UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-eighth session
Suzhou, China, 28 June - 7 July 2004

Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List (1994-2004)

SUMMARY

The World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns (2000) requested both ICOMOS and IUCN to: *"proceed with an analysis of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and the Tentative Lists on a regional, chronological, geographical and thematic basis"*. Furthermore, the Committee described the purpose of the analysis as to: *"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"*. This document provides an overall analysis as requested by the Committee, under the following sections:

A.   Introduction and background;
B.   World Heritage List: 1994 – 2004;
C.   Analysis of Properties Inscribed on the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists
    C.1. ICOMOS World Heritage List and Tentative Lists Analysis: Executive Summary;
    C.2. IUCN Analysis of Natural and Mixed sites: Executive Summary
D.   Cultural Landscape Analysis; and
E.   Decision for adoption by the Committee.

In addition, the following documents provide more detailed information with regard to the analysis reported by ICOMOS and IUCN in sections C.1 and C.2, respectively: (a) WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A – Full report of ICOMOS analysis; and (b). WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B – Full report of IUCN analysis.

Document WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13C summarizes the implementation of the Cairns Decision to date. The information contained in this document is provided as an input to the open-ended working group to discuss the Cairns Decision that will be set up at the time of the opening of the 28th session of the Committee.

Document WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13D provides information on the Camino Inca project where opportunities for transborder and serial nominations will be explored by 6 Latin American countries.

The Committee is requested to review and discuss the analyses presented and consider adopting the decision proposed in section E.

Draft Decision **28 COM 13** : see page 13

A. Introduction and Background

1. The Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1994, is an action programme designed to identify and fill the major gaps in the World Heritage List. The Global Strategy relies on regional and thematic definitions and analyses of categories of heritage of outstanding universal value, encourages more countries to become States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* and to develop Tentative Lists and nominations of properties for inscription on the List.

2. An overview of the origins of the Global Strategy and related activities conducted between 1994 and 2004 can be found particularly in the following documents:

   - Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List (*WHC-98/CONF.203/12*)
   - Progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List (*WHC-03/14.GA/8*)
   - Resolution Adopted by the 12th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention (on the Global Strategy) (*WHC-03/14.GA/INF.8*)

3. As the main goal of the 1994 Global Strategy has been to ensure a more representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, the analysis, conclusions and recommendations of this document will focus only on those aspects of the Global Strategy directly relevant to improving those three characteristics attributed to the List. As such, it is important to recall that:

   - **Representativity** refers to: filling the gaps in the World Heritage List by *ensuring the representation of properties of outstanding universal value from all regions on the World Heritage List* (2000 Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List);

   - **Balance**: *is not about numbers, but about representativity for bio-geographical regions or events in the history of life* (Report of the Experts Meeting on Evaluation of general principles and Criteria for Nominations of Natural World Heritage sites (Parc de la Vanoise, France, 22-24 March 1996; *WHC.96/CONF.201/INF.08*);

   - **Credibility** refers to: *ensuring a rigorous application of the criteria established by the Committee* (as reviewed during the development of the 1992 ICOMOS Global Study), while it should also refer to a List that is *an accurate reflection of the diversity of the outstanding heritage of humankind* (see above, Expert Meeting Parc de La Vanoise, 1996).

B. The World Heritage List: 1994 - 2004

4. The distribution of natural, cultural and mixed properties in the five, broad geographical regions recognized by UNESCO, in 1994 and 2004, is as follows:

Geographical Regions	Cultural properties		Natural properties		Mixed properties	
	1994	2004	1994	2004	1994	2004
Africa	14	28	18	30	1	2
Arab States	42	53	2	3	1	1
Asia and the Pacific	49	99	24	39	7	9
Latin America and the Caribbean	40	74	13	30	3	3
Europe and North America	160	328	31	47	5	8
	305	582	88	149	17	23

The following trends can be deduced from these figures:

➢ Overall growth in the number of properties has been lowest among mixed properties. This might be due to the fact that since 1994 cultural landscapes became the preferred nomination option for properties containing outstanding universal value resulting from the combined works of people and nature (see Section D below on Cultural Landscapes);

