

Distribution limited

WHC-02/CONF.201/6
Paris, 20 February 2002
Original : English/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

Twenty-sixth session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room IV
8 - 13 April 2002

Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda:

Progress report on the analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the identification of underrepresented categories of natural and cultural heritage

Action required:

The Bureau is requested to:

- (i) note progress made in the preparation of analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the identification of underrepresented categories of natural and cultural heritage; and,**
- (ii) transmit this progress report to the 25th session of the World Heritage Committee (Budapest, 24-29 June 2002) for noting.**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The 24th session of the Committee (Cairns, 2000) requested the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to proceed with an analysis of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and the tentative list on a regional, chronological, geographical and thematic basis. The Committee requested that the work be undertaken in two parts, sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and sites on the tentative lists (see Annex I).

2. The 13th General Assembly commented on the importance of establishing clear criteria for the selection of the limited number of nominations to be examined by the Committee each year. Some States Parties expressed the need for caution to ensure that properties of outstanding universal value were not excluded from consideration just because a State Party already had a site on the World Heritage List or because that category was already well represented on the List. In conclusion the General Assembly noted that the process of selection should be inclusive rather than exclusive and should be conceived in consultation with States Parties.

3. The 25th session of the Committee (Helsinki, 2001) discussed the analysis of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and the tentative lists in two separate agenda items. The Committee noted that a conceptual discussion is needed to provide a framework for such analyses and also recognized the need to identify methodologies to define under-represented categories of heritage (see Annex II).

4. Meetings of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to discuss the analysis of the List and tentative lists were held at UNESCO Headquarters on 21 January and 14 February 2002. The progress report presented in this document represents the collective discussion and agreement reached at those meetings.

5. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies will continue to meet at regular intervals as a working group to review progress with the preparation of the analysis. The working group will aim to develop complementary methods of analysis for the cultural and natural heritage with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre providing contributions to the analyses using a common data set. It is considered that the analysis will be meaningful as the data set is of a sufficient size to be statistically valid yet still small enough for the experts involved to have a knowledge of the majority of the properties being analysed.

II. GOAL

6. The overall goal is to conduct an analysis whose results will inform the process of building a credible and global network of World Heritage properties across the various geographic regions of the world.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE ANALYSIS

8. The overall objective of the analysis of the World Heritage List and tentative lists is to make a significant contribution to the implementation of the Global Strategy by reducing the current imbalance and thereby ensure a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List.

More specifically, the analysis will provide the World Heritage Committee with:

- (i) a clear overview of the present composition of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists, and
- (ii) likely trends in the short to medium term with a view to identifying under-represented categories of heritage of potential World Heritage value.

The results of the analysis will be communicated to States Parties as a basis for them to:

- (i) revise and if necessary harmonize their tentative lists taking into account, where appropriate, regional considerations, and
- (ii) prepare new nominations to the World Heritage List of heritage un- or less-represented on the World Heritage List and nominations that go beyond individual sites protected area units in an attempt to cover land/seascape, cultural and other connections.

IV. THE DATA SET

9. The World Heritage Centre will provide the following data in electronic format for the analysis:

Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List	721
Total number of properties presented for nomination up until 20 February 2002	1121
Properties included on the tentative lists of 124 States Parties	1356

Many additional sources of data and information will be used to inform the analysis. These will include technical reports and inventories and the results of Global Strategy meetings and studies and the first regional Periodic Reports for the Arab States and Africa.

V. ANALYSIS OF NATURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND TENTATIVE LISTS

10. IUCN has begun its review of the World Heritage List with the aim of establishing inventories of underrepresented categories of outstanding natural heritage. IUCN is currently finalizing its methodology for the analysis which will involve use of the matrices as outlined in Table 1 below and involve members of the IUCN World Heritage Panel, the IUCN World Heritage Technical Advisors Network, UNEP-WCMC and other experts as appropriate.

