azerbaijan
996	Historic Centre of Bruges	Belgium
1005	The Major Town Houses of the Architect Victor Horta	Belgium
1006	Archaeological Site of the Neolithic Flint Mines at Spiennes, Mons	Belgium
1009	Notre Dame Cathedral in Tournai	Belgium
993	Historic Centre of the Town of Goiás	Brazil
959	Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso	Chile
971	The Churches of Chiloé	Chile
1002	Ancient Villages in Southern Anhui - Xidi and Hongcun	China
1003	Longmen Grottoes	China
1004	Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties	China
1015	Historic Centre of Santa Fe de Bogotá	Colombia
957	Varazdin - Historic nucleus and Old Town (the Castle)	Croatia
961	Historical Town-planning Complex Tvrda in Osijek	Croatia
963	Cathedral of St. James in Sibenik	Croatia
1008	Coffee Plantation Culture from the Southeastern part of Cuba	Cuba

974	Monastic Island of Reichenau in Lake Constance (Klosterinsel Reichenau im Bodensee)	Germany
975	The Cultural Industrial Landscape of the "Zollverein Mine"	Germany
978	The Old Town of Corfu	Greece
990	The Historic Centre of Assisi and the Basilica of San Francesco	Italy
972	Gusuku Sites and Related Properties of the Kingdom of Ryukyu	Japan
997	The Abava Valley	Latvia
965	Rietveld Schröderhuis (Rietveld Schröder House)	Netherlands
1010	Cultural Ensemble of Shisr, Khor Rori, al-Balid Archaeological Sites and the Wadi Dawkha Frankincense Park in the Dhofar Region	Oman
1016	Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa	Peru
969	Historic Centre of Santarém	Portugal
976	Kyōngju Historic Areas	Republic of Korea
977	Koch'ang, Hwasun, and Kanghwa Dolmen Sites	Republic of Korea
980	Historic and Architectural Complex of the Kazan Kremlin	Russian Federation
981	The Bolgar Historical and Architectural Complex	Russian Federation
982	The Ensemble of Ferapontov Monastery	Russian Federation
956	Island of Saint-Louis	Senegal
973	Bardejov Town Conservation Reserve	Slovakia
987	The Roman Walls of Lugo	Spain
988	The Catalan Romanesque Cultural Landscape of the Vall de Boí	Spain

989	Archaeological Site of the Sierra de Atapuerca, in the municipalities of Atapuerca and Ibeas de Juarros (Burgos)	Spain
968	Södra Ölands Odlingslandskap (The Agricultural Landscape of Southern Öland)	Sweden
983	The Historic Town of St. George and Related Fortifications	United Kingdom
984	The Blaenavon Industrial Landscape	United Kingdom
986	Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas	Venezuela

C.2 Deferred and referred nominations for which additional information has been received

625 The Mir Castle Complex Belarus

In July 1999, the Bureau decided that this nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting the provision of an up-to-date report on the property, covering current legal status, ownership, management, and conservation history, with appropriate plans, photographs, and slides. At the extraordinary session of the Bureau in 1999, ICOMOS reported that the information had not been received, and the Bureau decided to defer examination of the nomination.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.204/15, WHC-99/CONF.208/8

567 Rev Tiwanaku: spiritual centre of the Tiwanaku Culture Bolivia

The extraordinary session of the 1998 Bureau deferred the nomination until the State Party was able to provide maps precisely defining the five zones composing this site, along with their buffer zones; and details relating to the protection and management of the site.

Ref: WHC-98/CONF.203/5

946 The Old City of Mostar Bosnia and Herzegovina

The 1999 Bureau decided that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting further information about the management plan for the Old Town. At the extraordinary session of the Bureau in 1999, ICOMOS informed the Bureau that no information had been received from the State Party by 1 October 1999. The Bureau decided to defer examination of this nomination.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.204/15, WHC-99/CONF.208/8

808 Rev The Ancient Pula with the Amphitheatre Croatia

The 1997 Bureau deferred the examination of this property to await the completion of a comparative study of Roman amphitheatres.

Ref: WHC-97/CONF.204/11

**859 Rev Honorary Holy Trinity Column in Czech Republic
Olomouc**

This nomination was withdrawn by the State Party prior to consideration by the 1998 Bureau.

696 Rev Kronborg Castle Denmark

The 1994 Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination until a satisfactory programme has been adopted by the State Party for the removal of the major part of the disused shipyard and the landscaping of the area.

