



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

39 COM

WHC-15/39.COM/INF.13A

Paris, 10 June 2015

Original: English

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-ninth session

**Bonn, Germany
28 June – 8 July 2015**

Item 13 of the Agenda: Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods

13A. Working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination: Report of the ad-hoc working group

INF. 13A: Information related to the ad-hoc working group on working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination

Summary

This document contains information regarding the ad-hoc working group established by the 38th session of the Committee to examine the issues related to working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination.

This document should be read in conjunction with Document WHC-15/39.COM/13A

Proposed Amendments to the Operational Guidelines

Decision 38 COM 13, in paragraph 8, “Calls upon the Advisory Bodies *to consult and have a dialogue with all concerned States Parties during the course of the evaluation of nominations*, in order to enhance overall transparency and to optimize future decision-making by the World Heritage Committee”.

Welcoming the letter of the President of ICOMOS dated 18 December 2014 indicating reforms to establish a proactive and productive dialogue with the Committee and States Parties, the following amendments to the Operational Guidelines are recommended based on discussions of the Ad Hoc Working Group with the Advisory Bodies:

I.G Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee

31. The roles of the Advisory Bodies are to:

- a) advise on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the field of their expertise;
- b) assist the Secretariat, in the preparation of the Committee's documentation, the agenda of its meetings and the implementation of the Committee's decisions;
- c) assist with the development and implementation of the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List, the Global Training Strategy, Periodic Reporting, and the strengthening of the effective use of the World Heritage Fund;
- d) monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and review requests for International Assistance;
- e) in the case of ICOMOS and IUCN evaluate properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, **in consultation and dialogue with all States Parties concerned**, and present evaluation reports to the Committee; and
- f) attend meetings of the World Heritage Committee and the Bureau in an advisory capacity.

III. E. Evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies

148. The following principles must guide the evaluations and presentations of ICOMOS and IUCN. The evaluations and presentations should:

- a) adhere to the World Heritage Convention and the relevant Operational Guidelines and any additional policies set out by the Committee in its decisions;
 - b) be objective, rigorous and scientific in their evaluations;
 - c) be conducted to a consistent standard of professionalism *and in consultation and dialogue with all States Parties concerned in a transparent and non-discretionary manner. The dialogue should start early in order to guarantee all necessary clarifications during the evaluation process, and would be intensified after the presentation of an interim report by the Advisory Bodies in January. The dialogue shall be through teleconference and/or face-to-face meetings, as requested by the State Party concerned;*
 - d) comply to standard format, both for evaluations and presentations, to be agreed with the Secretariat and include *names of all experts who participated in the evaluation process and, in an annex, a detailed breakdown of all costs and expenses related to the evaluation* ~~the name of the evaluator(s) who conducted the site visit;~~
- d)bis involve regional/sub-regional experts familiar with the subject;*
- e) indicate clearly and separately whether the property has Outstanding Universal Value, meets the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity, a management plan/system and legislative protection;
 - f) evaluate each property systematically according to all relevant criteria, including its state of conservation, relatively, that is, by comparison with that of other properties of the same type, both inside and outside the State Party's territory;
 - g) include references to Committee decisions and requests concerning the nomination under consideration;
 - h) not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after 28 February, as evidenced by the postmark, in the year in which the nomination is considered. The State Party should be informed when information has arrived after the deadline and is not being taken into account in the evaluation. This deadline should be rigorously enforced; and
 - i) provide a justification for their views through a list of references (literature) consulted, as appropriate.

A. THE ICOMOS PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES

1. In carrying out its evaluation of nominations of cultural properties ICOMOS (the International Council of Monuments and Sites) is guided by the *Operational Guidelines*; (see Paragraph 148).
2. The evaluation process (see Figure 1) involves consultation of the wide range of expertise represented by the membership of ICOMOS and its National and International Committees, as well as the many other specialist networks with which it is linked. Members are also sent on expert missions to carry out confidential on-site evaluations. This extensive consultation results in the preparation of detailed recommendations that are submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its annual meetings.

Choice of experts

3. **ICOMOS shall ensure a balance among different regions and increase the number of its advisors to include different fields of expertise covering all types of cultural heritage.** There is a clearly defined annual procedure for the submission of properties to the World Heritage List. Once new nominations have been checked for completeness by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, the nomination dossiers are then delivered to ICOMOS, where they are handled by the ICOMOS World Heritage secretariat. The first action involved is the choice of the experts who are to be consulted. This involves two separate groups. First, there are those who can advise on the “Outstanding Universal Value” of the nominated property. This is essentially a “library” exercise for specialist academics, and may sometimes involve non-ICOMOS members, in cases where there is no adequate expertise within the ICOMOS membership on a specific topic: an example is the occasional nomination of fossil hominid sites, where the services of palaeontologists are required.
4. The second group of experts are those with practical experience of the management, conservation, and authenticity aspects of individual properties, who are required to carry out site missions. The process of selecting these experts makes full use of the ICOMOS network. The advice of International Scientific Committees and individual members is sought, as is that of specialist bodies with whom ICOMOS has partnership agreements, such as The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), and the International Committee for the Documentation and Conservation of Monuments and Sites of the Modern Movement (DoCoMoMo). **Other institutions, i.e. UNESCO Chairs, universities and research institutes should be consulted during the evaluation process, and listed in the evaluation report.**