Table 1. IUCN Review of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists

- 1) Review of sites by theme (e.g. ecosystem types such as deserts, coastal/marine etc.)
- 2) Review of sites by Udvardy Biome Classification
- 3) Review of marine/coastal sites by Kelleher et al 1995 Marine Regions (and using outputs of UNESCO/IUCN/UNFIP project "Filling critical gaps and promoting multi-sites approach in new nominations of tropical coastal, marine and small island ecosystems").
- 4) Review of sites by conservation priority regions (e.g. biodiversity hotspots, WWF eco-regions etc.)
- 5) Review of sites by geological period

Timetable

11. IUCN expects to have preliminary results of its analysis by June 2002. IUCN shall also prepare a 4 year programme of work (2002-2005) designed to undertake, or revise, a number of thematic studies which will help to fill gaps in the coverage of natural heritage on the World Heritage

List. In this way, it will be possible to make a significant contribution to the Global Strategy of a network of “credible, balanced and representative” World Heritage natural sites.

Expected results

12. It is expected that the IUCN analysis will identify some major gaps (with regard to geographic areas, and ecosystem types). An identification of these gaps may be useful in suggesting to States Parties ways and means as to how they could identify potential areas and adopt innovative approaches to defining World Heritage properties to fill in these gaps. Through a process of tentative list analysis, comparative analyses, information and data collection it may be possible to prepare nomination strategies that go beyond individual protected area units in an attempt to cover land/seascape level linkages and connections as a contribution to improving management standards and conservation infrastructure. However, IUCN is concerned that use of the term "representativity" in this study will blur the distinction between the World Heritage List and other international designations for natural sites such as UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB). One of the objectives of the MAB Programme is to create a representative list of sites corresponding to the biogeographic provinces of the world but this is not the objective of the World Heritage Convention. The Convention deals with sites of outstanding universal value and there are many biogeographic provinces that do not contain sites of this caliber. Therefore in its analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists IUCN will seek to identify those geographical areas and ecosystems of the world, containing sites of potential outstanding universal value, which are not represented on the World Heritage List.

VI. ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND TENTATIVE LISTS

13. ICOMOS has already carried out analyses of the World Heritage List in 1994 and 1999 in the context of the development of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List and discussions on the Representivity of the World Heritage List. These analyses were made on the basis of "single-category" analysis- an analysis assigning each property on the World Heritage List to one of a limited set of categories. The result has been a broad and general guide to geographical and thematic over- and under- representation on the List.

Selection of categories for the analysis

14. ICOMOS is now working on the development of a methodology for the detailed, multi-category analysis in order to produce meaningful statistical data. ICOMOS, ICCROM and the World Heritage Centre have discussed the necessity of developing an agreed set of categories for the cultural heritage analysis and have discussed a number of different options to be used as part of a multi-category analysis within a regional, cultural, chronological and thematic framework. These options include the use of matrices to include reference to the definitions of cultural heritage and monuments, groups of buildings and sites in the *Convention* and to sub-categories of each of these categories thus creating a typology for analysis.

15. The global analysis being prepared by ICOMOS will include the contributions of ICOMOS National and International Scientific Committees, specialist groups and independent experts.

Regional desk studies

16. The World Heritage Centre, working in co-operation with ICOMOS, will organize desk studies, region by region, drawing on the results of Global Strategy and Periodic Reporting activities to date. These desk studies will be used to inform / contribute to the ICOMOS global analysis.

Timetable

17. The categories for analysis will be agreed by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with ICCROM, over the coming weeks. Preliminary results of the multi-category analysis and some of the initial regional desk studies may be completed in 2002. However, due to the complexity of the analysis involving a matrix approach more conclusive results are not expected until 2003.

Expected results

18. It is envisaged that the analysis will result in the identification and prioritization of thematic studies to be commissioned in order to identify criteria for selection and evaluation of properties in under-represented categories and regions. This process will be planned on a medium-term basis over the period 2002-2005.

