

Distribution limited

WHC-93/CONF.001/INF.2
11 June 1993
Original: English

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

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Seventeenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room IX (Fontenoy)

21-26 June 1993

Methodologies of monitoring

Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Monitoring World Heritage sites
Background and points for discussion
- III. Guidelines - Preliminary Considerations
- IV. Methodology
- V. Roles and Responsibilities
- VI. Draft Standard Monitoring Report

I. INTRODUCTION

At its sixteenth session held in Santa Fe, New Mexico, United States of America, from 7 to 14 December 1993, the Committee adopted the Strategic Orientations, including the following points under Chapter D, on monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, paragraphs 27 to 31 of the World Heritage Report.

"The Committee should systematically ensure that the recommendations made at the time of inscription have been put into practice.

All requests for assistance from the Fund should be accompanied by an assessment of the state of conservation of the property.

Monitoring should no longer be seen as a periodical inspection, but as a process of continuous co-operation involving local partners in a regional context, and including information and research activities. Each State Party could draw the attention of the Committee to situations of risk or deterioration of a World Heritage site or to a possible violation of the obligations foreseen by the Convention. The possibility should be considered of a clause which would require a periodical review of the properties on the World Heritage List, in order to determine after a given period whether the sites still meet, totally or partially, the criteria under which they had been originally included. Representatives of the Centre or experts from the NGOs will participate at this periodical review.

The Centre should produce a document on the state of the world cultural heritage, beginning with the Latin American region, for which a monitoring exercise along these lines has already been undertaken.

In order to strengthen the guidelines and procedures for systematic and continuous monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites, the Centre, in co-operation with IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM, should convene an experts' meeting during the year 1993.

II. MONITORING WORLD HERITAGE SITES - BACKGROUND AND POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION TO WORLD HERITAGE MONITORING

Partners involved in implementing the Convention have been raising aspects of monitoring within the Committee for several years; they have produced several reports on specific sites as these required attention. The Secretariat has been involved in monitoring activity of one kind or another throughout the Committee's life, and has experimented with several monitoring systems over time, including a questionnaire to States Parties. IUCN has been actively involved in monitoring sites with the aid

of its extensive network of specialists. ICOMOS has been active in monitoring many cultural sites as well as in the development of a monitoring theory which forms the basis of much of this discussion paper. UNDP/UNESCO have developed, over the last years, an ambitious monitoring scheme for Latin America. UNEP has been active in the Mediterranean. ICCROM has also been involved within its own programmes in informal monitoring of World Heritage sites. What appears critically important at this stage is a meeting which will attempt to harmonize these various initiatives for the benefit of the sites and the work of the Committee.

The following approach is suggested for structuring the agenda for the forthcoming monitoring meeting:

1. CLARIFYING THE NEED

- all World Heritage partners are agreed on the need for "monitoring", but most give the word different definitions and in practice, employ a variety of means and approaches; within the Committee's meetings, the presentations of the Centre, UNDP in the first place as part of the UN, ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN exemplify the wide range of approaches currently in use;
- by agreeing on the expected output of the monitoring exercise, it should become possible to talk about the desirable characteristics of a monitoring system;
- possible outputs could include recommendations regarding needs at:
 - specific sites: (technical, resources, infrastructure, training or education etc.), but also recommendations re emerging or consistently found patterns of problems requiring attention of the Committee. These latter would frequently sit within regional and/or typological groupings.

2. WHAT SHOULD A MONITORING SYSTEM INCLUDE?

- agreement on the characteristics of effective monitoring processes (addressed to needs of sites); the UNDP/UNESCO model for Latin America proposes a format for consideration; IUCN also has a format and these need to be reviewed to check the feasibility of integration.
- agreement on overall strategy: degree to which monitoring should be developed by regions, by typology, by sites;
- understanding and recognition of roles to be played by different partners and in different

regions, contexts; recognition of what roles partners play now in monitoring;

- agreement on format and mode of presentations for monitoring reports;
- recognition of responsibility for overall coordination of monitoring activity, reporting and follow up.