Ref: WHC-94/CONF.001/10

**933 The Loire Valley between Maine and France
Sully-sur-Loire**

At the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee in Marrakesh, a lengthy and substantive debate took place with regard to this nomination and on the general issue of cultural landscapes. It was generally recognised that the Loire Valley had outstanding universal value and was worthy of being inscribed as a cultural landscape on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (ii) and (iv). It was also noted that a Steering Committee with representation from territorial authorities and institutions involved, had been established to oversee the management of the area and that the management of this complex and extensive cultural site was exemplary, innovative and appropriate. However, several delegates raised concerns about the nuclear power plant located within the boundaries of the proposed site. After a vote (12 in favour of inscription and 7 in favour of deferral) and in the absence of the required majority (13) for inscription, the World Heritage Committee decided to defer the examination of the nomination to the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.209/22

- 534 Rev Gartenreich Dessau-Wörlitz (The Garden Germany**
Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz, cultural
landscape of Dessau-Wörlitz)
- In 1990, the Bureau recommended that the examination of the nomination of Wörlitz Park be deferred until the State Party provided a complete file including precise indications (accompanied by maps and slides) concerning the restoration work carried out in Wörlitz, in particular at the Georgium and the Luisium, as well as a map clearly indicating the boundaries of the area proposed for protection under the World Heritage Convention. In the light of this completed file and on the basis of the results of a comparative study to be carried out on this type of domain, the nomination concerning the cultural landscape of Dessau-Wörlitz will be re-examined.
Ref: CC-90/CONF.003/12
- 853 Rev Cultural stratification in the historic Hungary**
Centre of the City of Pécs
- The nomination was withdrawn by the State Party prior to the meeting of the 1998 extraordinary Bureau.
- 797 Rev City of Verona Italy**
- The 1997 Bureau deferred the examination of "The Roman Theatre and Amphitheatre of Verona" and invited the State Party to combine it with an eventual nomination of the Historic Centre of Verona.
Ref: WHC-97/CONF.204/11
- 613 Rev The Ruins of León Viejo Nicaragua**
- The 1995 Bureau adopted the recommendation made by ICOMOS to defer the examination of the nomination of the Ruins of León Viejo to enable the State Party to provide clearer information about the delineation of the proposed site and its buffer zone, the management plan and its implementation, and measures for protection against flood threats to the integrity of the archaeological remains.
Ref: WHC-95/CONF.201/12
- 930 The Palmeral of Elche: A Cultural Spain**
Landscape Inherited from Al-Andalus
- At the request of the State Party, the Bureau at its twenty-third ordinary session (1999) did not examine the nomination for El Palmeral de Elche y sustradiciones (Misteri). A revised nomination, for The Palmeral of Elche: A cultural landscape inherited from Al-Andalus, was submitted on 9 July 1999 simultaneously to the World Heritage Centre and to ICOMOS and IUCN for their evaluation.

At the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in Marrakesh, ICOMOS expressed concern about the heterogeneous character of this nomination - scattered, small areas in many locations. ICOMOS recommended that the State Party submit a more coherent nomination of a smaller contiguous area. The Bureau decided to defer examination of this property.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.204/15, WHC-99/CONF.208/8

522 Rev The Renaissance Monumental Ensembles Spain
of Úbeda and Baeza

Although the 1989 Bureau recognized the importance of the property for the State Party, it considered that the site did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List, as defined for the purpose of implementing the Convention.

Ref: SC-89/CONF.003/12

875 Rev The Archaeological Ensemble of Tárraco Spain

This nomination was withdrawn by the State Party prior to consideration by the 1998 Bureau.

884 Three Castles, Defensive Wall and Switzerland
Ramparts of the Market-town of
Bellinzone

At the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in Marrakesh, the Chairperson decided to convene a discussion concerning the proposal for the inscription of the three castles and ramparts of the Market Town of Bellinzone, attended by the Observer of Switzerland, ICOMOS and the Director of the World Heritage Centre. Following in-depth discussions, and taking into account the importance of the information provided on 19 November 1999 by the Secretary of the Swiss National Commission for UNESCO, it was agreed that:

- a. the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee would send a letter to the Swiss authorities informing them of the very positive spirit of ICOMOS in the examination of this property;
- b. at the initiative of the Observer of Switzerland, the Swiss authorities would invite the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to undertake a mission to the site with a representatives of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre;
- c. this nomination would be submitted to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its next session.