VII. ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have identified the need to develop and include in their analyses reference to mixed cultural and natural properties. A separate analysis of cultural landscapes is currently being carried out by a consultant to evaluate the implementation of the cultural landscape concept in the framework of the World Heritage Convention based on the decision of the World Heritage Committee in 1992 to include cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List. This study also aims at reviewing the World Heritage List and the Tentative Lists regarding cultural landscape properties and potential sites. Furthermore, an analysis of all global strategy meetings and regional thematic expert meetings on cultural landscapes for the period 1992 to 2002 will be provided.

Extract from the report of the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000) (WHC-2000/CONF.204/21)

3. REPRESENTIVITY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The Committee examined and discussed the recommendations of the Working Group on the Representivity of the World Heritage List chaired by Ambassador Yai (Benin), which had been transmitted by the Special Session of the Bureau with some changes.

The Committee recognized that the issue of representivity of the World Heritage List was the most difficult of the reform issues under consideration by the Committee. The Committee noted that more effective use of tentative lists and greater regulation of the ever-increasing number of nominations was required. It was agreed that other measures, such as assistance for capacity-building would be vital for ensuring the representation of sites from all regions on the World Heritage List.

The Committee therefore agreed on a decision presented in 5 sections:

1. Respecting the Convention
2. Tentative Lists
3. Nominations
4. Resolution of the Twelfth General Assembly, 1999
5. Capacity Building for under-represented Regions

With reference to Section 3, the Delegate of Hungary asked that his request for a change in the deadline for submission of nominations to be examined in 2002, from December 2000 as agreed by the Committee, to April 2001, be noted in the Report. The Committee agreed to note this request by the Delegate of Hungary but stated that in the interest of a smooth transition, the majority position of the Committee will be maintained.

With the exception of Hungary, the text of the decision was adopted by all members of the Committee. A letter from the Italian Government is included as Annex IX of this report.

The Committee agreed to transmit its decision to the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties in 2001.

1. Respecting the Convention

The Committee reaffirmed the Convention for the Protection of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage as an instrument of consensus, cooperation and accord between States Parties and takes particular note of Articles 6 (1) and 6 (2) and Article 11 (1):

(i) Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the States on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is situated, and without prejudice to property right provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate (Article 6 (1))

(ii) The States Parties undertake, in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, to give their help in the identification, protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage ... if the States on whose territory it is situated so request (Article 6 (2)).

(iii) Every State Party to this Convention shall, in so far as possible, submit to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the list ... (Article 11 (1)).

Decisive cooperative action is required by the Committee and States Parties to ensure that the World Heritage List is fully representative of the world's natural and cultural heritage.

2. Tentative Lists

(i) In the future, consistent with Article 11, the tentative lists of cultural and natural sites should be used, as a planning tool to reduce the imbalances in the World Heritage List. States Parties are reminded of the invitation to submit tentative lists in conformity with Article 11 of the Convention. The Committee should revise paragraphs 7 and 8 of the *Operational Guidelines* to extend to natural sites its decision not to examine nominations of sites for inscription if the property does not appear on a tentative list.

(ii) The advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre should proceed with an analysis of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and the tentative list on a regional, chronological, geographical and thematic basis. This analysis should be undertaken as soon as possible, taking into account the workload on advisory bodies and the financial implications of this work, particularly in regard to the large number of sites on the tentative list. For this reason, the work should be undertaken in two parts, sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and sites on the tentative list. The analysis will provide States Parties with

a clear overview of the present situation, and likely trends in the short to medium term with a view to identifying under-represented categories.

(iii) The advisory bodies should take into account in their analyses:

- The diversity and particularities of natural and cultural heritage in each region,
- The results of regional Periodic Reporting, and
- The recommendations of the regional and thematic meetings on the harmonisation of tentative lists held since 1984 and those on the Global Strategy organised since 1994.

(iv) The World Heritage Centre and advisory bodies should communicate the results of the analyses to the World Heritage Committee and, following the Committee's examination, the results should be conveyed to States Parties to the Convention, together with the Committee's recommendations. This will allow them to prepare, revise and/or harmonise their tentative list, taking into account, where appropriate, regional considerations, and to take the results of the analyses into consideration for the submission of future nominations.

