

Distribution Limited

WHC-96/CONF.201/6B
Paris, 25 September 1996
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twentieth session
Merida, Yucatan, Mexico

2-7 December 1996

Item 7.1 of the Provisional Agenda: Methodology and procedures
for reporting on the state of conservation:

- (b) Revision of the nomination form and format for World
Heritage state of conservation reports

SUMMARY

In accordance with the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session, the Secretariat circulated the proposed new nomination form and format for World Heritage state of conservation reports to all States Parties for comments. The Secretariat submits herewith a report on the replies received as well as proposed actions for implementation in 1997.

Decisions required:

Revision of the nomination form: para. 13

Format for World Heritage state of
conservation reports: para. 21.

BACKGROUND

1. Parallel to the discussions on monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Committee at its eighteenth session requested the Secretariat to 'prepare a revised nomination format for presentation to the nineteenth sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, so as to provide adequate baseline information at the time of inscription of properties on the World Heritage List' and to 'develop a format for monitoring reporting as an aid to the States Parties and to facilitate the processing of the reports and the information contained in them through a computerized data base' (Report of the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, para. IX.10(a) and IX.11(b)).

2. The Secretariat, jointly with the advisory bodies, prepared drafts of both documents for consideration by the nineteenth sessions of the Bureau and the Committee. The Committee at its nineteenth session, however, decided to defer its decision until the next session and invited the States Parties to send in their comments in writing ((Report of the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, para. VII.54)).

3. The Secretariat sent Circular Letter 3-96, dated 29 February 1996, to the States Parties, National Commissions and UNESCO Representatives requesting comments by 30 April 1996, and a follow-up letter, dated 4 July 1996, extending the deadline for comments to 1 September 1996.

4. To date, comments have been received from Canada, Cuba, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Madagascar, Niger, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and the Nordic World Heritage Office.

5. These comments were transmitted to the advisory bodies for advice. A substantive reply was received from ICOMOS on 19 September 1996.

REVISION OF THE FORM FOR THE NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Introduction

6. The need to constitute sound baseline information on World Heritage properties at the time of their inscription on the World Heritage List is becoming more and more apparent, not only during the evaluation and inscription process, but also at a later stage when an assessment has to be made of the preservation of their World Heritage values or when international cooperation is required. This need was clearly recognized by the Committee at its seventeenth and eighteenth sessions in requesting the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to develop a revision of the existing nomination form.

7. The proposed nomination form as it was submitted to the Bureau and the Committee at their nineteenth sessions and circulated to the States Parties is included in information document WHC-96/CONF.201/INF.16. It consists of an index and eleven pages of explanatory notes. It contains the same items as the existing form such as identification, location and justification for inscription. Items such as description, documentation and, above all, management and legal protection have been expanded.

8. A new item number 5, called 'factors affecting the site', is intended to assist the States Parties in identifying the factors which are likely to affect or threaten the site and in planning the measures to deal with them.

9. Under another new item, number 6, the State Party is requested to indicate how it intends to assess the state of conservation of the site over time. It should make clear that there is a regular system of inspection of the property, leading to the periodic recording of the condition of the site.

Comments from States Parties

10. Agreement with the proposed form was expressed by Canada, Cuba, Niger, Spain, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

11. Comments from other States Parties concentrate on item 2 ('Justification for inscription') and item 4 ('Management') of the proposed nomination form. These can be summarized as follows:

- a) Some States Parties raised the question of the comparative analysis that the State Party would be required to submit under item 2.b. of the proposed nomination form, arguing that this is a delicate matter for both the State Party and the Committee to undertake. It was also emphasized that the state of conservation of the nominated property in itself is not a criterion for inscription and should, therefore, not figure under this item.
- b) Comments were also made on the criterion of 'authenticity' (item 2.c.) expressing the need to strictly separate authenticity from the state of conservation of a specific property, as well as to introduce new concepts on authenticity as expressed in the Nara Document on Authenticity.
- c) As regards to the information that would be required on the 'management' of the property (item 4), a State Party suggested that sub-items a-d are essential and sub-items e-k should be optional.
- d) One State Party, furthermore, called for a particular attention to Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention regarding the presentation and transmission to future

generations of the cultural and natural heritage and measures to protect, conserve, and present the cultural and natural heritage.

