

EVALUATION OF IUCN'S WORK IN WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATIONS

Christina Cameron

Parks Canada

Former Chairperson, World Heritage Committee

August 2005

NOTE: THE IUCN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THIS REVIEW IS
INCLUDED IN THIS DOCUMENT AS ANNEX A (PAGE 18)

EVALUATION OF IUCN'S WORK IN WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	2
Terms of Reference.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Context.....	3
REPORT OF FINDINGS.....	5
A. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.....	5
B. SCIENCE.....	5
C. TENTATIVE LISTS.....	6
D. NOMINATIONS.....	6
i. Preparation of Nominations.....	6
ii. Evaluation of Nominations.....	7
a. Reviewers.....	7
b. Evaluators.....	8
c. World Heritage Advisory Panel.....	9
iii. Presentations to World Heritage Committee.....	10
E. CORPORATE IUCN.....	11
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference.....	16
Appendix 2: List of Persons Interviewed.....	17

Executive Summary

This evaluation is undertaken at the request of the Director, Global Programme of IUCN and the Head of IUCN's Programme on Protected Areas. IUCN is identified as one of the advisory bodies in the World Heritage Convention of 1972. This review focuses on the processes used by IUCN in the evaluation of natural and mixed heritage properties and their presentation to the World Heritage Committee for possible inscription on the World Heritage List. IUCN is undertaking this review in order to improve, where possible, its advisory role in relation to the inscription of World Heritage Sites.

The review was conducted between April and August 2005. It consisted of an examination of pertinent documents as well as interviews with staff from IUCN, the World Commission on Protected Areas, UNESCO's World Heritage Centre and some former Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee.

The report examines IUCN's technical support to World Heritage. It is structured to cover the use of science in implementing the advisory role, tentative lists, nominations and corporate issues related to the evaluation process. In general, IUCN is highly respected by those involved in the World Heritage Convention. Interviewees speak positively about IUCN's scientific capacity and the professional manner in which IUCN carries out its responsibilities. There are, nonetheless, issues that have been raised and areas where IUCN could enhance its performance. The recommendations in this report are offered in the spirit of continuous improvement.

This is a tough business. It will get tougher with the shift to a different range of sites that make it harder to reach the threshold of Outstanding Universal Value. IUCN has a difficult role to play. It is particularly challenging for professional staff, since World Heritage has become more political as its flagship status increases. Inevitably IUCN will be unpopular in some quarters, no matter how much it improves its work. In this highly charged environment, IUCN's advice on World Heritage nominations must be transparent and based on the best science possible. IUCN is accountable for the quality of its scientific advice; the final decision on Outstanding Universal Value belongs to the World Heritage Committee.

It has been a privilege to work with the dedicated IUCN team who graciously welcomed me in Gland, Switzerland, and provided any information I sought. I am also grateful to all those passionate individuals who generously shared their views and suggestions about World Heritage matters.

Christina Cameron
August 2005

Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (Appendix 1) indicate that IUCN is asking for advice on how to improve its performance related to the evaluation of World Heritage nominations for natural and mixed sites as well as for cultural landscapes. The review focuses on the processes used by IUCN in preparing and presenting the evaluations to the World Heritage Committee.

The review encompasses the working arrangement between IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, the interaction between IUCN and States Parties during the evaluation process, the selection and role of the field evaluators and reviewers, the operations of the IUCN World Heritage Advisory Panel, the application of the Global Strategy and other thematic studies, the interpretation of Outstanding Universal Value and the conditions of integrity, the treatment of supplementary information provided by States Parties and the presentations to the Committee.

