

Distribution limited

WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9
Paris, 25 November 2004
Original : English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Seventh Extraordinary Session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II
6 – 11 December 2004

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Co-operation and coordination between UNESCO
Conventions concerning heritage**

SUMMARY

The World Heritage Committee considered at its 28th Session in 2004 (Decision **28 COM 12**) that the 33 C/5 should envisage greater coordination and cooperation between the World Heritage Centre and other sectors of UNESCO, as well as coordination between the 1972 *Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations relevant to cultural heritage, notably the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, and protected area programmes and Conventions adopted within and outside the framework of UNESCO.

Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 9: see point III

Annex I: Five case Studies

Annex II: Coordination between the Secretariats of Biodiversity related Conventions and Programmes

Coordination between the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations relevant to cultural heritage, notably the 2003 Convention of the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage

1. The World Heritage Committee considered at its 28th Session in 2004 (Decision **28 COM 12**) that the 33 C/5 “should envisage greater coordination and cooperation between the World Heritage Centre and other sectors of UNESCO, as well as coordination between the 1972 *Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations relevant to cultural heritage, notably the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, and protected area programmes and Conventions adopted within and outside the framework of UNESCO”. It requested the Secretariat to present a document on this matter at its 7th Extraordinary session.
2. Point I presents general consideration on the relationship between the 1972 *Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Protocols relevant to cultural heritage. Due to the practical importance of Conventions as binding instruments for their respective States Parties, and in view of the very short time allowed for the preparation of this document, the latter addresses only UNESCO Conventions and Protocols related to cultural heritage. UNESCO’s Recommendations and Declarations and those approved outside of the Organization are not addressed here. Point II focuses in more details on the 1972 and 2003 Conventions. A number of proposals are formulated for greater coordination, mutual reinforcement and for future discussion. Point III presents a draft decision the World Heritage Committee may wish to adopt.

I Relationship between the 1972 *Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Protocols relevant to cultural heritage

3. UNESCO has elaborated several standard-setting instruments aiming at the protection of cultural heritage. In addition to the 1972 *Convention* concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, cultural heritage is protected by the following UNESCO Conventions and Protocols: the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its 1954 and 1999 Protocols; the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property; the 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage; and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.
4. Each international legal instrument is operational *per se* among its States Parties according to its content and within its scope of application. Nevertheless, the need to ensure an integrated approach when addressing the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage is becoming increasingly relevant, as reaffirmed in the framework of the United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage celebrated in 2002. It is also crucial to take stock of the

evolution of both conceptual and legal progress towards an enhanced protection of cultural heritage and to make sure that implementation measures of all these instruments are coherent.

5. All Conventions apply to a different subject matter of protection. In some cases, one or more Conventions may apply to the same cultural heritage. While the 1972 World Heritage List usually addresses heritage on land, differently from the 2001 Convention, the 1970 Convention entails measures against illicit trafficking of cultural property which may be useful also to properties on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee at its 21st session (Naples, Italy, 1997) discussed the complementarity of the two Conventions and adopted a Recommendation concerning illicit traffic affecting World Heritage sites (Annex VIII of the Rapport of the Rapporteur). The Recommendation stressed the need to strengthen national legislation and invited States, not yet party, to consider becoming party to the 1954 and 1970 Conventions as well as the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995). As a further example, the 1972 *Convention* and the 1954 Convention both apply to the Old Town of Dubrovnik for different aspects and contents of protection, respectively its outstanding universal value and the obligation for its protection during armed conflict. In these cases, the regimes of protection provided by different Conventions to the same cultural heritage are mutually beneficial.
6. With reference to the instruments addressing tangible heritage (the 1972 *Convention* and the 1999 Protocol to the Hague Convention), the conditions required for the inscription of a cultural property in the World Heritage List are different from those required for inscriptions in the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection under the 1999 Second Protocol. Even if a State is party to both instruments, there is no automatic transfer or inclusion of cultural property from the World Heritage List to the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection, or vice-versa. Indeed, a cultural property may be inscribed in both such Lists only where both sets of applicable conditions are deemed fulfilled by the respective Committees according to the 1972 *Convention* and the 1999 Protocol, following the specific requests addressed by the States Parties.
7. In such a case of a double listing of the same cultural property, the latter would benefit from both regimes of protection to the extent that they are applicable. For instance, if such a property is destroyed during an armed conflict, such destruction would face an efficient sanction under the 1999 Protocol but not solely under the 1972 *Convention*. Indeed, the latter does not provide directly for such sanctions.
8. The 1972 and 2003 Conventions, as well as the 1999 Protocol, entail a “List(s)” system and an important administrative apparatus, in the form an Intergovernmental Committee. Also these instruments operate according to their scope and content. Each instrument determines, among others, the functions of its respective Committee, whether and to which extent such body

