

Distribution limited

CLT-92/CONF.003/10

30 June 1992

Original: 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

Sixteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, 6-10 July 1992
Room XVI

Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: Study of the elements of
a strategy for the future.

The preparation of a strategy for the future is based on the conclusions of the evaluation report, document CLT-92/CONF.003/9, which were presented and discussed in depth by a small group of experts from the States Parties, IUCN and ICCROM, convened in Washington, DC, USA, 22-24 June 1992, at the invitation of the Government of the United States of America. The summary of the discussions and main recommendations of the meeting are presented in Appendix I.

The members of the Bureau will recall that at its fifteenth session in Carthage, Tunisia, in December 1991, the Committee expressed the wish that the preparation of the strategy for the future be undertaken in connection with the Resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO on 6 November 1991. The UNESCO Executive Board studied this question at its 139th session held in Paris from 18-27 May 1992, at the initiative of Italy. The Board held it appropriate to concentrate for the moment on the improvement of the current system rather than undertake a revision of the text of the Convention. In accordance with the Resolution of the General Conference, a report on the means to reinforce UNESCO's action in the safeguarding of the

World Heritage is being drafted by the Secretariat and will be submitted by the Director-General at the next session of the Executive Board in November. The Executive Board has decided to wait until the report is submitted before taking a decision as whether or not a consultative group of experts on the question be created. See Appendix II for the Executive Board's decision.

The members of the Bureau are invited to examine the recommendations made by the experts who met in Washington and make their comments and suggestions. On the basis of the Bureau's recommendations, the Secretariat will prepare a draft strategy which will be sent to all States Parties for comments. If necessary, the Secretariat will convene a small group of experts during late October/early November to finalize the document for submission to the Committee. Moreover, it is proposed that the Bureau meets two days before the Committee at Santa Fe, together with a few invited experts to finalize the draft strategy. This document will be adopted by the Committee.

After its adoption, the strategy should be published and widely distributed amongst policy-makers, the press and funding bodies, in order to mobilize the support of the different actors for the benefit of the Convention.

EXPERT MEETING FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING UNDER THE WORLD HERITAGE
CONVENTION IN WASHINGTON D.C. 22-24 JUNE 1992

A meeting of World Heritage experts was held in Washington D.C. from 22-24 June 1992 to elaborate a basis for a strategic plan for the reinforcement of the effective implementation of the World Heritage Convention over the next ten years. The meeting was organized by the recently established UNESCO World Heritage Centre and hosted by the US Department of the Interior. It was attended by twenty World Heritage experts in their personal capacity coming from States Parties as well as by World Heritage Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS) and the World Heritage Centre. For the list of participants please see Annex I.

The meeting was opened by Mrs. Salisbury, who in her capacity as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks of the US Department of the Interior, welcomed participants. She underlined the importance the United States allocates to the World Heritage Convention. The strategic planning meeting will be an input element for a successful World Heritage Committee session of Santa Fé/New Mexico in December. She expressed her wish for fruitful discussions which would result in a report to be submitted to the World Heritage Bureau.

Mr. von Droste, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, transmitted best wishes of the Director General of UNESCO for the success of the meeting. He expressed warm thanks to the United States and the Department of the Interior for hosting the meeting. He outlined previous initiatives of the United States to the World Heritage Convention and stated that the twentieth anniversary of the Convention provided an occasion to review its implementation since its adoption in 1972.

Mr. Knute Knudson, Deputy Chief of Staff, US Department of Interior, joined the meeting and presented greetings on behalf of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

The meeting elected Mrs. Cameron by acclamation as chairperson. Mr. Leon Pressouyre and Mr. Andy Turner were designated as rapporteurs.

It was decided to organize the work of the meeting under the following themes:

1. Examination of the World Heritage Convention and its links with other legal instruments
2. The structure for implementing the World Heritage Convention (Committee, Secretariat, advisory bodies)
3. The implementation of the Convention (List, Fund, Management, Promotion)
4. The role of the General Assembly.