- e) Several suggestions were made for textual modifications so as to make the text of the 'Explanatory Notes' less prescriptive and more applicable to the particular conditions of a country or site.

Advice from the Advisory bodies

12. ICOMOS, having examined the comments from States Parties, advised the following:

- a) Regarding the comparative analysis, ICOMOS recognizes the difficulty for a State Party to be completely objective about the relative cultural value of part of its own heritage and supports the complete excision of this requirement.
- b) As to the matter of authenticity, ICOMOS agrees that this is a requirement for inscription and that it is distinct from the state of conservation of the nominated property. ICOMOS proposes to amend the second sentence of paragraph 2.4. of the Explanatory Notes to read: 'In the case of a cultural site it should record whether repairs have been carried out using materials and methods traditional to the culture, in conformity with the Nara Document (1995).' In this respect ICOMOS recommends that the Nara Document be added to the Operational Guidelines as an annex.
- c) ICOMOS supports the suggestion that sub-items e-k of item 4 ('Management') should be optional and suggests that these be deleted and incorporated, as optional information, under sub-items c and d.
- d) As regards to the reference to the presentation/mise en valeur of the nominated property, ICOMOS proposes to introduce a new item 'Policies and programmes for the presentation and promotion of the property (where appropriate).'

Decision required:

13. Considering that the revision of the nomination form is necessary in order to provide adequate baseline information at the time of inscription of properties on the World Heritage List and to enhance the evaluation and inscription process, and also considering that the nomination form could be revised independently from the introduction of the reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, the Committee may

wish to:

- a) adopt the revised nomination form as presented in Annex I of this working document which includes the following amendments:

1. Identification of the Property

No modifications are proposed.

2. Justification for Inscription

- * Delete item 2.b. ('Comparative Analysis') from the table of contents and of paragraph 2.3. of the Explanatory Notes and the subsequent addition of a text to 2.5 which would read as follows:

" 2.5. Section 2 (d) is therefore the culmination of the section, relating the specific property to one or more individual criteria and saying unambiguously why it meets the specific criterion or criteria. States Parties may consider to provide a comparative analysis of the nominated property with similar properties. "

- * Revise paragraph 2.4. of the Explanatory Notes to read as follows:

" This section should demonstrate that the property fulfills the criteria of authenticity and/or integrity set out in paragraphs 24 (b) (i) or 44 (b) (i) - (iv) of the Operational Guidelines, which describe the criteria in greater detail. In the case of a cultural site it should also record whether repairs have been carried out using materials and methods traditional to the culture, in conformity with the Nara Document (1995). In the case of natural sites it should record any intrusions from exotic species of fauna or flora and any human activities which could compromise the integrity of the site. "

3. Description

- * Add an item 3.e entitled 'Policies and programmes for the presentation and promotion of the property (where appropriate)' as well as a new paragraph 3.6 to the Explanatory Notes as follows:

" Section 3 (e) refers to the stipulations in Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention regarding the presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage. States Parties are encouraged to provide

information on the policies and programmes for the presentation and promotion of the nominated property."

4. Management

- * Revise the last phrase of paragraph 4.2. of the Explanatory Notes to read as follows:

" For example it could be interesting to indicate whether the police, army or local authorities have the responsibility for enforcement and whether in practice they have the necessary resources to do so. "

- * Phrase paragraphs 4.5 - 4.7 of the explanatory notes in such a way that the provision of information under these headings is optional and to the discretion of the State Party.