may develop guidelines for the implementation of the instrument, and the conditions according to which the Committee may inscribe a cultural property in a “List”. Conditions for inscription of cultural property in a “List” are specific to each instrument. Nevertheless, the protection of a same cultural heritage within two distinctive Conventions may raise concern both in the management plan and the measures envisaged for its protection. The coordination of such distinctive measures may call for is generally ensured by the relevant authorities of the State Party at the level of the national implementation of its obligations under the different Conventions. Such coordination should also apply at the international level, both when preparing the Tentative Lists and when elaborating the management plans.

II Relationship between the 1972 and the 2003 Conventions

9. At the time of the adoption of the *World Heritage Convention*, more than 30 years ago, UNESCO Member States discussed, but did not retain, the possibility of including intangible heritage within the framework of the Convention. UNESCO has since developed a number of initiatives aiming at the safeguarding of such heritage, including the Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore in 1989, the Living Human Treasure Systems in 1994, and the Proclamation of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 1997. In the early 1990s, many Member States started to express themselves as being in favor of the development of a legal instrument that would recognize manifestations of intangible cultural heritage worldwide and that would complement the 1972 *Convention*.
10. The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO on 17 October 2003. To date, five States have ratified this Convention and the procedures for further ratifications are progressing rapidly in many other Member States. The 2003 Convention will enter into force three months after the deposit with the Director-General of UNESCO of the 30th instrument of ratification, and if the process continues at its current pace, the first General Assembly and Intergovernmental Committee of the 2003 Convention might be convened in 2006.
11. The 1972 and 2003 Conventions have been drafted by Member States to address different forms of heritage and therefore to have different scopes: the 1972 *Convention* covers primarily tangible natural¹ and cultural heritage, while the 2003 Convention applies to intangible cultural heritage (the respective scopes are reproduced in boxes 1 and 2).

¹ For natural heritage, see Annex II

Box 1: Definition of the Cultural and the Natural Heritage as provided in Article 1 and 2 of the 1972 *Convention* concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural heritage

Article 1

For the purposes of this *Convention*, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”:

- monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

Article 2

For the purposes of this *Convention*, the following shall be considered as “natural heritage”:

- natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;
- geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;
- natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

Box 2: Definition of the Intangible Cultural Heritage as provided in Article 2 of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage

For the purposes of this Convention,

Article 2.1

the “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.

Article 2.2

the “intangible cultural heritage”, as defined in paragraph 1 above, is manifested *inter alia* in the following domains:

- (a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;
- (b) performing arts;
- (c) social practices, rituals and festive events;
- (d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;
- (e) traditional craftsmanship.

12. The 1972 *Convention* in its definition of “sites” includes “combined works of man and nature”. Since the first adoption by the World Heritage Committee of the *Operational Guidelines* in 1977, the World Heritage Committee initiated a process of revision of these in order to reflect new concepts, knowledge or experiences. In the context of the reflection generated by the United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage (2002) and the 30th Anniversary of the 1972 *Convention*, promoting an integrated vision of cultural heritage, the World Heritage Committee recalled the importance of “living traditions”, “ideas”, “beliefs”, “artistic and literary works” or “traditional human settlements” (cultural criteria (vi) and (v) respectively, see Box 3), whose the Outstanding Universal Value justifies the inscription on the World Heritage List of the

tangible properties they are associated with.² It may therefore cover intangible cultural heritage to the extent that is associated with tangible cultural heritage.