Methodology

The evaluation was carried out between April and August 2005. It consisted of an examination of pertinent documents during a desk review at IUCN Headquarters in Gland, Switzerland. In addition, the reviewer conducted face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with people associated with IUCN, including staff, members of the World Commission on Protected Areas, members of the IUCN World Heritage Advisory Panel, and staff from UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Interviews were also conducted with staff from UNESCO's World Heritage Centre as well as four former Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee (Appendix 2). Typically, discussions focussed on IUCN's overall performance in the nomination process, the quality of its science, the evaluation process, as well as relationships between the Programme for Protected Areas and others, including the rest of IUCN, the World Heritage Centre, and other participants in the process.

Context

IUCN is a vast international partnership of governmental and non-governmental organizations spread across some 140 countries, dedicated to conserving the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensuring equitable and ecologically sustainable use of natural resources. The interests of its members range from governance to advocacy. Among IUCN's many global programs and responsibilities is its work for World Heritage. It is a small part of IUCN's focus and a limited number of staff are directly involved and knowledgeable about the World Heritage Convention.

IUCN's World Heritage role, as described in the World Heritage Convention, is a scientific one. IUCN provides advisory services for the implementation of World Heritage programs and projects, to the fullest extent possible, in its area of competence and capability.¹ In practice, IUCN provides advice to the World Heritage Committee on nominations of properties with natural heritage values and on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites inscribed under natural heritage criteria. In addition, IUCN reviews requests for international assistance and provides training to States Parties to build capacity for world heritage identification and conservation. This review is limited to IUCN's work in relation to the evaluation of nominations.

The context for this review is a mature World Heritage Convention, deemed to be UNESCO's most successful convention and a flagship for the organization. There are now 180 States Parties who have signed the Convention, and 812 properties (160 natural and 24 mixed sites) listed as World Heritage Sites. The concept of Outstanding Universal Value is at the heart of the nomination process, although not specifically defined in the Convention. A definition is proposed in the 2005

¹ Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, Paris: UNESCO, 1972, articles 8.3, 13.7 and 14.2.

Operational Guidelines and is given meaning through the Committee's application of assessment criteria.² In examining the implementation of the Convention over its first thirty years, it would appear that the interpretation of Outstanding Universal Value has evolved. This has been noted by the outcomes of the Special Expert Meeting on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value (Kazan, Russian Federation, 2005).

In the early years, there was a strong tendency to list iconic sites that are unique and widely known. These properties clearly met the benchmark of "best of the best" and their evaluation did not require much by way of comparative context and analysis. The recommendations of IUCN were for the most part positive, given that the universal values of the proposals were quite evident. The World Heritage Committee was able to reach a comfortable consensus on their Outstanding Universal Value without the need for comparative studies.

Over time, there has been a shift towards properties that are more "representative of the best". By the mid-1980s the Committee expressed concerns about the meaning of Outstanding Universal Value and began to hesitate over the values of certain properties, deferring them until comparative studies put them in context and calling for rigorous application of the criteria. While the shift towards representative examples manifested itself earlier in the cultural field, it also occurred in the natural field for sites like volcanic islands. The Committee's concern with maintaining rigour was a key issue for the World Heritage Strategic Plan of 1992, on the 20th anniversary of the Convention, and has been part of World Heritage discourse ever since. As part of that discourse, IUCN has been periodically directed to maintain rigorous, objective and consistent evaluation procedures.

At the same time, the Committee has been concerned about imbalances on the World Heritage List, expressing the view that the List needs to be representative to be credible. In 1994, the Committee approved a Global Strategy for World Heritage, a dynamic thematic framework that was meant to encourage nominations from cultures, regions and typologies not well represented on the List.

Taking its cue from the Global Strategy, IUCN has developed and applied various scientific tools: the Udvardy classification system, the data sheets from the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, global studies on themes like wetlands, mountains and boreal forests, and regional studies such as the one prepared for Central Asia. In encouraging thematic studies, the World Heritage Committee's Global Strategy has in a sense hard-wired the concept of "representative of the best" into the system. The question remains, however, whether representative sites of regional significance meet the test of Outstanding Universal Value. The fundamental principle remains clear: one can only speak of "representativity" in the context of sites that have Outstanding Universal Value. This is a significant challenge that faces IUCN today as it evaluates properties proposed for inscription using World Heritage criteria.