Mr. Beschaouch was asked to introduce each of these sections based on his draft evaluation report prepared for the World Heritage Committee. Discussions were also based on recommendations contained in documents made available for the meeting:

- (a) Joint Canada-US proposal for improving work under the World Heritage Convention;
- (b) Proposals submitted by ICOMOS;
- (c) Proposals submitted by IUCN;
- (d) Resolutions of the 24th General Conference of UNESCO and the 139th Executive Board to reinforce UNESCO's action for the protection of the world's cultural heritage.

A summary of the discussions and main recommendations of the meeting are given in the subsequent sections of the report.

I. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Summary of the discussion

The World Heritage Convention is one of the most universal of all the conventions concerning the conservation of natural and cultural heritage; however not all Member States of UNESCO have ratified it, and at present 125 States Parties belong. The Secretariat must therefore continue to promote the adherence to the Convention by states which have not yet ratified it.

The Group agreed that the Convention is a satisfactory instrument because of its clarity and its flexibility allows the Committee to implement it accordingly. The periodic review and revision of the Operational Guidelines of the Convention therefore allows for adaptation in the application of the Convention

regarding new issues and needs encountered during its implementation.

Furthermore, the Convention permits the Director-General of UNESCO to intervene when necessary, in time of war or peace. In many cases, these interventions have had positive effects. Thus, insufficiencies lies not in the legal framework, but rather in the means available for interventions.

The Hague Convention foresees rather complicated mechanisms which make its application difficult. A revision of these mechanisms would certainly be useful to make their application simpler and more efficient."

The World Heritage Convention should be considered within the larger context of other texts, conventions and recommendations on the conservation of heritage. Links with the different instruments in question must be reinforced to ensure respect for all the provision which direct this conservation effort.

Recommendations

All efforts should be made to encourage states which have not yet adhered to the Convention to ratify it.

The Strategic Planning Group recommended not to revise the World Heritage Convention, but the Operational Guidelines could be periodically amended.

The links between the World Heritage Convention and other Conventions (The Hague Convention, Geneva Convention, Ramsar Convention, CITES, Biodiversity Convention, etc.) should be reinforced, in particular by recommending that the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention also adhere to these other conventions and organize consultations between the Secretariats.

II. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

General recommendation

The three organs which serve for the implementation of the Convention, namely the Committee, the Secretariat and the advisory bodies, must fulfil their role in an harmonious manner.

1. The Committee

Summary of the discussion

Discussions centred around two main considerations:

- how to ensure an adequate level of expertise within the Committee so that it can deal with scientific and technical questions submitted for its consideration.
- how to better manage the Committee's agenda.

Concerning the first point it is appropriate to ensure that all Member States of the Committee be represented by experts at its sessions as is foreseen in the Convention. Financial aid from the World Heritage Fund should be available to facilitate the participation of experts. Moreover, the Group stated that the Committee should call upon outside expertise more frequently when necessary, as outlined in the Convention. This outside expertise could, in some cases, provide a more equal geographical and cultural representation within the Committee.

The second point addressed by the Group was the better distribution of the work within the Committee in order to avoid overburdening the Bureau, and to set up subcommittees to examine specific questions. The Bureau would continue to be responsible for the assessment of nominations to the World Heritage List.

The proposal of establishing debate procedures leading more easily to a vote, replies to the concern of better understanding and reflecting the opinion of each delegation. However, the Group underlined that the use of the vote should be minimized so as to avoid politicizing the debates, and because this procedure is not always suitable for discussions of a scientific and technical nature.

Finally, the idea of establishing a biannual cycle is undoubtedly advantageous for the better utilization of the Committee's time, but the Group pointed out that there are certain difficulties, especially in dealing with urgent questions. These difficulties should be seriously studied before a decision can be taken in this regard. This point was discussed again by the Group in the context of the World Heritage List.