Ref: WHC-99/CONF.208/8

173 Rev	The Stone Town of Zanzibar	United Republic of Tanzania
	The 1982 Committee decided that the Old Stone Town of Zanzibar, which had been nominated by the United Republic of Tanzania, should not be considered further for inclusion in the World Heritage List. Ref: CLT-82/CONF.014/6	
885	Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz	Uzbekistan
	The 1999 Bureau decided that the nomination should be deferred. The State Party was requested to furnish precise details of the area proposed for inscription, the limits of the buffer zone and the regulations governing its use, and further material relating to the merits of Shakhrisyabz in comparison with other central Asian cities. At its extraordinary session in Marrakesh, the Bureau recommended that the Chairperson send a letter to the Minister of Culture in Uzbekistan, expressing the in-principle support of the Bureau for the nomination of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz and propose that it be examined by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau in 2000. Ref: WHC-99/CONF.204/15, WHC-99/CONF.208/8	
C.3	Extension of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List	
777 Bis	The Monasteries of Haghpat and Sanahin	Armenia
707 Bis	The Potala Palace and the Jokhang Temple Monastery	China
813 Bis	The Classical Gardens of Suzhou	China

from **WHC-98/CONF.203/18: Report of the Twenty-Second Session of the World Heritage Committee, Kyoto, Japan, 30 November - 5 December 1998**

IX. FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORK OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

IX.1 At its twentieth session in December 1996, the Committee requested a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund for the year ending 31 December 1996 and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, the Committee established a Consultative Body “to take action on the proposal adopted by the Committee, to undertake a review of the way in which the World Heritage Centre has assisted the Committee in implementing the World Heritage Convention”.

IX.2 At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee had requested that the Consultative Body examine the following four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical issues
2. Communications and Promotion
3. Management Review and Financial Audit
4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.

IX.3 A meeting of the Consultative Body was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 29 and 30 April 1998. In accordance with the decision by the Consultative Body in December 1997, preliminary discussion papers on each of the four issues were prepared by designated members of the Consultative Body. These discussion papers then formed the basis of the Consultative Body’s deliberations during their meeting in April 1998.

IX.4 The Report of the Rapporteur of the meeting of the Consultative Body was adopted on 24 June 1998 and was subsequently discussed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and made specific recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. Some of the Bureau’s recommendations have required substantial follow-up on the part of the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies as well as by members of the Consultative Body.

IX.5 The Chairperson thanked Professor Francioni (Italy) for having chaired the Consultative Body in 1998. He also thanked the members of the Consultative Body - Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, the United States of America and Zimbabwe. He also thanked Greece for their

contributions to the work of the Consultative Body. He commented that the intensive work on the complex issues faced by the Consultative Body was to be highly commended.

1. TECHNICAL ISSUES

IX.6 The Delegate of Australia, who had prepared a discussion paper for the Consultative Body meeting in April, informed the Committee that the following technical issues were examined by the Consultative Body at the request of the twenty-first session of the Committee:

- (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi);
- (b) the test of authenticity;
- (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List; and
- (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy.

IX.7 The Delegate of Australia, informed the Committee about the deliberations of the Consultative Body and also referred to some of the main findings of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, held in Amsterdam in March 1998 (Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7). She acknowledged that the discussion on the use of cultural criteria (i) and (vi) and the test of authenticity had benefited from written contributions from Greece, Malta and Zimbabwe. The contribution from Malta had proposed more detailed guidelines for the more stringent application of cultural criterion (i). The Delegate of Zimbabwe’s contribution had focussed on the different understanding of authenticity in an African compared to a universal context. His paper also referred to the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage in Africa. Whilst noting that no change had been suggested to cultural criteria (i) and (vi) it was deemed necessary to suggest sparing use and a better definition of exactly how they should be used. She suggested that the advisory bodies may wish to review the qualifying conditions used to apply cultural criteria (i) and (vi) as part of their work to propose revisions to Section I of the Operational Guidelines.

IX.8 The Delegate of Australia then made reference to discussions on the test of authenticity and the application of the conditions of integrity. For authenticity, the discussions had focused on the nature of authenticity as outlined in the Nara Declaration on Authenticity. The Delegate of Australia highlighted two issues that had emerged from discussions. Firstly she stressed the need for more rigour to deter over-restoration. She also indicated the need to understand the link between authenticity and cultural value. In this respect she expressed the overwhelming view of the Amsterdam meeting that authenticity provisions should be defined for each of the criteria used to justify properties for inclusion on the World Heritage List. Furthermore, she noted that when devising new authenticity and integrity provisions, reference also needed to be made to geo-cultural contexts.

IX.9 The Delegate of Australia made reference to the recommendation of the twenty-second session of the Bureau that had asked, that in line with the discussions at the Global Strategy Expert Meeting in Amsterdam, further work be undertaken on breaking down the cultural themes outlined at the 1994 Global Strategy Experts Meeting into sub-themes that would assist identification of those types places that are over- or under-represented on the World Heritage List. The Bureau had requested that this work should recognise the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage. The Delegate of Australia commented that for natural heritage a number of thematic studies have been carried out by IUCN in a global context. However, she noted the ICOMOS studies seemed to be based on types of properties rather than cultural themes.