² "Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List," Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 2005, art.49.

a) REPORT OF FINDINGS

A. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

IUCN is highly respected by those involved in the World Heritage Convention. During the interview process, general observations were framed with adjectives that speak well of the organization and the quality of its performance related to nominations: excellent, professional, consistent, rigorous, solid, credible, admirable, satisfactory, straight-forward and principled.

With regard to cultural landscapes, there is a generally held view that IUCN did not fully embrace the concept at its inception and is not yet as deeply involved as it could or should be. Some hold the view that, by stepping back to allow ICOMOS to take the leadership role in this area, IUCN has contributed to an under-valuing of the natural dimensions of cultural landscapes. A draft strategy is currently under preparation to increase IUCN involvement in assessing cultural landscapes. IUCN is encouraged to complete this strategy as quickly as possible, in consultation with ICOMOS.

Another aspect of the review dealt with the relationship between IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. There have been disagreements and friction between the two organizations over the evaluation of nominations. The respective roles of the two organizations are drawn from article 14 of the World Heritage Convention. The Centre serves as the UNESCO secretariat to the Convention, and as such, has a clear role in managing the nomination process with States Parties. However, the Centre does not have a role in giving formal advice on whether or not nominations meet the threshold of Outstanding Universal Value. That role is the responsibility of the advisory bodies, ICOMOS and IUCN. There have been occasions when staff members from the World Heritage Centre have inappropriately taken a position on the Outstanding Universal Value of proposed sites. It would reduce tensions if senior management from the two organizations would clarify their respective roles and communicate the results to their staff.

Recommendation 1: IUCN is encouraged to complete its strategy for assessing cultural landscapes as quickly as possible, in consultation with ICOMOS.

Recommendation 2: Senior management from IUCN and the World Heritage Centre should clarify their respective roles in evaluating nominations and communicate the results to their staff.

B. SCIENCE

IUCN enjoys a strong reputation for the quality and scope of its scientific work. To support World Heritage, IUCN has produced research that is intended to set the global scientific context for individual properties. Research tools include data analyses from the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), global classification systems like Udvardy, IUCN/SSC Habitat, IUCN/WWF Centres of Biodiversity and others; and global framework/thematic studies on types of property like forests, mountains, wetlands and geological sites.

For the nomination process, these research tools provide States Parties with an essential scientific context for assessing the World Heritage potential of specific sites. Interviewees from States Parties praised IUCN's studies as being useful, noting that they do indeed provide a baseline for comparative analysis. While there is evidence that these science tools are being used in the preparation of some Tentative Lists and nomination dossiers, it would appear that most States Parties are not familiar with them and have not applied them. Factors that may limit their use include the fact that there are many biomes and themes that have not yet been the focus of study, the general nature of the framework studies and the need for greater specificity, the fact that the studies are available in English only and have not been translated into other working languages, and the fact that IUCN has not promoted this work through a targeted communications strategy. It should be noted that the scientific program of framework/thematic studies has not been the focus of

a discussion and endorsement by the World Heritage Committee. IUCN could be vulnerable to the criticism that it has inadvertently usurped the authority of the Committee. It would be prudent to encourage a Committee discussion of IUCN's scientific program to ensure an alignment of Committee priorities with the work program.

Additional guidance could be provided to States Parties through an in-depth analysis of the history of application of World Heritage criteria. With more than thirty years of implementation, the World Heritage Convention has matured sufficiently to support a case law approach to an analysis of criteria. By looking back over the history of Committee decisions – nominations that succeeded as well as those that did not – IUCN could undertake to document the threshold for Outstanding Universal Value through the lens of each natural criterion. By providing greater understanding and clarity on the application of criteria related to natural sites, IUCN could help States Parties early in the process to assess the potential Outstanding Universal Value of individual sites. This case law approach could also improve consistency in the decision-making of the World Heritage Committee by documenting the interpretations of earlier Committees.