Recommendations

In order to ensure the application of Article 9.3 of the Convention regarding the representation of States Parties by experts and professionals in the field of conservation, the Group recommends:

- that the States advise the Secretariat prior to the Committee meeting of the names and the professional qualifications of their representatives, and the Secretariat could remind them of their obligations in this respect.
- that, when necessary, the participation of experts, not only from least developed countries (LDCs) but also from other developing countries should be financed from the Fund.
- that, in conformity with Article 10.2 of the Convention, the Committee invites public and private institutions and/or qualified individuals to participate in the sessions of the Committee as observers, thereby reinforcing its expertise. In selecting these observers, utmost care must be taken to maintain an equitable geographical, natural and cultural balance within the Committee. They will be consulted on specific issues.

In view of improving the functioning of the Committee the Group recommends:

- that special subcommittees be established during the sessions of the Committee to examine issues such as the budget, the follow-up/monitoring and the state of conservation of properties, international assistance requests, as well as the revision of the **Operational Guidelines**. These subcommittees will report back to the Committee;
- that meetings of the outgoing Bureau be convened prior to the ordinary sessions of the Committee, facilitating an active participation of the outgoing members who will no longer be members of the new Committee;
- that more rigorous procedures for debate be instituted within the Committee to allow each member of the Bureau to express his/her position, eventually by vote, without excluding the possibility of consensus.

- that the rule prohibiting the representative of the State Party from intervening to support a proposition for inscription from his own country be applied more strictly;
- that the possibility of reducing the agenda of the Committee by the establishment of a biannual cycle be considered: the Committee would therefore alternately, first and foremost deal with inscriptions on the World Heritage List one year, and during the next, with matters of management. Emergency cases may, nevertheless, be discussed on a regular basis.

2. The Secretariat

Summary of the discussion

The Group considered that the creation of the World Heritage Centre by the Director-General of UNESCO would unite the so far dispersed natural and cultural parts of the Secretariat. It underlined the fact, that the Centre should benefit from all means and flexibility necessary for the management of the World Heritage Fund and for the collection of additional resources, including bilateral funds.

The Group referred on the one hand to the precarious situation of the Regular Programme budget and, on the other, to the general rules relating to the management of extrabudgetary funds, estimating that the Centre should be allocated a fixed percentage of the Fund to cover a part of its personnel expenses.

Recommendation

The Group noted with satisfaction the establishment of the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO which will permit the improvement of a unified approach by the Secretariat on questions relating to world cultural and natural heritage, as well as the reinforcement of its means.

The Group recommended that temporary assistance provided so far to the Secretariat by the World Heritage Fund should now be replaced by permanent assistance provided by the Fund through a fixed percentage; the Group suggested that this percentage be set by the Committee at its next meeting, at a rate which may range from 10-15% in accordance with the general management rules established by the UN system for extra-budgetary funds.

The Group furthermore recommended that the Director-General of UNESCO provides all necessary means to ensure the adequate functioning of the Centre, and that States Parties to the Convention be encouraged to send associate experts to the Centre, as professional staff to reinforce it.

3. Consultative Bodies (ICOMOS/IUCN/ICCROM)

Summary of the discussion

The Group discussed the concept of heritage which must increasingly be considered a part of the sustainable development process, and no longer be limited to cultural heritage on one side, and natural heritage on the other. This idea goes beyond the notion of mixed sites or landscapes and implies a broader vision, especially in the light of the debate and conclusions of the Rio Conference.

The Group estimated that IUCN possessed a broad and diversified network and the necessary expertise, but that this is not yet the case with ICOMOS. The lack of means of this organization, which prevents it from completing a number of the tasks which the Committee would like to assign it, such as comparative studies, was also discussed. As to ICCROM, its role in the development of conservation theory was underlined as well as its capacity to serve the Convention in the field of documentation and research, as well as in training.