Box 3: Cultural Criteria (v) and (vi) as formulated in the 2002 version of the *Operational Guidelines of the 1972 Convention*

Criterion C (v): to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

Criterion C (vi): to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural).

13. The 2004 proposed *Operational Guidelines* provide the increased possibility to take into consideration elements of the intangible cultural heritage for inscription on the World Heritage List under the 1972 *Convention* (Decision **6 EXT.COM 5.1**).

- Revised criterion (v) adds the possibility to inscribe a property that is “an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change”. It also acknowledges that “human activities, including those of traditional societies and local communities, often occur in natural areas; these activities may be consistent with the outstanding universal value of the area where they are ecologically sustainable.” However, it should be noted that provisions on “cultural spaces” and “human activities, including those of traditional societies and local communities” are provided under the 2003 Convention.
- Revised criterion (vi) may facilitate the inscription of certain cultural landscapes, including associative cultural landscapes, for which cultural material evidence may be insignificant or even absent, as it specifies “to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal value (the Committee considers that this criterion should *preferably* be

² Nine World Heritage properties are so far inscribed solely on the basis of criterion (vi), whereas 162 properties are inscribed under criterion (vi) in conjunction with other criteria. There are 97 sites inscribed under criterion (v), some of which also contain intangible elements when they concern traditional human settlements. Furthermore, natural criterion (iii), which refers to ‘exceptional beauty and aesthetic importance’, has been used in conjunction with criteria (v) and (vi) for the inscription of at least six World Heritage properties that include intangible heritage as defined by the 2003 Convention. Cf. *Operational Guidelines*, Provisional Revision, *WHC.02/2* July 2002, paragraph 24 (a).

used in conjunction with other criteria)".³ This revision shows the rightly grounded concern expressed by Member States for an integrated approach to cultural heritage protection, therefore including the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage elements. It aims to meet this concern by enhancing the provisions of such protection under the 1972 *Convention*. However, the scope of the 1972 *Convention* being the protection of the tangible heritage, UNESCO Member States decided to elaborate a new convention targeting specifically the intangible cultural heritage, which was adopted in 2003.

14. The 2003 Convention applies to intangible cultural heritage. It covers tangible instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces only to the extent that they are associated with intangible cultural heritage. Among the domains of intangible cultural heritage to which the Convention may apply, "knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe" and "traditional craftsmanship" may address domains where conservation of tangible heritage is at stake.⁴
15. The relationships between tangible and intangible cultural heritage attract growing professional attention, as testified by the session devoted to "Place-Memory-Meaning preserving Intangible values in monuments and sites" during the 14th General Assembly of ICOMOS (27-31 October 2003, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe), the session on "Museum and Intangible Heritage" during the ICOM 2004 General Conference (2-8 October 2004, Seoul, Korea) and the International Conference on the Safeguarding of Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Towards an Integrated Approach (19-23 October 2004, Nara, Japan).
16. The analysis of such relationships have indicated, among others, the essential differences which exist between tangible and intangible heritage, as well as among the different means and measures of their respective protection and safeguarding. Such differences may be summarized as follows:
 - The associative values of many World Heritage properties are not automatically to be considered as intangible heritage for the purposes of the 2003 Convention. Associative values of monuments and sites that do not belong to the heritage of present day people living within or near them are not covered by the 2003 Convention, however interesting and well documented they may be.
 - Most manifestations of the intangible cultural heritage do not depend for their enactment on a specific building or place. This holds as a rule for traditional music, oral traditions and knowledge about nature and the universe. Knowledge and skills are stored in the minds of tradition bearers and communities, and the audible and visible manifestations of the

³ Revision of *Operational Guidelines* (WHC-03 27COM, Annex 3 paragraph 10.iii).

⁴ 2003 Convention, article 2, paragraphs 1, 2 (d) and 2 (e).

intangible cultural heritage are temporary and ephemeral. The 2003 Convention aims at safeguarding knowledge and processes rather than at protecting products.