5. Factors affecting the Site

- * Add to paragraph 5.1. of the Explanatory Notes the following text:

" Obviously, not all of the factors suggested in this section are appropriate for all properties. They are indicative and are intended to assist the State Party to identify the factors that are relevant to each specific property."

- * Revise the second part of paragraph 5.5. of the Explanatory Notes to read as follows:

" An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Amongst possible forms of visitor pressure that could be considered are: "

- * Delete from paragraph 5.6. of the Explanatory Notes the following text: "(e.g. terrorist activity or the potential for armed conflict)".

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- * Revise paragraph 6.2. of the Explanatory Notes by replacing "should" by "could".

7. Documentation

No modifications are proposed.

8. Signature on behalf of the State Party

No modifications are proposed.

- b) revise, under item 17 of the Provisional Agenda and as per working document WHC-96/CONF.201/18, paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines accordingly;
- c) request States Parties to use the revised nomination form for all nominations that are to be submitted by July 1, 1998;
- d) request the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to widely distribute and announce the new nomination form and actively assist States Parties in its application.

FORMAT FOR A PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORT

Introduction

14. The proposed format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports as it was submitted to the Bureau and the Committee at their nineteenth sessions and circulated to the States Parties is included in information document WHC-96/CONF.201/INF.16. It consists of an index and nine pages of explanatory notes.

15. The proposed format for the state of conservation reports follows the structure of the revised nomination form. It will have to verify relevant information provided in the original nomination dossier and will thus record significant changes in the conditions of the site, its management structure and legal protection.

16. The core of the state of conservation report, however, would consist of items 2a. (statement of significance), 5 (factors affecting the site), 6 (monitoring/ inspection) and 8 (conclusions and recommended actions), providing an assessment if the values on the basis of which the site was inscribed are retained, recording changes in the state of conservation of the property over time, and identifying problems and proposed actions.

17. It should be noted that this format was prepared before the discussions on monitoring and reporting took place at the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties and before the Committee, at its nineteenth session, concluded that a reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties should be included in the States Parties' reports on the application of the Convention to the General Conference of UNESCO. If the General Assembly of States Parties and the 29th General Conference of UNESCO adopt the Committee's views, the World Heritage Committee would be requested to define the periodicity, form, nature and extent of the regular reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention, including the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

Comments from States Parties

18. Agreement with the proposed form was expressed by Cuba, Finland, Spain, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and the Nordic World Heritage Office.

19. However, several States Parties commented on the level of detail of the proposed format which, through its bureaucratic approach, would discourage States Parties to prepare periodic state of conservation reports. Subsequently, these States Parties suggested that the state of conservation reports should focus on the essential issue which is the preservation of the World Heritage values at the site. It was also recommended that the format for the state of conservation reports should be developed and presented in such a way that it could be adapted to the different types of properties and the characteristics of the heritage in different countries.

Advice from the Advisory bodies

20. The World Heritage Coordinator of ICOMOS, having examined the comments from States Parties, advised that he agrees with the suggestion that the format for the state of conservation reports should be more concise and concentrate on the essential issues.

Decision required:

21. Considering that the matter of monitoring and reporting will be discussed at the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties and the 29th General Conference of UNESCO, and considering the Committee's view that reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, and therefore would be included in the reporting on the application of the Convention, and considering the substantive comments from States Parties on the draft format for the periodic World Heritage state of conservation report, the Committee may wish to:

- a) defer its decision on the format for the periodic World Heritage state of conservation report awaiting the decisions of the Eleventh General Assembly and the 29th General Conference of UNESCO regarding the reporting procedures;
- b) request the Secretariat jointly with the Advisory Bodies to prepare, for its twenty-first session in 1997, a draft format for reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention, taking into account the comments made by States Parties as well as the principles of monitoring and reporting reflected in the Committee's report and draft resolutions to the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties and the 29th General Conference of UNESCO.