The World Heritage section of the WCPA website is well-organized and provides a good starting point for displaying and disseminating the additional information, guidance and studies called for in this review.

Recommendation 3: As resources permit, IUCN should expand its preparation of framework/thematic studies in areas of priority to the Committee (the Sahara, micro-climates, marine environments etc.).

Recommendation 4: IUCN should translate its framework/thematic studies into other languages as appropriate, to render them more accessible.

Recommendation 5: IUCN should develop and implement a communications strategy to heighten awareness and promote the use of the World Heritage framework/thematic studies.

Recommendation 6: IUCN should present to the World Heritage Committee for discussion and endorsement the scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites.

Recommendation 7: IUCN should document, disseminate and take into consideration the history of the Committee's application of natural criteria in the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.

C. TENTATIVE LISTS

Each State Party is responsible for preparing a Tentative List, an inventory of properties situated on its territory that the State Party considers suitable for inscription on the World Heritage List, i.e. properties which appear to have heritage of outstanding universal value.³ IUCN's framework/thematic studies and other scientific tools are essential for developing valid Tentative Lists. Recommendations 3,4, and 5 apply.

D. NOMINATIONS

D-i Preparation of Nominations

Each State Party is responsible for preparing nomination documents, including a section that justifies the inscription.⁴ IUCN takes the view that working with States Parties to prepare nominations would be a conflict of interest, given IUCN responsibility for evaluating nominations.

³ Operational Guidelines, 2005, art. 62.

⁴ Operational Guidelines, 2005, art. 132.3.

This is a fair point. Nonetheless, IUCN could work more closely with States Parties to provide general guidance about sources of information and expertise. In addition, there are two specific areas where IUCN could provide technical guidance. They correspond to two requirements in the justification section: the choice of criteria and the comparative analysis.

When States Parties propose a property for inscription, they are required to indicate which criteria appear to apply to the site, together with a clear argument for the use of each criterion. States Parties would be better able to make these arguments if they had a better understanding of the ways in which the criteria have been interpreted by the Committee in the past. IUCN could provide technical guidance on the application of criteria by making available, as discussed above, an in-depth analysis of the application over time of natural heritage criteria and the scientific evidence required. Recommendation 7 applies.

As part of the justification for inscription, States Parties are also required to provide a comparative analysis of the property, explaining its importance in relation to similar properties both at the national and international levels. IUCN's scientific work clearly contributes to the comparative analysis of sites in an international context and in fact sometimes serves as the basis for the evaluation. To ensure consistency and to help States Parties prepare this section, IUCN should consider producing a specific guideline on the basic requirements and available resource materials for preparing a comparative analysis for natural World Heritage Sites.

Recommendation 8: IUCN should produce a specific guideline on the basic requirements and available resource materials for preparing a comparative analysis for natural World Heritage Sites.

D.ii Evaluation of Nominations

The World Heritage Convention assigns to IUCN the responsibility for evaluating the natural heritage values of nominations. IUCN's evaluation process involves three levels of assessment: reviewers, field evaluators and the World Heritage Advisory Panel. Traditionally, the whole process has been somewhat secretive. The identities of reviewers, evaluators and the Panel have not always been recorded in the documents made available to the World Heritage Committee. Recently, IUCN has changed its policy and named some of the experts involved in the process. In the interests of transparency and credibility, IUCN should continue this practice and make available the names and credentials of all specialists involved in evaluating sites.

Recommendation 9: IUCN should make available the names and credentials of all specialists involved in evaluating the natural heritage values of nominations.