3. WHAT SHOULD A (SITE-SPECIFIC) MONITORING PROCESS INVOLVE?

- monitoring requires a known frame of reference against which change, positive or negative, can be measured; for most sites this means development of tools now in existence;
- documentation of the physical reality at the moment of inscription;(base data should be reflected in a comprehensive nomination document);
- identification of significant elements/patterns linked to reasons for inscription (described as "heritage character statement" in Article 20 of the Strategic Orientations);
- clear descriptions of issues, problems, shortcomings identified in site management-protection at time of initial evaluation;

Note: To implement the above it will be necessary to clearly inform site managers of expectations prior to and subsequent to inscription.

- monitoring requires an approach to site missions or visits which have certain key characteristics:
 - CONSULTATIVE:** working with local professionals and administrators in identifying and articulating key questions and problems;
 - CONSENSUAL:** recommendations whenever possible should reflect consensus between local and outside team members;
 - SUPPORTIVE:** focused on enabling and building capacities of local managers in the short and long-term;
 - CONSTRUCTIVE:** positive recommendations rather than just descriptions of inadequacies;
 - OPEN-ENDED:** suggested avenues for follow up.

- review of original inscription criteria in terms of present state and comparison with comparable World Heritage sites, (and criteria themselves as their formulation has evolved);
- monitoring activity may need to be understood and presented at various levels, (for example, preliminary, initial, follow up, etc.);
- monitoring reports, within the framework established need to achieve certain goals:

inform the Committee of the state of conservation of sites;

identify specific actions, technical assistance, training and management activities which can be developed into projects which will ensure effective management. Thus the monitoring process will become more than reporting, it will become a basis for future action;

inform management authorities of the state of conservation of the site;

feed back in useful ways into existing site management systems;

permit the Committee to identify broad problems best addressed through the development of general initiatives;

result in clear recommendations for follow up by the State Parties, the Centre, the Advisory Groups or the Committee.

4. HOW WILL THE MONITORING SYSTEM BE IMPLEMENTED?

- roles and responsibilities of various partners?
- resources to implement: what is needed and where will they come from?
- timetable for implementation:
 - what steps in 1993, simply to improve integration and consistency of presentations?
 - long-term processes and needs.

5. OTHER SUBJECTS TO BE ADDED TO THE AGENDA?

III. GUIDELINES - PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

1. EFFECTIVE MONITORING MUST BEGIN WITH RESPECT FOR THE CULTURAL VALUES OF THE COUNTRY OR REGION TO BE VISITED

The goal of conservation activity is the long-term preservation/protection and enhancement of the messages carried by sites, for instance, assessment of the effectiveness of conservation activity must begin with attempts to understand the cultural context of the site under evaluation. Conservation "doctrine" then does not encourage or sanction "technology transfer or the imposition of other cultural values on a site". This is important to recognize explicitly, to avoid the natural tendency of all professionals to see value in their own experiences and to seek to apply these elsewhere.

2. EFFECTIVE MONITORING MUST MAKE FULL USE OF THE BODY OF INTERNATIONALLY ACCEPTED "DOCTRINE"

Effective application of "doctrine" to assessment of conservation activity requires understanding of the intent of the documents in existence, particularly the World Heritage Convention. Several points should be noted:

CULTURAL SITES:

A. The reference framework is the body of accepted international principles. The thrust of thinking within ICOMOS over 15 years has been to accompany the central charter in the field, (The Venice Charter), with a series of adaptations to regional, national and thematic contexts. Hence, ICOMOS doctrine includes the Venice Charter and the reflections brought to it by those charters written in Australis, New Zealand, Pakistan and other countries, and those which touch specific technical areas (Historic Towns, Historic Gardens, Archaeological Heritage Management etc.). These charters are meant to be read and understood together. Equally, individual articles in specific charters are meant to be seen as a part of a linked set of ideas, not separated from each other in application.