IX.10 The Delegate of Canada gave a brief report on the Global Strategy meeting held in Amsterdam in March 1998. She reminded the members of the Committee that following the expert meeting on natural heritage held in the Parc de la Vanoise in 1996, the twentieth session of the Committee had requested a truly joint natural and cultural heritage expert meeting to discuss the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List*. She informed the Committee that the Amsterdam meeting had addressed four main points – (i) the application of the conditions of integrity versus the test of authenticity; (ii) the question of a unified or a harmonized set of criteria; (iii) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts; and, (iv) the credibility of the Convention and its implementation.

IX.11 The Delegate of Canada referred the Committee to the recommendations made in the report of the Amsterdam meeting for, (i) the existing natural and cultural heritage criteria to be unified into one single set of criteria to better reflect the continuum between nature and culture (Table 2 of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7); and (ii) the conditions of integrity (to include reference to the notion of authenticity) to be applied to both natural and cultural heritage (Table 3 of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7). She noted that the experts at Amsterdam asked that the World Heritage List reflect the broad spectrum of natural and cultural diversity and the outstanding relationships between people and the environment.

IX.12 With reference to the notion of outstanding universal value, the Delegate of Australia informed the Committee that a more regional and thematic approach to its interpretation deriving from broad themes and sub-themes had been recommended by the Amsterdam expert meeting. The expert group had noted that the implementation of the Global Strategy, using a regional and thematic approach, would be applied to fill in the gaps in the World Heritage List. The expert group had

acknowledged that good progress had been made in this regard but had recommended that steps be taken to accelerate its implementation.

IX.13 With regard to the credibility of the Convention and its implementation, the Delegate of Canada noted that the experts attending the Amsterdam meeting had stressed that inscription of a site on the World Heritage List is not a single event but part of a continuing process to ensure the protection of the values for which the site has been inscribed. The Delegate of Zimbabwe informed the Committee of the discussions on credibility of the Convention and its implementation that took place at the expert meeting in Amsterdam. He referred to the details of that discussion presented in Table 7 of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7. He noted that the working group on credibility at the Amsterdam meeting had emphasized that the cornerstone of the credibility of the World Heritage List is the rigorous monitoring of properties and the political commitment of the States Parties to their protection.

IX.14 With reference to the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi), the Committee did not suggest revisions. A number of Committee members did however suggest that a better understanding of the application of both criteria is required and explanatory text to accompany the criteria could be formulated to assist in this regard. It was noted that in applying cultural criterion (i), for example for rock art sites, it was important to go beyond reference to the ‘masterpiece of human creative genius’ to the landscape context which is inseparable to the meaning and prehistoric articulation of the landscape. The use of other cultural criteria and the three categories of cultural landscapes was noted as being important in this regard. A number of delegates and ICCROM stressed the need to finalise the work on bringing the natural and cultural criteria together and to expressing how they are to be used with greater clarity.

IX.15 Several delegates referred to the differential regional applications of the notion of authenticity. The Delegate of Greece made a statement that is included in Annex VIII.

IX.16 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.

IX.17 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.

IX.18 The Committee was of the general opinion that regionally specific approaches to the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List* (as adopted by the Committee as part of the Action Plan on the Global Strategy – see Section X) should be accelerated to ensure results. The Committee noted the need to use a more strategic approach to funding activities relating to underrepresented regions and themes.

IX.19 The Representative of IUCN reinforced the importance of there being one World Heritage that recognizes the nature-culture continuum. IUCN informed the Committee that they had discussed the concept of this continuum with IUCN members on several occasions, including the World Conservation Congress (Montreal 1996). The concept of one single set of criteria and the issue of a credible and representative World Heritage List reflecting cultural and natural diversity had received support among the IUCN membership. The IUCN Representative referred to their continuing work on thematic studies with new partners, including the WWF Global 200 Programme. He informed the Committee that IUCN sees further scope for cooperation with ICOMOS in relation to cultural landscapes, especially those with biodiversity values. He stated that the assessment of outstanding universal value in an international context and the maintenance of integrity and authenticity are key to ensuring the credibility of the World Heritage List.

IX.20 The Representatives of ICOMOS wished that attention be given to the actual inscription of a property on the World Heritage List rather than to the criteria, which may be considered as tools for analysis and which, furthermore, need not be mentioned in the published List. They insisted upon the importance of regular communication with the site managers so that they may be well informed of the debates taking place and take into account the reality of the field. Finally, they were of the opinion that the objectives of the Convention should be re-affirmed, that they do not have as aim the establishment of a list of the most prestigious properties, but first and foremost to implement international co-operation for the safeguarding of humankind's cultural heritage.

IX.21 The Chairperson thanked the Government of the Netherlands for hosting the Amsterdam Global Strategy meeting (March 1998) and the Committee, advisory bodies and observers for the rich and intensive debate. 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.