➢ Between 1994 and 2004, increase in the number of new properties for all categories was lowest among Arab States. In other regions, the number of cultural properties nearly doubled (the range being 1.85 (Latin America and the Caribbean) to 2.05 (Europe and North America)). Natural properties in Latin America and the Caribbean more than doubled but in other regions increased by a factor ranging from 1.5-1.7;

➢ At present, natural properties are relatively evenly distributed across the regions with the exception of Arab States where their number is extremely low. Only in Africa, the number of natural properties exceeds that of cultural ones. For cultural properties the bias in favour of the number in Europe and North America relative to the other regions accentuated between 1994 (160:145) and 2004 (328:254);

➢ While balance may be *not about numbers* of properties in the World Heritage List, excessive numbers in favour of a given region or a category may impact perceptions of the public, States Parties and partners regarding the credibility of the List; because credibility also depends on the List being *an accurate reflection of the diversity of the outstanding heritage of humankind (*see paragraph 3 above).

5. Some other important trends determined from the analysis of the World Heritage List of 1994 and 2004 in relation to the number of States Parties that ratified the World Heritage Convention up to those two benchmark years are:

➢ Percentage of States Parties **not** having any World Heritage properties decreased from 30.9 in 1994 to 27.1 in 2004;

➢ Percentage of States Parties having submitted Tentative Lists rose from 53% in 1994 (74 of 139 States Parties) to 75% in 2004 (132 of 177 States Parties);

➢ In 1994, 56 States Parties had 1-3 properties, 30, 4-10 properties and 7, 11 properties or more; the corresponding figures for 2004 are: 66, 44 and 19, respectively;

> The 19 States Parties with 11 or more properties in 2004 account for 389, or more than 50% of the total number of inscribed properties;

> There is considerable intra-regional clustering of properties in a small number of States Parties: the 13 States in Europe and North America, which have more than 11 properties account for 270 (70%) of the 383 properties in that group; four States Parties in Asia Pacific account for 79 (54%) of the 147 properties; and two States Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean have 40 (37%) of a total of 107 properties;

> The regional groups used for analysis are quite uneven. 35.1% of the 177 States Parties that have ratified the Convention are in Europe and North America. Africa, Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean each has about 18.3% of the States Parties; and the Arab States with 9.9% of the total number of countries that have ratified the Convention is the smallest group;

> Prior to 1994, the average number of years between ratification of the World Heritage Convention and first inscriptions of properties in States Parties of Europe and North America was 3.8 years; that same parameter in other regions was much higher; i.e. 6.8 in Africa, 6.7 in Arab States, 5.7 in Asia and the Pacific and 5.8 in Latin America and the Caribbean. Estimates of that parameter for States Parties that ratified the Convention between 1994 and 2004 indicated that the disparities observed for 1994 between some of the regions narrowed sharply: for example, it was 2 years for States Parties in Europe and North America and 2.5 years each for those in Africa and in Latin America and the Caribbean. In Asia and the Pacific the value showed an abnormal increase to 7. The only Arab country that acceded to the Convention between 1994 and 2004, i.e. United Arab Emirates (in 2001) is yet to submit a nomination of a World Heritage property.

6. These observations confirm the position stressed by ICOMOS and IUCN analyses (see sections C.1 and C.2 below): properties of outstanding universal value are not evenly distributed throughout the globe. Nevertheless, between 1994 and 2004, there were some shifts towards a representative, balanced and credible List; e.g. the percentage of States Parties without any property on the World Heritage List decreased; and the number of States Parties having submitted Tentative Lists significantly increased.

7. Except in Arab States, rate of increases in the number of cultural and natural properties between 1994 and 2004 in the different regional groups were comparable. Reasons for the relatively low rate of growth in new inscriptions among Arab States between 1994 and 2004 need to be understood and necessary remedial actions taken.