B. The principles of conservation are not absolute (with the possible exception of the imperative to respect cultural context in determining appropriate action/treatments and the need to share decision-making broadly) and should always be seen as a point of departure for interpretation of specific contexts. Conservation doctrine is not dogma, but the wisdom of recent generations collected in a manner intended to focus professionals on key ideas and questions.

NATURAL SITES:

Over the past fifty years a body of knowledge related to the protection and management of natural protected areas has been established. This generally accepted "doctrine" is not found in

one document but reflects the following standards and practices:

The World Charter for Nature, United Nations General Assembly, 1982

International Conventions

World Heritage Convention
 Ramsar Convention
 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
 Convention on Biological Diversity
 Berne Convention
 Other Regional Conventions

Resolutions of the General Assembly of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature

Recommendations of the World Congresses on National Parks and Protected Areas

Seattle, 1962
 Yellowstone, 1972
 Bali, 1982
 Caracas, 1992

National Legislation

All nations have a body of law related to national parks and other types of protected areas; where this law is not in conflict with International Conventions it should be respected.

Guidelines

These are primarily publications of IUCN's Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas:

Management of Protected Areas in the Tropics
 Categories Criteria, and Objectives for Protected Areas

General

As sovereign states, parties may proclaim legislation which will govern the management on their sites.

States Parties who are signatory to International Conventions are bound by them, and their legislation must conform to the International Standards.

3. MONITORING MUST BE CARRIED OUT IN FULL COLLABORATION WITH THE AUTHORITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR A SITE

Monitoring is an aspect of site management specifically designed to identify and resolve impediments to effective management. Even where discussions and visits lead to critical conclusions, these should be developed in full collaboration with responsible site authorities during the mission visit.

Presentations following site visits, made to the World Heritage Committee, should not "surprise" authorities present. The primary goal of the monitoring activity -- to provide positive inputs into ongoing site management, planning and operational practices -- should be kept in mind throughout. Recommendations should be future oriented rather than focused on the past.

By the same token, evidently, monitoring visits should be carefully planned with authorities: the purpose of the visit; the nature of the desired exploration, the expectations of the visiting expert regarding time required, access to the site, site managers and data, the results of the visit and the likely follow up should all be carefully explained well in advance of the visit. A logical first step is to meet with the sites's managers and inquire about their problems before beginning to look at the site. Equally the mission leader should attempt to share his/her conclusions in a final session with responsible authorities prior to departure.

4. MONITORING REQUIRES A FIXED FRAME OF REFERENCE AGAINST WHICH TO MEASURE CHANGE

At the time of inscription, the criteria which support a sites's universal values are identified. These provide a guide to the major reasons used in identifying a site's values, and are indicative of those that must be protected. Equally, discussions concerning authenticity/integrity and the adequacy of legal/management protection can result in tangible indications of conditions requiring attention.

As recommended in Santa Fe, there is a need for a clear statement of "Heritage character".

Finally, concern for the ability to measure physical change and establish the state of conservation on a site pre-supposes investment in recording and documentation at the time of inscription.

Without a fixed frame of reference at a point in time, change - positive or negative - cannot be clearly or systematically measured.

5. THE MONITORING REPORT SHOULD DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PROBLEMS (DIAGNOSES) and SOLUTIONS (PROGNOSIS)

Recommendations should separate problems from solutions. Equally, reports should identify follow up expectations and responsibility. It is a useful and realistic strategy to assume that a first visit will not be able to go beyond identifying broad areas in which problems lie, their urgency and investigative steps necessary to clarify or pinpoint preliminary diagnoses.