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON
THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Table of Contents

1. Identification of the Property
 - a. Country (and State Party if different).
 - b. State, Province or Region
 - c. Name of Property
 - d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
 - e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
 - f. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any.

2. Justification for Inscription
 - a. Statement of significance
 - ~~b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)~~
 - c. Authenticity/Integrity
 - d. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

3. Description
 - a. Description of Property
 - b. History and Development
 - c. Form and date of most recent records of site
 - d. Present state of conservation
 - e. **Policies and programmes for the presentation of and promotion of the property (where appropriate)**

4. Management
 - a. Ownership
 - b. Legal status
 - c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
 - d. Agency/agencies with management authority
 - e. Level at which management is exercised (e.g., on

- site, regionally) and name and address of responsible person for contact purposes
- f. Agreed plans related to property (e.g., regional, local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives (copy to be annexed)
- k. Staffing levels (professional, technical, maintenance)

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film/video
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

8. Signature on behalf of the State Party

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON
THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Explanatory Notes

INTRODUCTION

- (i) These notes are intended to provide guidance to those nominating sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List. They relate to the headings under which information is sought, which appear in front of each section of notes. Nomination dossiers should provide information under each of these headings. They should be signed by a responsible official on behalf of the State Party.
- (ii) The nomination dossier is intended to serve two main purposes.
- First it is to describe the property in a way which brings out the reasons it is believed to meet the criteria for inscription, and to enable the site to be assessed against those criteria.
- Secondly it is to provide basic data about the property, which can be revised and brought up to date in order to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the site.
- (iii) In spite of the wide differences between sites, information should be given under each of the categories set out at the head of sections 1 - 7 of these notes.

General Requirements

- (iv) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where that can be done and fully referenced.
- (v) Documents should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.
- (vi) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.

- (vii) Dossiers should be completed on A4 paper (210mm x 297mm) with maps and plans a maximum of A3 paper (297mm x 420mm). States Parties are also encouraged to submit the full text of the nomination on diskette.

1. Identification of the Property

- a. Country (and State Party if different).
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
- f. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any.

1.1 The purpose of this section is to provide the basic data to enable sites to be precisely identified. In the past, sites have been inscribed on the list with inadequate maps, and this has meant that in some cases it is impossible to be certain what is within the World Heritage site and what is outside it. This can cause considerable problems.

1.2 Apart from the basic facts at 1a - 1d of the dossier, the most important element in this section of the nomination therefore consists of the maps and plans relating to the nominated site. In all cases, at least two documents are likely to be needed and both must be prepared to professional cartographic standards. One should show the site in its natural or built environment and should be between 1:20,000 and 1:100,000. Depending on the size of the site, another suitable scale may be chosen. The other should clearly show the boundary of the nominated area and of any existing or proposed buffer zone. It should also show the position of any natural features, individual monuments or buildings mentioned in the nomination. Either on this map, or an accompanying one, there should also be a record of the boundaries of zones or special legal protection from which the site benefits.

1.3 In considering whether to propose a buffer zone it should be borne in mind that, in order to fulfil the obligations of the World Heritage Convention, sites must be protected from all threats or inconsistent uses. These developments can often take place beyond the boundaries of a site. Intrusive development can harm its setting, or the views from it or of it. Industrial processes can threaten a site by polluting the air or water. The construction of new roads, tourist resorts or airports can bring to a site more visitors than it can absorb in safety.

In some cases national planning policies or existing protective legislation may provide the powers needed to protect the setting of a site as well as the site itself. In other cases it will be highly desirable to propose a formal buffer zone where special controls will be applied. This should include the immediate setting of the site and important views of it and from it. Where it is considered that existing zones of protection make it unnecessary to inscribe a buffer zone, those zones also should be shown clearly on the map of the site.