8. The reasons for the significantly large number of properties in Europe and North America may be linked to the much lower average time interval that States Parties belonging to that region had between ratification and first inscription prior to 1994. The early advantage enjoyed by Europe and North America, due to readily available data and information and expertise needed to compile nomination dossiers and ensure their successful inscription probably continues to skew percentage numbers of cultural properties in favour of that group of countries.

9. Pre-1994 also marks a period when many cultural properties were perhaps inscribed without a field visit by ICOMOS and in some cases by IUCN. Inscription of multiple properties belonging to a particular theme was also much easier than it is now. As Europe and North America prepare its first-ever Periodic Reporting Cycle in 2005-2006 opportunities for undertaking a thorough review of such pre-1994 inscriptions must be

identified and used. Possibilities for retrospective applications of serial and transborder approaches to better rationalize the distribution of World Heritage properties in Europe and North America may have to be explored. An example of such a rationalization already requested by the World Heritage Committee, albeit for natural heritage, is for Bulgaria to consider co-operating with Romania and other concerned States Parties to create a transborder Danube World Heritage area linking Srebarna (Bulgaria) to the Danube Delta (Romania) World Heritage areas and other potential properties along the Danube River. Interest among States Parties with regard to exploring serial and transborder nominations options are growing as illustrated by the case of the Main Andean Road project described in document *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13D*. Several UNESCO-UNF projects are underway or are in preparation to elaborate serial and transborder nominations for natural heritage; they include the Madagascar moist forests and Western Ghats forests of India prioritised for the immediate future by the IUCN analysis (see *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B*) as well as tropical habitats in Central Africa and a number of sites covering tropical coastal, marine and small island ecosystems.

C. Analysis of Properties Inscribed on the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists

10. The World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns (2000) requested both ICOMOS and IUCN 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 proposed scope of the analysis was to "*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*". Section C.1 and C.2 below provide an executive summary of the analysis undertaken and the main conclusions and recommendations as reported by ICOMOS and IUCN respectively. The full texts of ICOMOS and IUCN analyses are included as documents *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A* and *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B*, respectively.

C.1. ICOMOS World Heritage List and Tentative Lists Analysis: Executive Summary

11. The ICOMOS analysis on the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists[1] should be seen as a contribution to the further development of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. The ICOMOS analysis has been based on three complementary approaches to the analysis of the representativity of the World Heritage List:

    a) Typological Framework based on categories
    b) Chronological-Regional Framework
    c) Thematic Framework

12. The study was carried out in two phases. The first phase was undertaken in 2002 and early 2003. It focused on a typological analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and it included two meetings of an international working group, in Paris, France (March 2002) and Zaragoza, Spain (December 2002). The next phase was carried out by ICOMOS during the latter half of 2003 and in early 2004. This focused on an analysis of the World Heritage List in terms of chronological-regional and thematic frameworks, to

---

[1] Document number WHC-04/COM.28/INF.13A

complement the typological framework. This phase included working group meetings in Munich, Germany (July 2003) and in Paris, France (January 2004).

a). Typological Framework based on categories : The first Typological Framework Analysis, which is based on the categories used for the classification of cultural heritage in past ICOMOS evaluations of nominations for inclusion in the World Heritage List, has shown that the most represented cultural heritage categories on the List are architectural properties, historic towns, religious properties and archaeological properties, which together constitute 69% of the cultural properties on the World Heritage List. In various regions, there are pronounced gaps related to the representation of certain categories, for instance cultural landscapes do not figure at all in the Arab States, while in Africa there is a low representation of categories of archaeological properties, rock-art sites, vernacular sites, cultural routes and burial sites. As a general observation it can be said that incorporation of the properties in the current set of Tentative Lists into the World Heritage List would not change the balance or imbalance of the World Heritage List. The regional representation would remain more or less the same, and even within the categories there would only be minor changes.