Visits that too quickly result in easy solutions are likely in the long-term to benefit neither the site, its custodians nor the sponsoring organization. Again, the expected results of the visit (and their limitations) should be communicated well in advance. Problems, when identified, should be "located": the broad sector in which the problem sits and the authorities responsible for change should be identified.

Solutions, where proposed, should be "situated" in similar fashion - linked to broad areas where problems have been identified, linked to authorities responsible and linked finally to the broad strategic means (resources, training, policy, planning, management,) suggested to address problems. The long-term goal of conservation monitoring is not to provide a list of elements to fix, but to provide strategic identification of how best to improve the management framework to care for the site.

6. MONITORING REPORTS MADE TO THE COMMITTEE SHOULD PROVIDE A CLEAR BASIS FOR ACTION AND FOLLOW-UP

Based on the Mission Report, a brief summary should be prepared for review by the Bureau or Committee. Each such summary should include:

1. Reasons for inscription and comments made at inscription regarding authenticity/integrity, adequacy of boundaries, management and legal protection.
2. A review of previous reports made to the Committee.
3. Background to the current site report.
4. Observations made during the visit.
5. Recommendations - these should be carefully formulated: actions-contacts-time frames for action or response/technical assistance requirements-training/identification of targets for recommendations or prospects for follow up.
7. **EXPERTS CHOSEN FOR MISSIONS SHOULD HAVE SKILLS AND BACKGROUND APPROPRIATE TO THE SITES TO BE VISITED**

Mission participants must be comfortable within the cultures with which they will be working.

Mission participants must have experience relevant to the topics they will be investigating and the sites they will be visiting.

Language facility is an asset but not a necessity.

Mission participants must be in appropriate physical condition to undertake the travel and to adjust to the different local circumstances to which they may be exposed.

The involvement of site managers, their staff and other knowledgeable people should be an essential facet of all missions.

IV. METHODOLOGY

1. Development and refinement of methodology
 - consultations with regional experts and local counterparts and national and local site personnel.
2. Preparation and completion of comprehensive monitoring documents
 - incorporate in evaluation procedures.
3. Information collection
 - desk study
 - correspondence
 - questionnaire.
4. Site visits for information - data collection (if necessary)
 - information collection in-situ
 - setting-up a national/local pluridisciplinary working group for next steps (4, 5 and 6) and co-ordination arrangements
 - preliminary evaluation on past preservation activities and present state of conservation.
5. Preparation of preliminary report
 - results of steps 2 and 3
 - outline and programme step 5.
6. In-situ consultations (site visits)
 - i) With the participation of: local/national working groups, technicians, managers, authorities and experts and a limited number of international (regional) experts and consultants preferably from the region.
 - ii) With possible training of technicians in workshops in-situ on "site management" and "monitoring".

a pre-condition for the local monitoring process in-situ is that it should be continuous. Therefore, capacity-building and local training on monitoring is of crucial importance.

iii) With evaluation of:

- * past preservation efforts
- * present situation (conservation, legislation, institutional structure and logistic capacity, human resources, etc.).

iv) The formulation of:

- * required future actions
- * proposed Technical Assistance (multi/bilateral co-operation, UNDP, WHF, banks and others), pre-investment for integrated conservation taking into account considerations related to Human Development and the Environment.

7. Preparation of conservation status report

Comprising elements in previous points.

8. Comparative analysis executive summary

- results of steps 2 to 6 summarized and presented in the form of a report to the World Heritage Centre, the World Heritage Committee and States parties concerned.

9. Evaluation of methodology (optional)

- consultation with regional-local experts
- evaluation of methodology and monitoring exercise
- revision of methodology for next monitoring cycle, if necessary.

V. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Roles

It is evident that monitoring will continue to be a joint endeavour of States Parties, the Committee, the Secretariat and the non-governmental organizations named in the Convention.

Past practice has also involved "special consultancies" such as the Latin American and Mediterranean projects.

The question of roles is a complex one which will need to be clarified via-à-vis policy as well as execution.