D.ii.a Reviewers

IUCN solicits views on World Heritage nominations from 10-15 reviewers selected by the Programme for Protected Areas. Reviewers are drawn primarily from the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and increasingly from the Species Survival Commission (SSC). Reviewers are asked to comment on the proposed criteria, conditions of integrity, boundaries and management practices related to the property. Some interviewees commented positively on the efforts of IUCN to involve specialists from various parts of the world and to seek views from a range of perspectives. Nonetheless, participation from different regions of the world is still uneven. Responses from reviewers appear to be variable, in part because of busy schedules and in part because input is sought on a voluntary basis. Reviewers need to have good scientific knowledge of the heritage in question as well as a thorough understanding of World Heritage criteria and the concept of Outstanding Universal Value. Their responses are stronger on issues of integrity, boundaries and management practices, and weaker on criteria and Outstanding Universal Value. The recent initiative to provide small honoraria to reviewers has apparently improved the quality of

the reviews. If it intends to continue with this review stage, IUCN should revise its selection process to increase participation from different regions and to access the broader scientific community beyond the WCPA and SSC.

Recommendation 10: IUCN should revise its selection process for reviewers to increase participation from different regions and to access the broader scientific community beyond WCPA and SSC.

D.ii.b Evaluators

Following the review process, IUCN evaluators carry out site visits to the nominated properties. Evaluators are either staff members of the Programme for Protected Areas or are chosen by them. The evaluation process is one of the weak areas and a matter that affects the credibility of IUCN. Issues that need to be addressed include the selection process, competence, and further clarification of the roles to be carried out by field evaluators.

The selection process for evaluators is not well documented. The roster of evaluators appears to lack regional and gender balance. In the period 2001-2004, of the 34 evaluators used to carry out 72 evaluations, 33 were male and 25 were from English-speaking developed countries. It is hard to avoid the impression that evaluators belong to an exclusive club. It would appear that IUCN has not invested sufficiently in building up a network of qualified evaluators. Several interviewees noted that the evaluator role should be distributed broadly, not always the same persons or groups. Concerns about competence and concerns about possible regional bias were raised in those cases where the expert evaluators might come from the same region as the nominated property. Without losing its focus on professional competence, IUCN has an opportunity to improve relationships with States Parties and increase global participation in conservation by clarifying the selection process for evaluators and increasing participation.

Evaluators face the challenge of linking the specialized knowledge of ecosystems with a thorough knowledge of the World Heritage Convention. Their work is generally judged to be strong on assessing the conditions of integrity, boundary definitions and management practices, but they sometimes lack the experience and knowledge to judge the appropriateness of criteria application and the merits of the comparative analysis. IUCN should initiate a strategy to develop a cadre of evaluators from all regions and major linguistic groups. It will take time, resources and targeted effort (a combination of mentoring, apprenticeships, study and certification) to build capacity to carry out this essential World Heritage function and to build a global (as contrasted with a national or regional) approach. One strategy might be to send two or more evaluators to investigate a site, thereby offering opportunities for mentoring and for combining regional and non-regional participation.

On-site communications between State Party representatives and the IUCN evaluators have been characterized as one-sided, since the evaluators do not generally share the results of the assessment. Some evaluators have reported that they feel comfortable de-briefing the States Parties on conditions of integrity, boundaries and management practices, but not on the central issue of Outstanding Universal Value. While recognizing that evaluators need time to absorb the site visits, it is recommended that they take part in feedback sessions with States Parties at the end of their site visits in order to share their general observations, raise questions and identify areas for further information. The feedback session should form part of the record of the site visit.

A problem occurs when the reviewers and field evaluators make a positive recommendation on a proposal, only to have the World Heritage Advisory Panel turn it down. There is a debate about whether or not evaluators should formulate a recommendation on Outstanding Universal Value. At best, this formulation can only be considered a preliminary one, since site inspection is only one element in an overall judgement. Other factors include the reports from reviewers, WCMC data, specific scientific expertise and the Panel's collective knowledge. Evaluators should not be asked

to make definitive recommendations on Outstanding Universal Value, leaving that judgement to the World Heritage Advisory Panel, based on the various inputs listed above.