Site missions

5. In selecting experts to carry out on-site evaluation missions, the policy of ICOMOS is wherever possible to choose someone from the region in which the nominated property is located. Such experts are required to be experienced in heritage management and conservation: they are not necessarily high academic experts in the type of property. They are expected to be able to talk to site managers on a basis of professional equality and to make informed assessments of management plans, conservation practices, visitor handling, etc. They are provided with detailed briefings, which include copies of the relevant information from the dossiers. The dates and programmes of their visits are agreed in consultation with States Parties, who are requested to ensure that ICOMOS evaluation missions are given a low profile so far as the media are concerned. ICOMOS experts submit their reports in confidence to the Executive Committee on practical aspects of the properties concerned, and premature publicity can cause embarrassment both to ICOMOS and to the World Heritage Committee.

5 bis. ICOMOS shall promote a holistic approach to the evaluation process. Experts who visit the site on technical missions should be able to comment on OUV and other core elements of the Convention.

World Heritage Panel

6. The two reports (cultural assessment and site mission report) that emerge from these consultations are received by the ICOMOS secretariat in Paris, and from them a draft evaluation is prepared. This contains a brief description and history of the property, summaries of its legislative protection, management, and state of conservation, comments on these aspects, and recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. Draft evaluations are then presented to a two or three-day meeting of the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel. The Panel comprises the members of the Executive Committee, who come from all parts of the world and who possess a wide range of skills and experience. The Executive Committee members are supplemented by experts in certain categories of heritage that figure on the annual list of nominations but which are not represented on the Committee. **After the submission of evaluation reports, the names of the members of the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel as well as their qualifications shall be provided to the World Heritage Committee and also published on the ICOMOS website.**

6 bis. ICOMOS shall engage in dialogue and consultation with States Parties concerned in a cooperative, transparent and non-discretionary manner. In this regard, dialogue shall start early in the evaluation process and intensify after the meeting of the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel in December. An interim report outlining the status of evaluations and requests for supplementary information shall be provided by ICOMOS to the nominating States Parties, copied to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, (members of the Committee), and the World Heritage Center. Dialogue and consultation shall be through teleconference and/or face-to-face meetings, as requested by the State Party concerned.

7. Each nominated property is the subject of a 10–15 minute illustrated presentation by a representative of ICOMOS, followed by discussion. Following the objective and

exhaustive examination of the nominations, the collective recommendations of ICOMOS are prepared, and the evaluations are revised and printed, for presentation to the World Heritage Committee. *In order to allow the experts of delegations to study them, electronic version of the final evaluation reports in their original language would be sent to the Chair, the Committee Members and the World Heritage Centre. The Centre would forward them immediately to the concerned nominating State Parties.*

B. THE IUCN PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF NATURAL PROPERTIES

8. In carrying out its evaluation of nominations of natural properties, IUCN (the International Union for Conservation of Nature) is guided by the *Operational Guidelines* (see Paragraph 0). The evaluation process (see Figure 2) involves ~~five~~ six steps:

- (i) **Data Assembly.** Following receipt of the nomination dossier from the World Heritage Centre, a standardised data sheet is compiled on the property by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), using the Protected Area database, and verified with the State Party during the field inspection.
- (ii) **External Review.** The nomination is normally sent for desk review to up to 15 experts knowledgeable about the property, primarily members of IUCN's specialist Commissions and networks.
- (iii) **Field Inspection.** One or two IUCN experts visit each nominated property to clarify details about the area, to evaluate site management and to discuss the nomination with relevant authorities and stakeholders. IUCN experts, selected for their global perspective on conservation and natural history as well as their knowledge of the *Convention*, are usually members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas' World Heritage Expert Network or are IUCN secretariat staff. (This field inspection is undertaken jointly with ICOMOS in certain situations - see Part C below)
- (iv) **Other sources of information.** IUCN may also consult additional literature and receive comments from local NGOs and others. *Other institutions, i.e. UNESCO Chairs, universities and research institutes should be consulted during the evaluation process, and listed in the evaluation report.*
- (v) **IUCN World Heritage Panel Review.** The IUCN World Heritage Panel, reviews all field inspection reports, reviewers' comments, the UNEP-WCMC data sheet and other background material before finalising the text of the IUCN evaluation report for each nominated property. *After the submission of evaluation reports, the names of the members of the IUCN World Heritage Panel as well as their qualifications shall be provided to the World Heritage Committee and also published on the IUCN website.*

(v)bis IUCN shall engage in dialogue and consultation with States Parties concerned in a cooperative, transparent and non-discretionary manner. In this regard, dialogue shall start early in the evaluation process and intensify after the meeting of the IUCN World Heritage Panel in December. An interim report outlining the status of evaluations and requests for supplementary information shall be provided by IUCN to the nominating States Parties, copied to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, (members of the Committee), and the World Heritage Center. Dialogue and consultation shall be through teleconference and/or face-to-face meetings, as requested by the State Party concerned. In order to allow the experts of delegations to study them, electronic version of the final evaluation reports in their original language would be sent to the Chair, the Committee Members and the World Heritage Centre. The Centre would forward them immediately to the concerned nominating State Parties. IUCN shall promote a holistic approach to the evaluation process. Experts who visit the site on technical missions should be able to comment on OUV and other core elements of the Convention.