- Authenticity is also of an unequal relevance. While World Heritage properties must fulfil the test of authenticity in terms of “design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components”⁵, intangible cultural heritage as defined by the 2003 Convention is evolving continuously and therefore a reference to the concept of authenticity was omitted.
 - “Protection” and “safeguarding” measures also differ according to the nature of the heritage at stake. The latter measures under the 2003 Convention refer to measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification⁶, inventory-making,⁷ documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission (particularly through formal and non-formal education), as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage.
17. Such and other differences are also reflected in the two Conventions. As a matter of example, while the 1972 *Convention* addresses only cultural and natural heritage of “outstanding universal value”, the 2003 Convention deliberately did not retain such a limitation in scope and it apprehends any intangible cultural heritage as defined by its Article 2. The proposed *Operational Guidelines* indicate that “outstanding universal value” means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity (WHC-03/27COM/10 paragraph I.C.3). The proposed *Operational Guidelines* thereby underline that the value of cultural heritage can be determined by international comparison, whereas the 2003 Convention identifies the value of cultural heritage on the basis of its representative character for the community concerned. The diversity of approach is self-evident.

⁵ The revised *Operational Guidelines*, in its paragraph II.D.5, reinforce the use of intangible elements for determining the authenticity of properties nominated to the World Heritage List: “[...] properties may be understood to meet the test of authenticity if their cultural value [...] is truthfully and credibly expressed through [...] attributes including: [...] traditions [...] language, and other forms of intangible heritage; spirit and feeling [...]”.

⁶ Among the measures to be taken at the national level, the 2003 Convention highlights the need to identify and define elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in a State Party’s territory, with the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organisations.

⁷ Articles 11-12 of the 2003 Convention: Other measures proposed are the adoption of a general policy aimed at promoting the function of the intangible cultural heritage in society, and the integration of the safeguarding of such heritage into planning programmes; designation or establishment of one or more competent bodies for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory; fostering scientific, technical and artistic studies, as well as research methodologies; adoption of appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures. The Convention also proposes specific measures related to education, awareness raising and capacity building, and measures aiming at safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage at the international level (articles 13-15).

18. While the relationship between the two Conventions is clearly stipulated in Article 3 of the 2003 Convention, which provides that the 2003 Convention is not to be interpreted as altering the status or the level of obligations contracted under the 1972 *Convention*, the issue of coordination between the two Conventions remains relevant.
19. In light of the above, and pending the entry into force of the 2003 Convention, UNESCO will ensure proper coordination to assist the States Parties concerned in elaborating and taking protection and safeguarding measures, respectively of the tangible and intangible aspects of heritage, which are appropriate under, and in conformity with, both Conventions, as regards identification, listing, nomination, protection and safeguarding measures of cultural heritage.
20. UNESCO will continue to stimulate intellectual debate and reflection concerning issues that need to be elaborated in order to ensure appropriate and coordinated safeguarding of cultural heritage in all its forms, while taking into account changing approaches towards the cultural heritage and new modalities for its protection and safeguarding. Such a process could eventually lead to a revision of the *Operational Guidelines* under the 1972 *Convention* following the entry into force of the 2003 Convention, and in the light of the experience gained in its application.

The World Heritage Committee may wish to adopt the following draft decision (~~WHC/04/7 EXT.COM/9~~):

III. Draft Decision

Draft Decision : 7 EXT.COM 9

The World Heritage Committee:

1. *Recalling Decision 6 EX COM 5.1 concerning the revision of the Operational Guidelines,*
2. *Taking note of the Decision 28 COM 12 (paragraph 9) calling for “greater coordination and co-operation between the World Heritage Centre and other sectors of UNESCO, as well as coordination between the 1972 Convention and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations relevant to cultural heritage, notably the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage”,*
3. *Takes note of the document WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9 and in particular of the general considerations on the relationship between the 1972 Convention and other UNESCO Conventions and Protocols relevant to cultural heritage, as well as the proposal for greater coordination, mutual reinforcement and for future discussion,*