b). Chronological-Regional Framework : The second Chronological-Regional Framework analysis, which classifies cultural heritage in relation to time and space, has shown that various cultures are clearly 'under-represented' in the current World Heritage List. For example, in the Near and Middle East the ancient Sumerians and Babylonians are not yet represented, while the Islamic period, which has a number of occurrences already, cannot be said to be sufficiently represented in all its significant aspects. This is true also for Europe, where the northern and eastern parts have only a limited number of properties compared to southern and western parts. However, whilst it is possible to identify some civilizations or cultures, which are not represented on the World Heritage List, it is necessary to verify whether a sufficient testimony remains of these cultures to justify inscription with reference to the criteria and conditions established for the inclusion of sites on the World Heritage List.

c). Thematic Framework : The third Thematic Framework analysis, which classifies the relationship between people and objects, has shown that most of the occurrences relate to the theme 'expressions of creativity', which has been subdivided into monuments, groups of buildings and sites as defined by the *World Heritage Convention ;* most of them relating to the 'monuments' section. In a similar conclusion to the 'typological framework' analysis, religious monuments are seen to have more occurrences than any other types. Other features that are well represented include artistic and decorative equipment of architecture, military structures, and rulers' residences. Regarding the category of 'sites', there is now an increasing number of cultural landscapes being inscribed, though there are still relatively few sacred mountains or sacred forests. Most other themes have relatively few references, such as 'utilising natural resources', 'movement of peoples', and 'developing technology'.

13. In Chapter 4 of the document *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A* under the title "Understanding the Results: Reasons for Gaps in the World Heritage List", ICOMOS summarises the following main reasons:

a) The number of nominated properties in relation to the time since ratification by State Parties: on average, there has been about one property per State Party inscribed every four years, while for the most active States Parties the average rises to nearly one property per year. An important aspect in this analysis is the consideration of the number of States Parties from each region related to the overall number of their inscribed properties.

b) Lack of Tentative Lists: analysis of the available Tentative Lists shows that inscription of all the properties on the current Lists would not significantly improve the present imbalance, underlining the need for more inscriptions from Africa, the Arab States, and the Caribbean and Pacific sub-regions, and for Tentative Lists to be developed to allow this to happen.

c) Lack of knowledge and resources: a lack of comprehensive appraisals of heritage assets within some regions, with little proper information on, and inventories of cultural heritage properties, means that the formation of Tentative Lists may not properly reflect the overall assets of a region. Priority should be given to capacity building in order to develop more in-depth knowledge and understanding of heritage resources through appropriate listing procedures.

d) Lack of legal protection and management systems: progress in the preparation of Tentative Lists and nominations may be hindered in some countries by the political situation or the lack of legal protection. There is also the additional problem that certain categories of cultural heritage that are under-represented may not be covered by existing cultural heritage protection laws. All this may not be helped by the lack of qualified professionals and technicians who could contribute to the development of relevant policies, strategies and conservation and management plans.

14. These reasons can be grouped into two main categories:

- Structural – relating to the World Heritage nomination process and to managing and protecting cultural properties;
- Qualitative – relating to the way properties are identified, assessed and evaluated.

Structural: The structural constraints relate to lack of technical capacity to promote and prepare nominations, carry out adequate assessments of heritage properties, or an appropriate legal or management framework, which either individually or collectively hinders the preparation of successful nominations. Some of these problems are susceptible to training and support programmes and these are addressed in the Action Plan presented in chapter 5 of the report included as document *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A*.

Qualitative: The second main constraint relates to gaps in the World Heritage List, which can be seen to be associated with certain types or themes of properties. One way to address these gaps is to promote the preparation of Tentative Lists for States Parties, which do not have them. However, for these Lists to reflect the overall cultural assets of countries adequately, new ways of identifying cultural properties need to be considered. It is suggested that a positive way forward could be the formation of Tentative Lists based on an assessment of the cultural qualities of potential properties, thus reflecting the way properties are assessed for outstanding universal value when they are submitted for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

15. In summary, support is needed to encourage States Parties to undertake research to identify their heritage resources. 48 States Parties do not yet have any properties on the World Heritage List. Support for producing Tentative Lists is a way forward. The second main focus is on the need to identify properties, which are either under-represented on the World Heritage List or not represented at all, through assessments of cultural qualities of heritage assets. This may also highlight types of properties not previously considered for nomination.