(v) The results of the analyses should be communicated no later than 30 September 2001.

3. Nominations

In order to promote the effective management of the increasing size of the World Heritage List, the Committee at each ordinary session will set the maximum number of nominations to be considered. In the first instance and on an interim basis, it is proposed that at the twenty-seventh session of the Committee in 2003, the number of nominations examined by the Committee will be limited to a maximum of 30 new sites.

In order to determine which sites should be given priority for consideration, all nominations to be considered at the twenty-seventh session of the Committee must be received in full by the new due date of 1 February 2002 agreed by the Committee as part of the change of cycle of meetings. No State Parties should submit more than one nomination, except those States Parties that have no sites inscribed on the World Heritage List who will have the opportunity to propose two or three nominations.

In order to address the issue of representivity of the List the following criteria will be applied in order of priority¹:

¹ In nominating properties to the List, States Parties are invited to keep in mind the desirability of achieving a reasonable balance between the numbers of cultural heritage and natural heritage properties included in the World Heritage List (Paragraph 15 of the *Operational Guidelines*)

In the event that the number of nominations received exceeds the maximum number set by the Committee, the following priority system will be applied each year by the World Heritage Centre before nominations are transmitted to the advisory bodies for evaluation, in determining which sites should be taken forward for consideration:

1. Nominations of sites submitted by a State Party with no sites inscribed on the List;²
2. Nominations of sites from any State Party that illustrate un-represented or less represented categories of natural and cultural properties, as determined by analyses prepared by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies and reviewed and approved by the Committee;
3. Other nominations.

When applying this priority system, date of receipt of full and complete nominations by the World Heritage Centre shall be used as the secondary determining factor within the category where the number of nominations established by the Committee is reached.

In addition to the approved maximum number of sites, the Committee will also consider nominations deferred, or referred, from previous meetings and changes to the boundaries of already inscribed properties. The Committee may also decide to consider, on an emergency basis, situations falling under paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Transition arrangements

Committee meeting, December 2001

No change to existing system.

Committee meeting June 2002

Full and complete nominations received by the World Heritage Centre prior to 31 December 2000 will be considered together with nominations deferred, or referred, from previous meetings and changes to the boundaries of already inscribed properties. The Committee may also decide to consider, on an emergency basis, situations falling under paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Committee meeting June 2003

Nominations to be submitted by 1 February 2002 and prioritized in accordance with the system as described above.

² In evaluating these, and all other nominations, the Advisory Bodies should continue to apply a strict evaluation of criteria as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*.

Review

The system described above is to be reviewed by the Committee after two full years of operation.

4. Resolution of the Twelfth General Assembly, 1999

The Committee decided to call on States Parties concerned to inform the Committee with a minimum of delay, of measures taken in the implementation of the clauses of the Resolution adopted by the Twelfth General Assembly (Paragraph B) that invites all States Parties that already have a substantial number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List to:

(i) Apply paragraph 6 (vii) of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*:

a) by spacing voluntarily their nominations according to conditions that they will define, and/or

b) by proposing only properties falling into categories still under-represented, and/or

c) by linking each of their nominations with a nomination presented by a State Party whose heritage is under-represented, or

d) by deciding, on a voluntary basis, to suspend the presentation of new nominations.

ii) Initiate and encourage bilateral and multilateral co-operation with States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented in the List within the framework of the preparation of tentative lists, nominations and training programmes,

iii) Give priority to the re-examination of their tentative lists within the framework of regional consultations and to the preparation of periodic reports.

5. Capacity Building for Under-represented Regions

The Committee decided that cooperative efforts in capacity-building and training are necessary to ensure that the World Heritage List is fully representative and agrees that:

(i) The World Heritage Centre should continue to promote training programmes, preferably at the regional level, aimed at allowing States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented to be better versed in the Convention and to better implement the measures under Article 5. These primarily concern the identification, management, protection, enhancement and conservation of heritage. Such programmes should also assist States Parties to acquire and/or consolidate their expertise, in the preparation and harmonisation of their tentative lists and the preparation of nominations.