The Group has, moreover, underlined the role which other organizations can fulfil, such as ICOM, especially in the concept of site museums, but also the different services of UNESCO which the Centre could call upon.

Recommendations

The Group noted with satisfaction the high quality of work achieved by the two organizations in charge of the evaluation of nominations for the inscription of sites on the World Heritage List.

The Group stressed the fact that cultural and natural heritage should no longer be envisaged separately. The Group considered that it is imperative to promote a common philosophy integrating human and environmental dimensions of this heritage and recommended that the Centre to take all steps necessary in this regard.

The Group furthermore recommended that all support be given to reinforce the structure and expertise of ICOMOS and IUCN.

Concerning ICOMOS, the Group recommended that the States Parties be urged to more actively support National Committees, and that ICOMOS try to achieve a better representation of the various disciplines concerned, following the example of IUCN.

The Group recommended that an enhanced participation of ICCROM in the implementation of the Convention be undertaken in matters other than that of training.

More specifically, the Group recommended the establishment of a real partnership between the three organs and the Centre in technical matters as well as ethics and principles of conservation so as to avoid the notion that these organizations merely have the role of providing services.

Finally, the Group recommended that the Centre establish a list of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and other institutions with which closer links would be desirable and which could additionally be consulted by the Committee on specific issues in compliance with Article 10.1 of the Convention.

III IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

1. World Heritage List

Summary of the discussion

The Group examined the means for limiting the number of inscriptions on the List, while progressively filling in the gaps which still exist. Although the Group did not consider it neither desirable or possible to set a quantitative limit to the List, it nevertheless examined the various means to slow down the rate of inscriptions while ensuring a rigorous examination of the nominations.

To fill the existing gaps, the simplest method remains to encourage the establishment of indicative lists. However, this can stimulate national and political biases, occasionally to the detriment of cultural minorities. Additionally, some countries are unable to establish these lists. It is the Centre's task to avoid these risks by encouraging regional consultations and more systematic provision of preparatory assistance to those countries.

The obligation of establishing an indicative list before proposing the inscription of a property must be considered flexible; it should not be applied when the inscription of a property is urgent, nor in the case of natural heritage.

The Group underlined the limits of the global study, particularly of the traditional art history approach which can not be applied to all cultures. For these cultures, a new approach needs to be defined.

Concerning the criteria, the Group estimated that an expert meeting should be convened, namely to review the formulation of the criteria in the Operational Guidelines in the light of the difficulties encountered in their application and the developing concept of heritage. Additionally, the concepts of integrity and authenticity should not be subject to an over-restrictive interpretation, which might lead to the exclusion from the former of the process of anthropisation, and from the latter of a whole category of properties made of degradable, therefore evolutive materials, or reconstructed periodically.

Recommendations

The Group recommended that no quantitative limitation be set for the List, but however to encourage States Parties to provide the Committee with indicative lists, and to provide those countries which have not yet established lists with preparatory assistance in a more systematic manner.

As to the proposals for inscription presented on an annual basis, the Group does not consider a quantitative limitation necessary. However, in order to deal with the difficulties encountered by the Committee for an objective and sound evaluation, the Group suggests that several complementary solutions could be considered: requirement from the States that they provide more complete files and respect the deadlines set by the Operational Guidelines; that the members of the Committee receive all available documentation; that the evaluators be given more time by forwarding the date for the annual Bureau meeting; and possibly to adopt a biannual cycle for the Committee's agenda (see Recommendations on the Committee).

The Group has recommended that the possibility be considered of a clause requiring a periodical review of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, in order to evaluate at the end of a predetermined period whether the sites are still consistent to the criteria which justified their inscription.

With a view to ensuring a better representation on the List, the Group recommended that the Centre study with the competent and relevant experts the gaps in the list and their means of remedy.

The Group furthermore recommended that a critical evaluation should be undertaken for revisiting the selection of criteria of cultural and natural heritage, including those of authenticity and integrity.