2 Justification for Inscription

- a. Statement of significance
- ~~b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)~~
- c. Authenticity/Integrity
- d. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

2.1 This is the most crucial aspect of the whole nomination dossier. It must make clear to the committee why the site can be accepted as being "of outstanding universal value". The whole of this section of the dossier should be written with careful reference to the criteria for inscription found at paragraphs 24 and 44 of the Operational Guidelines. It should not include detailed descriptive material about the site or its management, which come later, but should concentrate on what the site represents.

2.2 The statement of significance (a) should make clear what are the values embodied by the site. It may be a unique survival of a particular building form or habitat or designed town. It may be a particularly fine or early or rich survival and it may bear witness to a vanished culture, way of life or eco-system. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional eco-systems, outstanding landscapes or other natural phenomena.

~~2.3 The comparative analysis (b) should relate the site to comparable sites, saying why it is more worthy than they are for inscription on the World Heritage list (or, if they are inscribed, what features distinguish it from those sites). This may be because the site is intrinsically better, or possessed of more features, species or habitats.~~

~~It may also be because the site is a larger or better preserved or more complete survival or one that has been less prejudiced by later developments. This is the reason for the requirement for an account of the~~

~~state of conservation of similar sites.~~

2.4 ~~This section should demonstrate that the site fulfills the criteria of authenticity/integrity set out in paragraphs 24 (b) (i) or 44 (b) (i) - (iv) of the Operational Guidelines, which describe the criteria in greater detail. The section relating to authenticity/integrity (c) should flow from the account of the present state of conservation. In the case of a cultural site it should also record whether repairs have been carried out using traditional materials and methods traditional to the culture, in conformity with the Nara Document (1995) and whether the principles of the Venice Charter and other international standards have been observed. In the case of natural sites it should record any intrusions from exotic species of fauna or flora and any human activities which may have compromised could compromise the integrity of the site. This section should demonstrate that the site fulfills the criteria of authenticity/integrity set out in paragraphs 24 (b) (i) or 44 (b) (i) - (iv) of the Operational Guidelines, which describe the criteria in greater detail.~~

2.5 Section 2 (d) is therefore the culmination of the section, relating the specific site to one or more individual criteria and saying unambiguously why it meets the specific criterion or criteria. **States Parties may consider to provide a comparative analysis of the nominated property with similar properties.**

3. Description

- a. Description of Property
- b. History and Development
- c. Form and date of most recent records of site
- d. Present state of conservation
- e. **Policies and programmes for the presentation of and promotion of the property (where appropriate)**

3.1 This section should begin with a description (a) of the property at the date of nomination. It should refer to all the significant features of the property. In the case of a cultural site this will include an account of any building or buildings and their architectural style, date of construction and materials. It should also describe any garden, park or other setting. In the case of an historic town or district it is not necessary to describe each individual building, but important public buildings should be described individually and an account should be given of the planning or layout of the area, its street pattern and so on. In the case of natural sites the account should deal with important physical

attributes, habitats, species and other significant ecological features and processes. Species lists should be provided where practicable, and the presence of threatened or endemic taxa should be highlighted.

The extent and methods of exploitation of natural resources should be described. In the case of cultural landscapes it will be necessary to produce a description under all the matters mentioned above.

- 3.2 Under item (b) of this section what is sought is an account of how the property has reached its present form and condition and the significant changes that it has undergone. This should include some account of construction phases in the case of monuments, buildings or groups of buildings. Where there have been major changes, demolitions or rebuilding since completion they should also be described. In the case of natural sites and landscapes the account should cover significant events in history or pre-history which have affected the evolution of the site and give an account of its interaction with humankind. This will include such matters as the development and change in use for hunting, fishing or agriculture, or changes brought about by climatic change, inundation, earthquake or other natural causes. In the case of cultural landscapes all aspects of the history of human activity in the area will need to be covered.
- 3.3 Because of the wide variation in the size and type of properties covered by properties nominated as World Heritage Sites it is not possible to suggest the number of words in which the description and history of properties should be given. The aim, however, should always be to produce the briefest account which can provide the important facts about the property. These are the facts needed to support and give substance to the claim that the property properly comes within the criteria of paragraphs 24 and 44 of the Operational Guidelines. The balance between description and history will change according to the applicable criteria. For example, where a cultural site is nominated under criterion 24 a (i), as a unique artistic achievement, it should not be necessary to say very much about its history and development.
- 3.4 Under section 3 (c) what is required is a straightforward statement giving the form and date of the most recent records or inventory of the site. Only records which are still available should be described.
- 3.5 The account of the present state of conservation of the property [3 (d)] should be related as closely as possible to the records described in the previous