(ii) The advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre should use the opportunity of evaluation missions to hold regional training workshops to assist under-represented States in the methods of preparation of their tentative list and nominations. Appropriate financial and human resources should be provided through the World Heritage Centre budget process to undertake such workshops.

(iii) Requests by States Parties whose heritage is non-represented or under-represented should be given a high priority when the portion of the World Heritage budget relating to Preparatory Assistance in preparing nominations is developed.

(iv) The order of priorities for the granting of international assistance, as defined in paragraphs 91 and 113-114 of the *Operational Guidelines*, should be revised in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (Canterbury, United Kingdom) to improve the representivity of the World Heritage List and to be coherent with the Global Strategy. Beyond the conditions provided for by the Convention, and subject to the conclusions of the evaluation of international assistance, the new priority order should take into account:

-The necessity of encouraging the beneficiary countries to develop measures for the implementation of the Convention in their country,

- The order of priority for the examination of the nominations for inscription,

- The state of preparation of the beneficiary countries, and

- The necessity of giving priority to the least developed countries (LDCs) and countries with a low revenue.

(v) Regional Plans of Action should be updated and developed within the framework of the Global Strategy. These should specify for each targeted region and State Party, the objective, action needed, responsibility, timetable for adoption, state of play and a mechanism to report on progress in implementing these at each session of the World Heritage Committee. In order to underline their incentive nature, the Plans of Action should highlight the actions by the States Parties concerned, notably in application of Article 5 of the Convention, and should mention the bilateral or multilateral co-operation programmes in the field of heritage in general, for the elaboration in particular of nominations.

(vi) The next UNESCO Medium-Term Strategy should stress the necessity of adopting an intersectoral policy aimed at better implementing the Convention. From the 2002-2003 biennium, an intersectoral project should be developed and implemented to encourage the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented to reinforce their capacity to protect, conserve and enhance it.

The Committee noted that the Hungarian authorities had prepared a proposal for the establishment of a Heritage Partnership Programme to be examined by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns (WHC-2000/CONF.204/19).

The Committee decided that a review of the implementation and effectiveness of such measures should take place not later than 2003.

Extract from the report of the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee (Helsinki, 2001) (WHC-01/CONF.208/24)

IX. PROGRESS REPORT ON REGIONAL ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE AND BALANCED WORLD HERITAGE LIST

...

IX.4 Several Committee members stressed the importance of the Resolution of the General Assembly concerning the Representivity of the World Heritage List and that the substantive work on the analysis of the current World Heritage List and the tentative lists must be given top priority. New thematic studies and meetings should be carried out only upon the completion of this global analysis, and on the basis of the priorities identified for each region. A number of delegates stated that since 1994, many regional and thematic meetings have been convened, and the results of these meetings need to be reviewed before others are launched.

...

IX.19 The Committee concluded its examination of Global Strategy activities by reiterating the need for the Secretariat to focus on the analysis of the World Heritage List and the national tentative lists as a priority, as well as on assistance to States Parties for the establishment and revision of these tentative lists as required. The Committee however noted that a conceptual discussion is needed to provide a framework for such analyses and also recognized the need to identify methodologies to define under-represented categories of heritage.

...

3. The Identification of un-represented or less represented categories of natural and cultural properties

X.7 The Director of the World Heritage Centre introduced the topic by recalling the decision of the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns, Australia, in 2000 to limit, for a two-year trial period, the number of new nominations to be examined by the Committee in June 2003 to thirty. The Committee agreed to implement the decision according to a priority system:

1. States Parties with no sites on the List may submit up to three new nominations;
2. All other States Parties may submit only one new nomination;
3. If the number of new nominations is greater than thirty, then a selection process will be applied, based on whether the nomination falls into one or more un-represented or less-represented categories.

X.8 He noted that the Committee had also decided to consider nominations which had been deferred or referred from previous meetings, as well as extensions to sites already inscribed in addition to the thirty new nominations. He invited the Committee to consider the case of transboundary nominations, which he proposed as another category of nomination which could be excluded from the 30-nomination limit, as a means to encourage more nominations of this type.