16. ICOMOS studies and their analysis have highlighted three different ways of categorising the World Heritage List. Each of the three frameworks has its strengths and weaknesses and is only one way of approaching the challenge of classification. Unlike natural heritage, cultural heritage is fragmented and diverse and not predisposed to clear classification systems. One of the main reasons for this is the need to take account of qualities, which are subjective, and of the value that society may give to those qualities.

17. If progress is to be made in encouraging the nomination of properties of outstanding universal value which better reflect regional cultural identities, significances and values, a clearly defined set of actions is needed, linked to targets and resources – both human and financial, guided by recognisable aims, and underpinned by monitoring and evaluation parameters. When evaluating 10 years of Global Strategy programming, and as underlined by the ICOMOS analyses, several premises need to be taken into account:

- In many countries, the range and extent of cultural heritage has not been adequately assessed as it has been either only partially recorded, or not recorded at all;
- At the same time, there is often a lack of appropriate State protective regulation for monuments, sites, cultural ensembles and their surroundings, and even where these exist they can be limited by the lack of cultural heritage lists or registers, which are needed to implement the laws;
- Given the incredible diversity of cultural heritage, the way it is distributed and how it is now valued around the world, there will probably always remain a certain 'imbalance' between various regions and countries of the world;
- As the definition of cultural heritage continues to evolve over time, through a more holistic approach to cultural properties and a new definition of authenticity, the identification of potential cultural heritage properties for nomination to the World Heritage List will necessarily remain an open issue, subject as well to policies, strategies and available resources. Improving representativity and filling gaps will therefore, require an on-going process of research and evaluation, "a process of continuous collaborative study of the development of knowledge, scientific thought, and views of relationships between world cultures";
- This means that discussion of issues of 'balance' or 'representativity' and the perception of whether or not there are gaps, cannot be simply based on numerical analysis.

18. Based on their analysis, ICOMOS sets out certain categories or themes of cultural properties that are under-represented on the World Heritage List. In total 10 categories or themes, related to geo-cultural regions of the world are summarised. This list could form a concrete focus for a follow-up to the Global Strategy programme, as well as providing information to be disseminated to States Parties for national or regional action.

19. The report proposes an Action Plan (see chapter 5 of document *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A*) that sets out measures to allow States Parties to contribute to the development of a World Heritage List. The Action Plan has five key aims:

   1. *To achieve a credible Tentative List for every State Party which has ratified the Convention*
   2. *To optimise the success of World Heritage nominations*
   3. *To make the new Guidelines operational*
   4. *To achieve sustainable World Heritage properties in the sense of constant protection and conservation*
   5. *To raise awareness of the World Heritage Convention*

   The Action Plan suggests short and medium term actions, linked to well-structured aims. It also suggests the resources necessary to achieve those aims, from States Parties and partners, and targets to be met in order that progress can be monitored and evaluated against the aims.

20. Furthermore it suggests that strong partnerships will be needed between States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, linked to well-structured programmes with well-defined outcomes in order to allow States Parties to contribute to the development of a World Heritage List that may better reflect the cultural identity, significances and relevance of properties in defined regions of the world.

C.2. IUCN Analysis of Natural and Mixed Sites: Executive Summary

21. The strategy paper (*WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B*) analyses the coverage of the world's designated natural and mixed World Heritage properties and sets out some indicative future priorities. It is largely based on a more detailed analysis (available separately) of the world's natural and mixed World Heritage properties undertaken by UNEP's (United Nations Environment Programme) World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), under the title: "*A Review of the Global World Heritage Network: Biogeography, Habitats and Biodiversity*" (This document is available separately from IUCN and UNEP/WCMC).