Each evaluation report presents a concise summary of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property nominated, a comparison with other similar sites and a review of integrity and management issues. It concludes with the assessment of the applicability of the criteria, and a clear recommendation to the World Heritage Committee. The UNEP-WCMC data sheets are also made available to the World Heritage Committee.

The Udvardy biogeographic classification system

9. In the evaluations, IUCN uses Udvardy's "Biogeographical Provinces of the World" (1975) biogeographic classification system. This is a classification system for freshwater and terrestrial areas of the world which enables predictions and assumptions to be made about similar biogeographical regions. The Udvardy system provides an objective means of comparing nominated properties with sites of similar climatic and ecological conditions.
10. It is stressed, however, that the Biogeographical Province concept is used as a basis for comparison only and does not imply that World Heritage properties are to be selected solely on this criterion. The guiding principle is that World Heritage properties must be of Outstanding Universal Value.

Systems to identify priority areas for conservation

11. IUCN also uses systems which identify priority areas for conservation such as the Worldwide Fund for Nature's (WWF) Global Ecoregions, WWF/IUCN's Centres of Plant Diversity, Conservation International's Biodiversity Hotspots, and Birdlife International's Endemic Bird Areas and Important Bird Areas.

Systems to evaluate properties for earth science value

12. In evaluating properties which have been nominated for their geological value, IUCN consults with a range of specialised organisations such as the UNESCO Earth Sciences Division, the International Union of Speleology and the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS).

Relevant publications used in the evaluation process

13. The evaluation process is aided by the publication of some 20 reference volumes on the world's protected areas published by IUCN, UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, Birdlife International and other publishers. These include:
- (i) Reviews of Protected Area Systems in Oceania, Africa, and Asia;
 - (ii) The four volume directory of Protected Areas of the World;
 - (iii) The World Atlas of Coral Reefs;
 - (iv) The six volume Conservation Atlas series;
 - (v) The four volume "A Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas";
 - (vi) The three volume Centres of Plant Diversity; and
 - (vii) Important Bird Areas and Endemic Bird Areas of the World
14. These documents together provide system-wide overviews which allow comparison of the conservation importance of protected areas throughout the world. With the development of the Global Strategy work for natural heritage, IUCN is increasingly using its "global overview" papers to identify gaps in natural World Heritage coverage and properties of World Heritage potential. These can be viewed on the IUCN website at <http://iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wheritage/globalstrategy.htm>

Evaluation of Cultural Landscapes (see also Annex 3)

15. IUCN has an interest in many cultural properties, especially those nominated as cultural landscapes. For that reason, it will on occasion participate in joint field inspections to nominated cultural landscapes with ICOMOS (see Part C below). IUCN's evaluation of such nominations is guided by an internal paper, "The Assessment of Natural Values in cultural landscapes", available on the IUCN web site at <http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wheritage/culturallandscape.htm>
16. In accordance with the natural qualities of certain cultural landscapes identified in Annex 3, Paragraph 11, IUCN's evaluation is concerned with the following factors:
- (i) Conservation of natural and semi-natural systems, and of wild species of fauna and flora
 - (ii) Conservation of biodiversity within farming systems;
 - (iii) Sustainable land use;
 - (iv) Enhancement of scenic beauty;
 - (v) Ex-situ collections;
 - (vi) Outstanding examples of humanity's inter-relationship with nature;
 - (vii) Historically significant discoveries

The following table sets each of the above list in the context of the categories of cultural landscapes in Annex 3, thereby indicating where each consideration is most likely to occur (the absence of a consideration does not mean that it will *never* occur, only that this is unlikely):

Cultural Landscape type (see also Annex 3)	Natural considerations most likely to be relevant (see Paragraph 16 above)						
Designed landscape					(v)		
Organically evolving landscape - continuous	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)			
Organically evolving landscape – fossil	(i)					(vi)	
Associative landscape							(vii)

C. ADVISORY BODY COLLABORATION - THE EVALUATION OF MIXED PROPERTIES AND OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Mixed properties

- 17.** Properties that are nominated as having both natural and cultural value entail a joint IUCN and ICOMOS mission to the nominated property. Following the mission, IUCN and ICOMOS prepare separate evaluation reports of the property under the relevant criteria (see A, Paragraph 5 and B, Paragraph 9 (iii) above).

Cultural Landscapes

- 18.** Properties nominated as Cultural Landscapes are evaluated by ICOMOS under criteria (i) - (vi) (see Paragraph 77 of the *Operational Guidelines*). IUCN is called upon by ICOMOS to review the natural values and the management of the nominated property. This has been the subject of an agreement between the Advisory Bodies. In some cases, a joint mission is required.