



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

36 COM

WHC-12/36.COM/13

Paris, 11 May 2012

Original: English / French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-sixth session

**Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation
24 June – 6 July 2012**

Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*

SUMMARY

The World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) adopted the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and requested the World Heritage Centre to upload it on its webpage <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide11-en.pdf>. Furthermore, the Committee decided to “*establish an open-ended working group on the Operational Guidelines at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 to consider the proposals made by Jordan on paragraph 68 (Decision 35 COM 13 point 8) and reflect on other elements of the Operational Guidelines as may be proposed by other States Parties*”.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 13** (see point 9) will be finalized by the working group.

I. Introduction

1. The Committee took note of the results of the Working Group on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* established as a Consultative Body (Brasilia, July-August 2010) as well as of the results of the Working Group (UNESCO, Paris, November 2010) and adopted these revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).
2. Furthermore, it welcomed the offer of the Government of Poland to host an International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Criterion (vi) (Warsaw, 28-30 March 2012) and requested the World Heritage Centre to report on the results of this meeting to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012. No changes to the *Operational Guidelines* are foreseen as a result of the recommendations of this meeting. The full report and recommendations of the meeting are available at the following address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/827> .
3. In addition, it requested the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to organize an International World Heritage Expert Meeting to reflect on the integrity of cultural properties and to seek extrabudgetary funding to support the organization of this meeting. The United Arab Emirates hosted this meeting (Al Ain, 12-14 March 2012). The results of this expert meeting can be found at the following address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/833> . Annex I to this document provides the recommendations for changes to the *Operational Guidelines*.
4. In order to examine the issue of Tentative Lists as proposed by Jordan (see Annex II), the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), decided to « *establish an open-ended working group on the Operational Guidelines at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 to consider the proposals made by Jordan on paragraph 68 (Decision 35 COM 13 point 8) and reflect on other elements of the Operational Guidelines as may be proposed by other States Parties* ».

II. Background

5. This issue had already been raised by the World Heritage Committee in 2008 during its 32nd session in Quebec City. Draft Decision **32 COM 8A point 4** as contained in document *WHC-08/32.COM/8A* proposed to replace the text of paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines* as follows:

Draft Decision 32 COM 8A

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/8A,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 8A.3** adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Takes note of the Tentative Lists presented in Annexes 2 and 3 of this document,
4. Decides to replace the text of paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines with the following text:

“68. Upon reception of the Tentative Lists from the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre checks for completeness of the documentation and for consistency of the proposed properties with properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. If the documentation is not considered complete, the World Heritage Centre

refers it back to the State Party. In case an inconsistency with properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List is detected, the World Heritage Centre informs the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, who could take the decision to refer the proposal back to the State Party for clarification. Once clarification by the State Party is received, the proposal is examined again by the Chairperson. If the clarification is considered satisfactory by the Chairperson, the property is registered by the World Heritage Centre. If the clarification is not considered satisfactory by the Chairperson, the case is presented to the World Heritage Committee at its following session, which takes a decision on the matter. When all information has been provided, the Tentative List is registered by the World Heritage Centre and transmitted to the relevant Advisory Bodies for information. A summary of all Tentative Lists is presented annually to the Committee. The World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the States Parties concerned, updates its records, in particular by removing from the Tentative Lists the inscribed properties and nominated properties which were not inscribed.”

5. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to examine the Tentative Lists already registered and to check for inconsistencies with properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, using the mechanism described above, and to report to the World Heritage Committee on this activity at its 33rd session in 2009.*
6. The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) did not adopt this text and decided (Decision **32 COM 8A** point 5) to *“Further requests the Chairperson of the 33rd session to establish a working group to continue the analysis of these issues in order to suggest a solution”*.

Decision 32 COM 8A

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/8A,
2. Recognizes the value of the discussions held on issues raised in Document WHC-08/32.COM/8A;
3. Notes that these discussions have not reached an agreed conclusion at the 32nd session;
4. Requests that this item be included on the agenda for its 33rd session;
5. Further requests the Chairperson of the 33rd session to establish a working group to continue the analysis of these issues in order to suggest a solution.
7. Such a working group was not established at the 33rd session, and this issue was also not raised nor discussed at the *Working Group on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines* (Paris, UNESCO, 15-16 November 2010).

III. Open-Ended Working group at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee

8. Furthermore, the working group at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee may wish to take into account revisions proposed under item 14 on International

Assistance. Working Document *WHC-12/36.COM/14* contains proposals to modify several paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines* related to International Assistance. Some of these modifications are the result of the recommendations of the external auditors on the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative; others are made in order to clarify the priorities and avoid processing requests on a 'first come, first served' basis.