   IUCN analysis was guided by four principles:

   a) The key test for inscription on the World Heritage List is that the sites are of outstanding universal value (OUV) as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the *World Heritage Convention* (see also Annex 1 in *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B*).

   b) Although the new Operational Guidelines of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* (2004) call for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List, it was never intended that the List should ensure complete "representativity" of all the earth's numerous ecosystems and habitats, which is the role of national, regional and other international protected area systems (as reflected in the figure included as Annex 1 in *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B*).

   c) As for any natural resource, natural and mixed World Heritage properties, both designated and potential ones, are not distributed evenly around the globe. Therefore, a perfect "balance" for all areas and types is not achievable, nor does it follow that in every country there will be at least one property that will potentially qualify for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

d) Since the test for inclusion on the World Heritage List is that of outstanding universal value, it follows that the List cannot be open-ended and that there must be some kind of eventual limit on the total number of natural and mixed World Heritage properties. However subsequent additions to the List may be needed in the light of new information and scientific knowledge.

22. IUCN analysis is based on the review of the World Heritage List in relation to a number of scientific assessments relating to habitats and biodiversity: (a) Udvardy's Biogeographical classification; (b) IUCN/SSC habitat classification; (c) WWF Ecoregions; (d) Conservation International Biodiversity "Hotspots"; (e) BirdLife International Endemic Bird Areas; and (f) IUCN/WWF Centres of Plant Diversity. The IUCN report (in document *WHC-04/28.COM.INF.13B*) also discusses the World Heritage properties in terms of their earth science values. IUCN has reviewed Tentative Lists of States Parties as an input to this analysis, but points out that many Tentative Lists are incomplete and are not as useful as they could be in relation to the development of a strategy for future natural and mixed World Heritage properties. One of the reason is that – in contrast with the situation with cultural properties - until very recently, such Tentative Lists were not required before a natural property could be nominated

23. IUCN draws a number of conclusions from its analysis:

a) Natural and mixed properties on the World Heritage List cover almost all biogeographic regions, biomes, and habitats of the world with a relatively balanced distribution.

b) The biomes most commonly found in World Heritage properties are Mountains, Humid Tropical Forests, Tropical Dry Forests and Mixed Island Systems.

c) There are major gaps in the World Heritage coverage of the following biomes: Tropical Grassland/Savanna; Lake Systems; Tundra and Polar Systems; Temperate Grasslands; and Cold Winter Deserts. There is thus potential for listing natural and mixed World Heritage sites within these biomes.

d) There are also some terrestrial and marine habitat types within these biomes that may have potential for new World Heritage inscriptions. These include sites, which have been defined as priorities by Conservation International, IUCN/Species Survival Commission, WWF and BirdLife International. Nominations from any of the areas listed below should receive priority in the immediate future:

Grasslands

~ Sudd-Sahelian savanna and flooded grasslands
~ Sub-antarctic grasslands, including South Georgia
~ Sub-polar and arctic tundra

Wetlands

~ Flooded grasslands such as Okavango and the Sudd swamps
~ Volga and Lena River deltas
~ Western Ghats rivers

Deserts

- ~ Succulent Karoo
- ~ Namib desert
- ~ Central Asian deserts
- ~ Socotra desert

Forests

- ~ Madagascar moist forests
- ~ Forests in southern Chile and southern Argentina
- ~ Dry and moist forests in New Caledonia
- ~ Western Ghats forests

Marine

- ~ Red Sea corals
- ~ Andaman Sea (sites within the marine ecoregion)
- ~ Benguela Current (marine)
- ~ Marine sites within the following WWF ecoregions of Fiji, Palau and Tahiti
- ~ Gulf of California
- ~ Maldives/Chagos atolls

24. In translating the above set of priorities into a programme for nominating and inscribing additional World Heritage sites, IUCN would emphasise the following:

- The list is indicative but not exclusive – there may be sites in other areas that also merit inscription, but the emphasis should be placed on these priority habitats.

- The list is broad rather than prescriptive. Any property identified within these habitats must not only meet the criteria, but would also have to satisfy the Conditions of Integrity as described in the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* before it could be inscribed on the World Heritage List. In this context it is essential that properties nominated have formal protection under national/sub-national legislation or under clear and fully recognized principles of customary law.