From the Convention and the Guidelines, the following "Roles" are identified:

A. States Parties

- (i) Produce tentative lists of sites to be nominated;
- (ii) Prepare nominations;
- (iii) Protect sites, conserve sites, present sites;
- (iv) Prepare management/safeguarding plans;
- (v) Take corrective action as necessary;
- (vi) Inform the Committee of the status of a site (proposed);
- (vii) Pay appropriate fees.

B. Committee

- (i) Establish World Heritage List;
- (ii) Establish List of World Heritage in Danger;
- (iii) Define criteria;
- (iv) Receive and study requests for international assistance;
- (v) Manage World Heritage Fund;
- (vi) Co-operate with other institutions.

C. Secretariat

- (i) Prepare Committee documentation and agendas;
- (ii) Implement Committee liaisons;
- (iii) Co-operate with designated NGOs;
- (iv) Review nominations for technical accuracy.

D. The NGOs

- (i) Provide information in their respective areas of competence and capability;
- (ii) Evaluate nominations;
- (iii) Prepare technical assistance projects;
- (iv) Assist in training programmes.

2. Responsibilities

Other than the simple division between cultural and natural properties, the role to be carried out by the various players is not clear. However:

- a) In the new Guidelines, each State is required to periodically inform the Committee of the status of its sites;

- b) The Committee has specifically directed the Secretariat (World Heritage Centre) to carry out special missions e.g. Durmitor, Plitvice, Nimba.
- c) ICOMOS and IUCN have submitted "Re-active" and "Situation" reports to the Committee on numerous occasions;
- d) The Committee has specifically designated consultants, e.g. UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project for Latin America to carry out regional/specific evaluations.

Other Partners' Proposals for discussion

- 1. States Parties are responsible for the provision of indicative lists, nominations and periodic reports on the conservation status of sites. The latter should be done in co-operation with the designated NGOs, in accordance with a schedule developed through consultation with the Centre.
- 2. Conservation Status Reports will require a Documentation Centre which is clearly tied to the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat and to States Parties. Included in the Documentation Centre would be:
 - a) indicative lists;
 - b) nominations;
 - c) evaluations;
 - d) Bureau and Committee recommendations;
 - e) Conservation Status Reports.
- 3. The World Heritage Centre should maintain a schedule regarding the periodic and systematic evaluation of sites.
- 4. The World Heritage Centre should co-ordinate the monitoring progress on behalf of the Committee.
- 5. The assignment of monitoring functions should take place through a joint meeting of the World Heritage Centre staff, the NGOs and other affiliated partners prior to each meeting of the Bureau.
- 6. NGOs and the Centre should remain responsive to the need for 're-action type' reports requiring unscheduled action.

**DRAFT CONSERVATION STATUS REPORT
(adapted Mutal/IUCN)**

1. Name of property
2. State Party
3. Date inscribed
4. Criteria for inscription
5. Observations by IUCN/ICOMOS at time of inscription:
 Recommendations - Accept: Date
 Defer: Date
 Reject: Date
6. Observations by World Heritage Bureau
7. Observations by World Heritage Committee
8. Action taken with respect to points 5, 6 and 7.
9. Technical Assistance:
 * World Heritage Fund
 * Other
10. Legal framework:
 * at national level
 * at sub-national level
11. Institutional framework/management
 * national, department/ministry
 * regional
 * site
12. Policy objectives
 * national
 * sub/national
 * site
13. Programme and activities related to site management
 * resource/artifact inventories
 * applied research
 * education/extension
 * management plans
 * zoning plans
 * visitor/tourism management
14. Infrastructure/operations/maintenance
 * equipment
 * capital investment budget
 * operations budget
 * maintenance budget
 * staff -

professional
technical
administrative

15. Analysis of issues and concerns relating to effective management.
16. Issues for future action: Conclusions and recommendations
* debriefing
17. Implementation
18. Proposed by
19. Date