9. The following text may be taken into account by the Working Group for a Draft Decision **36 COM 13**:

Draft Decision: 36 COM 13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/13,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 13** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) to "establish an open-ended working group on the Operational Guidelines at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 to consider the proposals made by Jordan on paragraph 68 and reflect on other elements of the Operational Guidelines as may be proposed by other States Parties",
3. Takes note of the recommendations of the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Integrity for Cultural Heritage (Al Ain, United Arab Emirates, 12-14 March 2012);
4. Further notes the recommendations of the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Criterion (vi) (Warsaw, Poland, 28-30 March 2012);
5. Also takes note of the revisions proposed on International Assistance in working document WHC-12/36.COM/14.

IV. Extract of the Report of the International Expert Meeting on Integrity for Cultural Heritage, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates, 12-14 March 2012

Possible revisions to the text of the *Operational Guidelines*

The meeting proposed to remove the footnote to paragraph 89 and suggested the following changes to the *Operational Guidelines* to be taken into account at a future revision [all new text in *italics*]:

89. For properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi), the physical fabric of the property and/or its significant features should be in good condition, and the impact of deterioration processes controlled. A significant proportion of the elements necessary to express the totality of the value conveyed by the property should be included. Relationships and dynamic functions present in cultural landscapes, historic towns or other living properties essential to their distinctive character should also be maintained.

Additionally, guidance on the condition of integrity is provided for the following typologies:

- a) *Properties nominated as cultural landscapes, should contain key interrelated, interdependent and visually integral elements. For example, an agricultural landscape should include not only the production fields, but also the watersheds and irrigation systems as well as processing features of the agricultural products, social practices and expressions of associative values such as rituals.*
- b) *Properties nominated as archaeological sites should contain the necessary interrelated, interdependent and visually integral elements which provide important information critical to its understanding. Prospects for future potential discoveries related to the Outstanding Universal Value should also be recognized. For example, a settlement area should take into consideration the physical traces of the social, economic, historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological behaviour relating to the site. Or, for example, a property proposed for its ancient water irrigation system should have sufficient necessary elements to demonstrate the key aspects for the understanding of its overall value, i.e. physical components: underground and surface water channels, shafts (inspection covers), water collecting points, and irrigated fields; social/economic components: traditional water sharing practices, etc.*
- c) *For properties nominated as historic towns consideration should be given to the fact that they are living and dynamic and that their integrity should be considered within the framework of the need to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property while its people maintain a good quality of life.*
 - (i) *The elements of the Historic Urban Landscape approach (see the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape) should be used to assess the conditions of integrity including topography, geomorphology, hydrology and natural features; its built environment, both*

historic and contemporary; its infrastructure above and below ground; its open spaces and gardens, its land use patterns and spatial organization; perceptions and visual relationships (both internal and external); building heights and massing as well as all other elements of the urban character, fabric and structure.

(ii) Conditions of integrity also include social and cultural practices and values, economic processes and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to diversity and identity (valid also for other cultural heritage properties).

(iii) All of the elements mentioned above in (i) and (ii) will need to be assessed to consider their positive and negative impacts on integrity.

d) Properties nominated as monuments should contain all elements (for example, principal and subsidiary buildings), infrastructure, and environmental and landscape layouts necessary to express their Outstanding Universal Value as well as their successive additions/expansions that are compatible with the Outstanding Universal Value or contribute to it. Consideration should also be given to the need to ensure important views to and from the monument using appropriate management tools such as buffer zones. Proposed properties may include surrounding neighbourhoods. For example, the nomination of a monument with religious significance should include its environment, spaces for related practices, and subsidiary buildings supporting traditional forms of maintenance.

e) Nominated properties which contain groups of buildings should contain all the necessary elements that through their mutual relationships, express their Outstanding Universal Value. For example, the nomination of a large and fragmented defence system should include the necessary constitutive elements (forts, bastions, wall-paths, towers as well as other defensive features), expressing the system's function along with those of its various parts.

Further specific examples can be found in the Resource Manuals at whc.unesco.org.

Footnote: Serial nominations still need to be considered in future discussions (see Section C on Recommendations of the International Expert Meeting on Integrity for Cultural Heritage).

Proposal submitted by the Delegation of Jordan at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee

Paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines* (amended)

68. *“Upon reception of the Tentative Lists from the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre checks for completeness of the documentation and for consistency of the proposed properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. If the documentation is not considered complete, the World Heritage Centre refers it back to the State Party indicating the documentation needed. In case an inconsistency with properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List is detected, the World Heritage Centre informs the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, who refers the proposal back to the State Party asking for clarification within three months. Once clarification by the State Party is received, the proposal is presented to the World Heritage Committee for examination at its following session. If the clarification is considered satisfactory by the Committee, the property is registered by the World Heritage Centre and transmitted to the relevant Advisory Bodies for information. If the clarification is not considered satisfactory for any reason by the Committee, it takes a decision not to register the property on the Tentative List. A summary of all Tentative Lists is presented annually to the Committee.*

The World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the State Parties concerned, updates its records, in particular by removing from the Tentative Lists the inscribed properties and the nominated properties which were not inscribed.”