Finally, the Group recommended that the features justifying the inscription of the property on the List, and therefore guiding its future management, be specified for each inscription.

2. The List of World Heritage in Danger

Summary of the discussion

The Group estimated that this issue has many different aspects, depending on the case. For instance, the case of Dubrovnik showed the need for the Committee to have the ability in an emergency case to inscribe a property without a prior request by the State concerned and without a request to the Committee for assistance from the Fund. Conversely, in the case of danger, a consultation with the State concerned, revealed indispensable in the case of Garamba National Park in Zaire for the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, helped to mobilize funding for its conservation. In fact, in most cases, the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be used to raise this funding and an explanation to the States will be necessary for them to consider the inscription from that point of view.

Moreover, the problem arises when the State concerned, while wishing for the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, is not requesting financial assistance from the Fund. In such cases, the Group held that the concept of assistance should be broadened to cover the pressure which the Committee can exert by mobilizing the public opinion through the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Recommendations

According to the Group, the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should not be considered a sanction but a declaration by a State requiring safeguarding measures and should provide a means to mobilize resources to this end. The Group therefore recommended that the Centre promote this conception among States Parties.

The Group recommended, however, that the Operational Guidelines be modified to allow the inscription of a site without a preliminary request from the State concerned.

The assistance foreseen in Article 11.4 of the Convention may take the form of messages issued by the Committee which call public attention to a potential or imminent threat, and may be requested

by any Committee member. Paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines will be modified accordingly.

3. Withdrawal of a Property from the World Heritage List

Summary of the discussion

The issue of whether withdrawal from the List could be made without the consent of the State concerned was discussed. On the one hand, the possibility of applying this exclusion procedure would undoubtedly constitute a threat regarding States which do not respect their obligations. On the other, the exclusion of a property should be considered only as a last resort which justifies that it occurs only in consultation with the State concerned as foreseen by the Operational Guidelines. The Group once again raised the possibility of establishing a periodical review of the properties to evaluate whether the sites still meet the criteria which justify their inscription. The exclusion of a property from the List would therefore be one of the possible consequences of such a periodical review. Therefore, the World Heritage values of each site should be precisely defined.

Recommendation

The Committee should envisage the modalities for the withdrawal of a property from the List when the World Heritage characteristics for which the property has been inscribed have disappeared.

4. Monitoring of the State of Conservation

Summary of the Discussion

The issue of monitoring was discussed at length. What the Committee has been calling monitoring in the past few years (actually an inadequate word) covers a number of different concepts. When a specific threat affects a property, the monitoring must be immediate and the Committee warned, so that it may take action with the relevant authorities and attempt to find a solution with them. When the solution is improved, the Committee is informed about the results of its action. This conception of monitoring is dominant in the reports presented by IUCN at each Committee session. It has allowed for a number of positive results.

However, the Group held that one needed to go beyond this conception to set up a system of continuous consultation in the field with local experts and researchers, mobilizing also the local population. This partnership system should progressively set up and lead to periodical reports on the state of the properties prepared by the World Heritage Centre. Additionally, this monitoring should lead to the formulation of restoration or management projects.

Nevertheless, the Group agreed that it was of no value to request States to produce national reports, even though the Convention foresees it, since this type of report most frequently does not reflect the real problems of the sites.

Finally, the Committee should systematically verify that its recommendations at the time of inscription have been followed and that the States requesting assistance from the Fund are in possession of data on the state of conservation of the site.

Recommendations

The Committee should systematically verify that there has been a follow up to the recommendations made on inscription of a property.

Every request for international assistance under the World Heritage Fund should be accompanied by a report on the state of conservation of the property.

Furthermore, the group believes that the concept of the monitoring should be modified: the monitoring should not be seen as a periodic inspection mechanism but as a continuous co-operation process involving local partners in a regional context and including awareness and research activities.

The Group requests the Centre to produce documents on the state of World Heritage starting with the Latin American region for which a monitoring exercise along these lines has already been undertaken.