paragraph. As well as providing a general impression of the state of conservation dossiers should give statistical or empirical information wherever possible.

For example, in a historic town or area the percentage of buildings needing major or minor repair works, or in a single major building or monument the scale and duration of any recent or forthcoming major repair projects. In the case of natural sites data on species trends or the integrity of eco-systems should be provided. This is important because the nomination dossier will be used in future years for purposes of comparison to trace changes in the condition of the property.

- 3.6. **Section 3 (e) refers to the stipulations in Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention regarding the presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage. States Parties are encouraged to provide information on the policies and programmes for the presentation and promotion of the nominated property.**

4 Management

- a. Ownership
- b. Legal status
- c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
- d. Agency/agencies with management authority
- e. Level at which management is exercised (e.g., on site, regionally) and name and address of responsible person for contact purposes
- f. Agreed plans related to property (e.g., regional, local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives (copy to be annexed)
- k. Staffing levels (professional, technical, maintenance)

- 4.1 This section of the dossier is intended to provide a clear picture of the protective and management arrangements which are in place to protect and conserve the property as required by the World Heritage Convention. It should deal both with the policy aspects of legal status and protective measures and with the practicalities of day-to-day administration.

- 4.2 Sections 4 (a) - (c) of the dossier should give the

legal position relating to the property. As well as providing the names and addresses of legal owners [4 (a)] and the status of the property [4 (b)], it should describe briefly any legal measures of protection applying to the site or any traditional ways in which custom safeguards it. Legal instruments should be given their title and date. In addition, the dossier should say how in practice these measures are applied and how responsibility for dealing with potential or actual breaches of protection is exercised. For example, ~~it should say~~ **it could be interesting to indicate** whether the police, army or local authorities have the responsibility for enforcement and whether in practice they have the necessary resources to do so.

It is not necessary to set out all the elements of legal protection, but their main provisions should be summarized briefly. In the case of large natural sites or historic towns there may be a multiplicity of legal owners. In these cases it is necessary only to list the major land- or property-owning institutions and any representative body for other owners.

- 4.3 Sections 4 (d) and (e) are intended to identify both the authority or authorities with legal responsibility for managing the property and the individual who is actually responsible for day-to-day control of the site and for the budget relating to its upkeep.
- 4.4 The agreed plans which should be listed at 4 (f) are all those plans which have been adopted by governmental or other agencies and which will have a direct influence on the way in which the site is developed, conserved, used or visited. Either relevant provisions should be summarized in the dossier or extracts or complete plans should be annexed to it.
- 4.5 Sections 4 (g) and (h) ~~should~~ **could** show the funds, skills and training which are available to the site. Information about finance and expertise and training ~~should~~ **could** be related to the earlier information about the state of conservation of the site. In all three cases an estimate ~~should~~ **could** also be given of the adequacy or otherwise of what is available, in particular identifying any gaps or deficiencies or any areas where help may be required.
- 4.6 As well as providing any available statistics or estimates of visitor numbers or patterns over several years, section 4 (i) ~~should~~ **could** describe the facilities available for visitors, for example:
- (i) interpretation/explanation, whether by trails, guides, notices or publications;

- (ii) site museum, visitor or interpretation centre;
- (iii) overnight accommodation;
- (iv) restaurant or refreshment facilities;
- (v) shops;
- (vi) car parking;
- (vii) lavatories;
- (viii) search and rescue.