4. *Invites the Director-General to ensure that such a coordination applies at all levels, when assisting State Parties for the identification, listing, nomination, protection and safeguarding measures of cultural heritage under 1972 and 2003 Conventions;*
5. *Further invites the Director-General to continue to stimulate intellectual debate and reflection concerning the interconnectedness between the intangible and tangible cultural heritage, with a view, inter alia, to eventually proposing a revision of the Operational Guidelines under the 1972 Convention, in the light of the forthcoming entry into force of the 2003 Convention.*

ANNEX I: Five Case Studies

Five case studies are provided here in order to illustrate different types of interdependence between tangible and intangible heritage:

1. **The Medina of Marrakech** in Morocco may serve as model of a historic city centre where significant tangible and intangible manifestations of cultural heritage are found together. The Medina includes within its boundaries the cultural space of the Jemaa el Fna square, a “veritable open-air theatre”⁸, which at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1985 was already used as an argument for the establishment of a list focusing on intangible heritage. This Square, which should be seen as an integral part of the market area (*souks*), was proclaimed as a cultural space under the programme of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2001, and may be transferred to the List of Intangible Heritage of the 2003 Convention after its entry into force. As a result, the Medina of Marrakech will benefit from the protection under two international conventions.
2. **The Cliff of Bandiagara (The Land of the Dogons)** in Mali is an example of a mixed World Heritage property with exceptional natural value and prominent intangible aspects, for which the 2003 Convention might provide an additional framework of protection. It was inscribed in 1989 under natural criterion (iii) and cultural criterion (v). ICOMOS questioned at the time of the first nomination “what [was] the intention to protect, materially and topographically” in an area of about 400,000 hectares, and wondered whether “a civilization, no matter how rich it may be, constitute[s] a cultural property in the sense that this term is defined by ICOMOS”.⁹ The need to safeguard intangible aspects of the property was indicated by ICOMOS in its evaluation in 1989, highlighting “the precarious preservation of [...] traditional habitats and handicraft techniques, lifestyles and way of thinking which helped the Dogon people to survive”.¹⁰ Furthermore, IUCN stressed the link between intangible heritage and the environment by stating that “the region is one of the main centres for the Dogon culture, rich in ancient traditions and rituals, art culture and folklore. [...] Symbolic relationships occur with the environment such as with semi-domesticated crocodiles, pale fox and the jackal, and the development of elaborate masks, head dresses and ritual dances”.¹¹
3. **The Tongariro Park** in New Zealand, which was the first property inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape, is an example of a property that could also benefit from safeguarding measures envisaged within the framework of the 2003 Convention. The Park was first inscribed in 1990 under natural criteria (ii) and (iii), and cultural criterion (vi) was added in 1993. This was justified because the mountains at the heart of the park have cultural and religious significance for the Maori people, and symbolize the spiritual links between them and their environment. The addition of

⁸ As stated in the brief description of the nomination dossier.

⁹ ICOMOS evaluation of the nomination dossier *The Land of Dogons*, 1981.

¹⁰ ICOMOS evaluation, N° 516, April 1989.

¹¹ World Heritage property of the *Cliff of Bandiagara (The Land of the Dogons)*, inscribed in 1989 under criteria N (iii) and C (v).

cultural criterion (vi) was a reflection of the establishment at national level of specific legislation to protect the intangible value of the property.

4. **Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)** in Italy may serve as an example of a cultural landscape for which the preservation of its outstanding universal value is strongly linked to the transmission of associated intangible heritage. The property was inscribed in 1997 because of the “harmonious interaction between people and nature to produce a landscape of exceptional scenic quality that illustrates a traditional way of life that has existed for a thousand years and continues to play an important socio-economic role in the life of the community”.¹² When tourism increasingly became a more profitable source of income, the inhabitants of the area started to neglect the traditional agriculture methods and land conservation techniques on the escarped slopes, leading to the deterioration of the landscape. The exceptional scenic quality of this landscape is therefore negatively affected by the disappearance of its associated intangible elements.