- Given the emphasis on the absolute need for all sites to be of outstanding universal value, there is a clear implication that there must be a finite number of existing and potential properties for inclusion on the World Heritage List. Though further analytical work will be required to determine this with confidence, IUCN considers that a number in the range of 250-300 natural and mixed World Heritage properties should be sufficient to complete this part of the World Heritage List. This might be done over a 10-year period.

- There is increasing use of serial property and transboundary nominations by a number of States Parties. While such initiatives are positive, IUCN considers that clearer directions and guidelines are needed to ensure that serial and transboundary nominations are properly prepared and are effectively managed.

- It is also useful to consider World Heritage sites in relation to other types of protected areas with respect to the application of outstanding universal value and the concept of 'representativity'. World Heritage properties need to be considered along with other protected area types and systems.

25. As a result of the above analysis IUCN makes the following recommendations:

a) Regarding **nominations**, the list of priority areas above provides initial indications of the important habitats that should be included in the World Heritage List.

b) **Tentative Lists** should be developed so that they become a more effective tool to assist in the identification of natural and mixed World Heritage properties at national and regional/sub-regional levels.

c) The **Udvardy System** should remain an entry point for global comparative analysis and for the broad categorization of World Heritage sites

d) **Global Theme Studies** should be developed and refined. The following studies should be completed within the 2004-2008 period: Deserts and Grasslands; Polar Regions; Central Asia (currently underway); and Freshwater Lakes/Wetlands/Rivers. Further work on geological properties is also required. Also existing theme studies should be periodically updated, taking into account recommendations arising from the Periodic Reporting process.

e) Support should be given to the UNEP-WCMC proposal to prepare a **"World Heritage Atlas".**

f) **Serial and transboundary nominations** should be more widely used, but additional technical and policy guidance is required on how to take advantage of the opportunities they provide. This should be done through a series of global and regional/sub-regional workshops.

g) Full use should also be made of **other international instruments and agreements** to complement properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. These include UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and Ramsar Sites, as well as regional level designations. In relation to geological sites, the Geopark Initiative of UNESCO could be useful.

h) As the World Heritage List gets closer to eventual completion, more attention should be focussed on the **better management of existing natural and mixed World Heritage properties;** that is on issues related to the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties, and on policies and programmes designed to maintain their integrity.

D. Cultural Landscape Analysis

26. In addition to ICOMOS and IUCN analysis, during 2002 and 2003, an evaluation of 10 years of work on cultural landscapes undertaken within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention* took place. A consultant reviewed the World Heritage List and all Tentative Lists for this category, which was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 16th session in 1992. The consultant presented the preliminary results to the workshop

"Cultural Landscapes – challenges for conservation", which was organized at the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention* (Ferrara, Italy, November 2002). The workshop gave a global overview of the applications of the cultural landscape concept in all regions of the world and presented in depth-case studies. The results were transmitted to the Venice Conference "Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility" (Venice, Italy, November 2002) and the recommendations disseminated via the website - http://whc.unesco.org/venice2002/workshops/pdf/ferrara.pdf; the proceedings were published as World Heritage papers No. 7 in 2003.[2]

27. The study by the consultant was published as World Heritage papers No 6 (World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992-2002 by P.J. Fowler) and includes 12 specific recommendations out of which, twelve, the following are most important to the consideration of the issues of representativity, balance and credibility of the World Heritage List:

- Enhance the identification of all types of landscapes; for example urban, industrial, coastal and submarine, and not only rural landscapes;
- Take into account the principles of the Global Strategy in encouraging and selecting nominations of, and in inscribing, cultural landscapes on the World Heritage List;
- Undertake a project to provide the basis for the major cultures in the world to be represented by at least one World Heritage cultural landscape and encourage research into methodologies arising from an improving data-base of World Heritage information, not least to complement conventional assessment of existing properties on, and nominations to, the World Heritage List;
- Support a programme of regional studies of potential cultural landscapes seeking to fill the 'gaps' now identified and based on themes appropriate to each region; and
- World Heritage cultural landscapes should henceforth be subject to continual monitoring and periodic, external review in order to maintain the Committee's awareness of developments, programmatic and intellectual.