4.7 Section 4 (j) in the dossier ~~should~~ **could** provide only the briefest details of the management plan relating to the site, which ~~should~~ **could** be annexed in its entirety. If the plan provides details of staffing levels it ~~is~~ **would** not necessary to complete section 4 (k) of the dossier and other sections may also be omitted where the plan provides adequate information (e.g. on finance and training).

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

5.1 This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4 (c) or otherwise. **Obviously, not all of the factors suggested in this section are appropriate for all properties. They are indicative and are intended to assist the State Party to identify the factors that are relevant to each specific property.**

5.2 Section 5 (a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; the introduction of exotic species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centres of population on or near sites so as to harm them or their settings.

5.3 Environmental pressures [5 (b)] can affect all types

of site. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section of the dossier is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the site, or may do so in the future, rather than an historical account of such pressures in the past.

- 5.4 Section 5 (c) should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the site and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)
- 5.5 In completing section 5 (d) what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects, i.e. its carrying capacity.

An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Amongst possible forms of visitor pressure ~~to~~ **that could** be considered are:

- (i) Damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces;
- (ii) Damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;
- (iii) Damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things;
- (iv) Damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life;
- (v) Damage to visitor experience as a result of over-crowding.

- 5.6 Section 5 should conclude with the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants within the nominated site and any buffer zone, any activities they undertake which affect the site and an account of any other factors of any kind not included earlier in the section which have the potential to affect its development or threaten it in any way (~~e.g. terrorist activity or the potential for armed conflict~~).

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

6.1 This section of the dossier is intended to provide the evidence for the state of conservation of the property which can be reviewed and reported on regularly so as to give an indication of trends over time.

6.2 Section 6 (a) ~~should~~ **could** set out those key indicators which have been chosen as the measure of the state of conservation of the whole site. They ~~should~~ **could** be representative of an important aspect of the site and relate as closely as possible to the statement of significance. Where possible they ~~should~~ **could** be expressed numerically and where this is not possible they ~~should~~ **could** be of a kind which can be repeated, for example by taking a photograph from the same point. Examples of good indicators are:

- (i) the number of species, or population of a keystone species on a natural site;
- (ii) the percentage of buildings requiring major repair in a historic town or district;
- (iii) the number of years estimated to elapse before a major conservation programme is likely to be completed;
- (iv) the stability or degree of movement in a particular building or element of a building;
- (v) the rate at which encroachment of any kind on a site has increased or diminished.

6.3 Section 6 (b) should make clear that there is a regular system of formal inspections of the property, leading to the recording, at least annually, of the conditions of the site. This should result, every five years, in a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Committee.

6.4 Section 6 (c) should summarize briefly earlier reports on the state of conservation of the site and provide extracts and references to published sources.

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

7.1 This section of the dossier is simply a check-list of the documentation which should be provided to make up a complete nomination.

- 7 (a) There should be enough photographs, slides and, where possible, film/video to provide a good general picture of the site, including one or more aerial photographs. Where possible, slides should be in 35mm format. This material should be accompanied by a duly signed authorization granting free of charge to UNESCO the non-exclusive right for the legal term of copyright to reproduce and use it in accordance with the terms of the authorization attached.
- 7 (b) Copies of and extracts from plans should be provided.
 - Management plan.
 - Legal protection, if necessary summarized.
 - Maps and plans.
- 7 (c) The Bibliography should include references to all the main published sources and should be compiled to international standards.
- 7 (d) One or more addresses for inventory and site records should be provided.

8. Signature on behalf of the State Party

The dossier should conclude with the signature of the official empowered to sign it on behalf of the State Party.

draft prepared: 23-9-1996

submitted to:

XX session of the Committee as Annex I.2. of WHC-96/CONF.201/6.B