X.9 The Director indicated that an examination of the number of States Parties which had actually submitted new nominations each year revealed that in only two cases over the life of the Convention had more than thirty States Parties submitted new nominations in any one year. The implication of this, he stressed, was that if each State Party submitted only one nomination, it was quite possible that the Secretariat would receive less than 30 nominations. In that case, no selection of nominations to be examined based on un- or less-represented categories would need to be made.

X.10 Finally, in the event that more than thirty nominations were received, the Director described several proposed selection processes that had been examined. In particular, he suggested that, to address the smaller number of natural sites on the World Heritage List, the Committee accept all natural nominations up to a certain specified limit.

X.11 A long discussion followed the Director's presentation. While some delegates questioned the decision of the previous Committee to limit the total number of nominations to be examined, and to limit the number of new nominations which a State Party could submit to one per year, other delegates recalled that these decisions had been taken as a result of long deliberation in the Twelfth and Thirteenth General Assemblies, in the Working Group on Representivity, and in the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns. These meetings had consistently argued for a limit on the number of nominations examined by the Committee. This limit would give the Committee

more time to take on its important role of reviewing the state of conservation of sites already inscribed and to develop a proactive approach to Periodic Reporting, and to have time for strategic discussions. It would also relieve the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies of a workload that had been growing larger each year.

X.12 Several delegates mentioned that the application of these rules would disadvantage large States Parties with multi-ethnic populations whose diverse heritage should be reflected in nominations to the World Heritage List.

X.13 Several observers reminded the Committee of the voluntary restraints requested of States Parties well-represented on the List by the resolutions of the General Assembly. It was noted that while some well-represented States Parties had refrained from nominating new sites, seven of the ten States Parties with the greatest number of sites had had new sites inscribed on the World Heritage List this year. Several delegates reminded the Committee that the decision once taken by the Cairns Committee should not be reopened at this stage, before the two-year trial proposed by the Committee had actually taken place. The Committee also noted that the initial first phase of this experiment would only be for one year and was to be evaluated in 2003.

X.14 Concerning the selection process recommended in Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/12ADD, most delegates cautioned against using the preliminary cultural categories presented therein. In addition, while the proposed priority for natural nominations might be appropriate to some regions, there are more natural than cultural properties in Africa for example. The Committee regretted that the full analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the World Heritage List requested by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns had not yet been undertaken. Delegates urged that in the budget discussions this activity be fully funded so that it could take place as soon as possible.

X.15 ICOMOS undertook to carry out a summary analysis of the existing List, to serve as the basis for a working group on a proposed methodology for selection of nominations, based on perceived under-represented regions and categories of property.

X.16 Several delegates took up the proposal that, for the nominations to be reviewed by the Committee in 2003 (to be received in the Centre by 1 February 2002), the April 2002 session of the Bureau should be asked for its guidance if the number of nominations exceeded the 30-nomination threshold.

The Committee came to the following consensus agreement:

X.17 The Committee confirmed that at its session in 2003 the number of new nominations examined would be limited to a maximum of thirty, as decided at its twenty-

fourth session in Cairns. In addition to the approved maximum number of nominations, the Committee would also consider nominations deferred or referred from previous meetings and extensions to the boundaries of already inscribed properties. The Committee may also decide to consider, on an emergency basis, situations falling under paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

X.18 The Committee also confirmed that only one nomination per State Party would be accepted, except for those States with no sites on the World Heritage List, which might present up to three nominations.

X.19 Transboundary nominations would not be counted within the limit of thirty nominations.

X.20 If more than thirty nominations are received, the date of receipt of full and complete nominations by the World Heritage Centre would be considered as a secondary determining factor for the selection, as decided by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns.

X.21 If for reasons of co-incidence in the dates of presentation, more than thirty nominations are still received and acceptable, the issue would be referred to the April 2002 Bureau for a decision.