5. **The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras** in the Philippines were inscribed in 1995 and were also included in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2001; the Hudhud Chants of the Ifugao people who work on these terraces were proclaimed a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2001. The Terraces and the Hudhud Chants, which are sung during the sowing season and the rice harvest, are intimately related and present a unique interdependence of a World Heritage property and a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. The knowledge and skills handed down from generation to generation, and a delicate social balance, have helped to create a landscape and musical and other cultural traditions that testify to the harmony between people and their environment. Both the terraces and the chants are endangered; local experts and practitioners claim that coordinated protection actions are in order and that neither the terraces nor the chants can be safeguarded in isolation.

¹² Justification for Inscription in the Nomination file, 1997.

ANNEX II: COORDINATION BETWEEN THE SECRETARIATS OF BIODIVERSITY RELATED CONVENTIONS AND PROGRAMMES

	UNESCO		UNEP		
	Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB) 1971	Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (RAMSAR) ¹³ 1971	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) 1992	Convention on Migratory Species of wild animals (CMS) 1979	Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species of wild fauna and flora (CITES) 1973
Objectives	Biosphere Reserves are areas of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems which are internationally recognized within the framework of UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	The conservation and wise use of all wetlands through local, regional and national actions and international cooperation	The conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components. The Convention text notes that a fundamental requirement for the conservation of biological diversity is the in-situ conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats and the maintenance and recovery of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings	To conserve terrestrial, marine and avian migratory species throughout their range	To ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival
In force since	N/A	1975	1993	1983	1975
Memorandum of Understanding	N/A	1999 (WHC specific)	2004 (WHC specific, UNDP)	2002 (UNESCO)	N/A
State Parties/ratifications	N/A	141	188	86	154
World Heritage Involvement	76 Biosphere Reserves are wholly or partly (natural or cultural landscape) World Heritage sites (of a total of 440 Biosphere reserves in 97 countries)	24 Ramsar sites are wholly or partly World Heritage sites, offering the opportunity to coordinate some activities Ramsar maintains the Montreux Record; four sites are both on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the Montreux Record	Coordinated activities: participation in regular Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice meetings providing technical input to CBD policy and decisions. Notably, the WHC was involved in the development of the CBD programme of work on protected areas. Both Convention secretariats are members of the Biodiversity Liaison Group with the other biodiversity conventions, to ensure enhanced coordination of activities; WHC received invitation by the CBD secretariat to develop a joint programme of work; participation in the CBD Conference of the States Parties (the most recent being COP VII, February 2004)	Discussions on site specific activities between the Secretariats (on-going for example for the safeguarding of gorillas in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Uganda border area)	Discussions on site-specific issues between the Secretariats, including cooperation with CITES on the Monitoring of Illegal Killing of Elephants project in Central Africa

Biodiversity related Conventions and Programmes

The World Heritage Centre is participating in efforts to improve the co-operation with other Biodiversity related Conventions and Programmes. At the 7th Conference of the States Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), it was decided to establish a joint liaison group between all biodiversity related Conventions (CBD, Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), the Convention on Wetlands (RAMSAR) and the *World Heritage Convention*) to enhance synergies and reduce inefficiencies in a manner consistent with their respective mandates. A joint programme of work is currently under discussion with the Secretariat of CBD. Collaboration was further enhanced with the participation of the World Heritage Centre in the Convention Reporting harmonization process, invited by UNEP and WCMC. The World Heritage Centre is a member of the International Steering Committee for the International Biodiversity Science and Governance Conference organised by the Government of France in co-operation with UNESCO, at the UNESCO premises in January 2005. The Centre is also participating in the UNEP project entitled: "Issue based modular approach to the coherent implementation of the biodiversity related conventions". Major coordination activities between Conventions and Programmes were also discussed during the 5th World Parks Congress (Durban, South Africa, September 2003). The resulting Durban Action Plan, in one of its key targets on the role of World Heritage sites in biodiversity conservation, calls upon the World Heritage Committee to give priority to the integration with the other international biodiversity related Conventions. Efforts are also underway within the UNESCO Secretariat to improve cooperation with the Natural Sciences Sector, particularly the Division of Ecological Sciences, Division of Hydrology, and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, through the establishment of an informal biodiversity working group.

¹³ Ratification instruments for RAMSAR are deposited in UNESCO.