28. The study (Fowler, P.J. (2003), *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992 – 2002*. UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris) also provided some quantitative analysis of cultural landscapes for the period 1992-2002 as follows:

	Africa	Arab States	Asia / Pacific	Europe / North America	Latin America / Caribbean
Thirty Official World Heritage Cultural Landscapes	2	1	1 / 3	21 / 0	0 / 2
Hundred Possible Cultural Landscapes on the World Heritage List (including the above)[b]	5	3	18 / 3	64 / 2	2 / 3
Analysis of all Tentative Lists with respect to Cultural Landscapes[c]	11	2	27 / 4	82 / 4	22 / 0

Row 1 describes the distribution of the thirty World Heritage properties explicitly recognized by the World Heritage Committee as cultural landscapes during the period 1992-2002. However, Fowler (2003) concludes that "…there are many other cultural landscapes on the List" and that the List "…is much richer in cultural landscapes than it has perhaps been realized and certainly than has been openly admitted". Hence in Row 2, he has expanded the consideration to a total of 100 properties, including the 30 referred to in row 1, and 70 others that in his view have World Heritage Cultural Landscapes potential. Row 3 figures are the outcome of a computerized search for references to cultural landscape among the Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties; row 3 figures could be viewed as indicators of the extent to which cultural landscape figured in State Parties' thinking in the preparations of their respective Tentative Lists (see Fowler 2003, page 114).

*Draft Decision: **28 COM 13***

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Noting with interest the results and interpretation of the ICOMOS and IUCN analyses, and of additional analysis undertaken by the World Heritage Centre and others that are presented in the document WHC-04/28.COM/13,*

2. *Acknowledging that although it may wish to encourage greater consistency in the methodologies applied to the identification of all potential World Heritage, considerable differences prevail in the historical, socio-political, cultural and natural contexts within which natural and cultural heritage properties of outstanding universal value are identified, nominated and evaluated,*

3. *Notes with concern that despite the fact that a growing number of States Parties are submitting Tentative Lists, the potential sites included in those Lists, if nominated and inscribed on the World Heritage List, would not bring about significant improvements to the current levels of representativity, balance and credibility of the World Heritage List;*

4. *Draws attention of States Parties, ICOMOS, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to the fact that while document WHC-04/28.COM/13 and related information documents (WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A and INF.13B) provide excellent insights into past trends and future directions for cultural and natural heritage, opportunities for identifying mixed heritage based on the different combinations of the ten criteria included in the new Operational Guidelines may require further thinking, consultations and analyses;*

5. *Calls upon the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN and other partners to significantly increase their support to States Parties, particularly in less developed countries, in the identification of cultural, natural and mixed properties of outstanding universal value and to aim for improving the success rate of inscriptions on the World Heritage List of properties nominated by such States Parties (see Aim 2 under section 5 - The Way Forward: 2004-2008 Action Plan - in document WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A providing the analysis of ICOMOS);*

6. *Emphasizes that the rigorous application of criteria and conditions of integrity is the ultimate determinant of the credibility of the World Heritage List;*

7. *Recommends that the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN, in co-operation with appropriate scientific institutions, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other relevant partners convene an international consultation to derive an action plan for enabling States Parties to better identify natural, cultural and mixed properties of outstanding universal value and effectively contribute to the development of a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List;*

8. *Invites all States Parties to review and discuss in detail the findings and analyses of ICOMOS and IUCN with national and/or regional scientific, academic, technical institutions and provide inputs, before 31 December 2004, to the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN in the preparation of the action plan referred to in paragraph 7 above;*

9. *Requests the Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN to co-operate with all concerned to design, draft and submit the action plan specified in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, including recommended measures and time tables for the financing and effective implementation of the action plan, to the 29th session of the Committee in 2005.*