5. The World Heritage Fund

Summary of the discussion

The overall functioning of the World Heritage Fund has been questioned. Firstly, the Group considered that the reports provided by the States receiving assistance from the Fund should be detailed and should undergo the scrutiny of the Committee (by a working group). Secondly, the Fund should be utilized more systematically

for the formulation of projects with the relevant authorities likely to receive funding from other bi- or multilateral sources. A dispersal effect may thereby be eliminated.

Finally, the amount in the Fund is of course insufficient and the Centre should attempt systematic funding-raising for specific projects. Thus, the Fund's resources should not only originate from national contributions, as is currently the case, but from foundations and public or private institutions.

Recommendations

The World Heritage Centre should ensure a better fund-raising effort. This fund-raising should include several aspects: a systematic reminder to States Parties that have not paid their contribution; or fund-raising from private and public funds for specific projects.

More elaborate reports, drawn according to precise standards, should be requested from the States that have been granted assistance.

Finally, the Fund should invest more systematically in the formulation of good projects likely to attract funding through short-term initiatives. Training should preferably, but not exclusively, be provided to World Heritage site managers.

6. Promotion

Summary of the discussion

The Group has underlined that promotion included two distinct, but complementary aspects: general information, and the search for financing through a "marketing" policy. The Group held that concerning general information, much had been achieved in the past few years, namely by the production of diversified material and the utilization of existing channels for the diffusion of information. An effort directed at a more specialized public should, however, be undertaken through the support of scientific publications and more systematically providing professional bodies with information on the Convention.

The Group furthermore estimated that the promotion policy should be more geared to fund-raising for the safeguard of sites, by setting up a "marketing" policy. The Centre will organize a consultation with the communication specialists to develop such a policy.

Finally, the Group recalled that the Committee wished that the question of the impact of tourism on the sites be examined, and that the Secretariat had begun work on these questions, jointly with the ITO and UNEP.

Recommendations

All promotional activities concerning the Convention should, within UNESCO, be under the sole responsibility of the World Heritage Centre, which will report to the Committee.

A report on the state of World Heritage sites showing the effects of the inscription on conservation should, insofar as possible, be published by the Centre on a biannual basis.

The Committee should, during its sessions, spend more time discussing issues concerning promotion, which should be examined by specialists. The States Parties should promote the Convention, particularly that of the World Heritage sites, through the production of publications, plaques etc., explaining to the public and concerned populations the values which justified the inscription of the site. The States Parties should additionally promote the creation and action of associations in the field of the safeguard of natural or cultural sites.

The World Heritage Centre should undertake an in-depth reflection on the impact of tourism on the World Heritage sites.

IV. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Summary of the discussion

Two questions were raised under this point:

How can one prevent the elections from being subject to a distribution by political groups? How can the General Assembly be made to also discuss the state of implementation of the Convention, so that all States Parties will be more closely associated with implementation?

Recommendation

The Group recommends that the General Assembly of States Parties be held at the beginning of the General Conference and that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee present before it the report addressed by the Committee to the General Conference.

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The general areas of improvement considered most important are:

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

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

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

1. Role and effectiveness of the Committee

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

Recommendation:

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

2. Assuring the integrity of the World Heritage List

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

3. The List of World Heritage in Danger

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

Discussion:

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

4. Delisting

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

5. Technical Assistance Requests

Recommendation:

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

Recommendation:

- Publish summaries of the above biannually for public distribution.

Discussion:

See public awareness below.

Recommendation:

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

6. Public Awareness

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

7. Miscellaneous

Recommendation:

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

Discussion:

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

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

World Heritage Convention Evaluation

DRAFT

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

Introduction

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

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

2. The Effectiveness of the Convention

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

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

Discussion could also focus on:

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

a) The integrity of the listing process

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

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

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

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

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

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

b) The effectiveness of care provided after inscription

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c) Effectiveness of the Convention in times of conflict

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

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

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

Achieving these goals requires measures which would:

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

d) Providing models for conservation

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

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

3. Adequacy of ICOMOS evaluation procedures for nominations

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

a. Distinguishing between evaluations and presentations

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

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

b. Evaluation visits to sites proposed for evaluation

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

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

c. Adequacy of ICOMOS funding

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

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

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

d. Adequacy of comparative data for evaluations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

this would of course require revision of the entire process.

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

f. Limits on proposals for inscription

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

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

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

4. Working with the Operational Guidelines

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Monitoring

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

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

ICOMOS believes the following:

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

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

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

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

Two forms of positive monitoring output can be envisioned:

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

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

Herb Stovel, Secretary-General, ICOMOS

UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTER

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

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

MONDAY, 22nd JUNE 1992

- 8:30 AM ***Check-In at C Street Entrance ~ Receive Identification Badge***
(Badge should be worn at all times each day of the meeting)
- 9:00 AM **REGISTRATION (Room 5160)**
- 9:30 AM **MEETING CONVENES (Room 5160)**
1. Welcome by the Host
(Ms. Jennifer Salisbury, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior
for Fish and Wildlife and Parks)
 2. Aims and Objectives of the Meeting
(Mr. Bernd von Droste, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre)
 3. Elections of Chairperson and Rapporteur
 4. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda

Coffee/Tea Break
 5. Presentation of the Draft Evaluation of the Implementation
of the World Heritage Convention
(Mr. Azedine Beschouch, Chairman of the World Heritage Committee)
 6. Presentations of Experiences in the Implementation of the Convention
on the National Level (USA, Canada, France, Australia, and others)
- 1:00 PM ***U.S.- Hosted Lunch for Participants ~ Secretary's Dining Room (Room 5149)***

MONDAY, 22nd JUNE 1992 (Cont'd)

2:00 PM SESSIONS RESUME (Room 5160)

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

Coffee/Tea Break

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

6:00 PM Adjourn for the Day

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

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

TUESDAY, 23rd JUNE 1992

10:30 AM MEETING RECONVENES (Room 5160)

10. Framework of A Future Strategy

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

Coffee/Tea Break

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

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

2:30 PM SESSIONS RESUME (Room 5160)

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

Coffee/Tea Break

TUESDAY, 23rd JUNE 1992 (Cont'd)

VII. Promoting Awareness for the Work of the Convention

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

5:30 PM Adjourn for the Day

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

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

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

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

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

WEDNESDAY, 24th JUNE 1992

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

WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING

Secretary's Conference Room

United States Department of the Interior

Invited Participants

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

Invited Observers

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

MR

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

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

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



1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

2. TRENDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. CURRENT ISSUES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. CRITERIA FOR NATURAL SITES

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

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

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

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

5. ACTION POINTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source: GAO's analysis of data from secretariats.

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

Hundred and thirty-ninth Session

139 EX/Decisions
PARIS, 16 June 1992

**Decisions adopted by the Executive Board
at its 139th session**

(Paris, 18-27 May 1992)

(. . .)

4.7 Culture

4.7.1 Revision of the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (139 EX/29 and 139 EX/36)

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 26 C/Resolution 3.9, particularly its invitation to all Member States to increase their efforts to achieve better implementation of the existing instruments and to reinforce UNESCO's action for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage,
2. Having taken note of the proposal made by Italy concerning the revision of the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, as explained in document 139 EX/29,
3. Considering that it would be advisable for the moment to concentrate on improving the existing system for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage,
4. Noting that the matter is being carefully studied by the Director-General and that a report will be submitted to the Executive Board at the 140th session,
5. Noting with interest the proposal made by Italy and supported by several Member States to set up a consultative group of experts, with the participation of the World Heritage Committee, to assist the Executive Board in examining the report by the Director-General,
6. Decides to defer a final decision on the matter until its 140th session.

(139 EX/SR.1 and 7)