Recommendation 11: IUCN should increase global participation in conservation by clarifying the selection process for evaluators and increasing participation.

Recommendation 12: IUCN should initiate a strategy to develop a cadre of evaluators from all regions and major linguistic groups.

Recommendation 13: IUCN should consider the feasibility of sending two or more field evaluators to investigate a site, thereby offering opportunities for mentoring and for combining regional and non-regional participation.

Recommendation 14: IUCN evaluators should take part in feedback sessions with States Parties at the end of their site visit in order to share their general observations, raise questions and request further information. The feedback session should form part of the record of the site visit.

Recommendation 15: Evaluators should not be asked to make definitive recommendations on Outstanding Universal Value.

D.ii.c World Heritage Advisory Panel

IUCN's World Heritage Advisory Panel formulates recommendations on the merits of World Heritage nominations, based on reports from reviewers, WCMC data, specific scientific expertise and the Panel's collective knowledge and experience. IUCN is uniquely positioned to prepare an institutional assessment without individual bias of Outstanding Universal Value and the other conditions related to integrity and management practices. According to its participants, the Panel discussions are thorough, lively and rooted in science. The Panel recommendations are advisory; final approval of the recommendations is the responsibility of IUCN staff.

Four issues have been identified in the course of this review: the composition of Panel, the choice of Chairperson, the assessment process, and the level of final approval.

The Panel is composed of a small group of people with deep experience in evaluation and a solid grasp of World Heritage. There are permanent members and rotational members. From an external perspective, the Panel appears to be exclusive and little known. It does not have terms of reference and a list of its members is not generally available. Membership is predominantly male, English-speaking and drawn from developed countries. The Panel needs to be larger, more representative and draw on a broader range of scientific organizations. The challenge facing IUCN, from both a technical and budgetary perspective, is to expand membership of the Panel to better reflect regions and the global heritage community while maintaining its scientific rigour. Some interviewees suggested that IUCN should add Panel members from international NGOs with large projects on the ground, in order to make better use of global knowledge and experience.

The Chair of the World Heritage Advisory Panel is the Director of the Programme on Protected Areas. He is also responsible for agenda preparation and the Secretariat functions of managing the contract with the World Heritage Centre, engaging and coordinating reviewers and evaluators, and preparing documentation for the World Heritage Advisory Panel. Based on the principle of separating the secretariat function from the governance function, it would appear inappropriate to have a staff officer preside over the Panel. The separation of the two roles has obvious benefits, especially in that political as well as technical factors can more obviously be considered and accountability would expand to the larger IUCN organization. There are several options for selecting a Chair, including an internal candidate (the Director General or his representative) or an external candidate from the broader volunteer constituency (recognized expert or member of the World Commission on Protected Areas). Given that IUCN's Director General lends institutional

support to the Panel recommendations when he gives final approval, an external choice might be more suitable.

In terms of process, two issues have been raised: the increasing workload for Panel members and an appearance of possible bias in a system where evaluators participate as Panel members. In terms of workload, it appears that Panel members are being required to supplement the research documents by preparing additional comparative analyses and other material. This additional workload is apparently the result of poor quality nomination dossiers, especially in the comparative analyses. Recommendation 8 is particularly pertinent to this issue.

On the second issue, it is recognized that Panel members need to have experience in carrying out field evaluations so that they fully understand the evaluation process. To counter any appearance of bias, if costs were not an issue and if many experienced Panel members were available, an ideal process would be to separate evaluators and Panel members in any given year. Evaluators would present their findings to the Panel and then depart. They would not be part of the Panel in a year in which they presented evaluations. At the present time, evaluators are requested to leave the room during discussion of nominations that they have evaluated. They then rejoin to Panel. This process gives an appearance of undue influence through the collegiality of the group. As an interim measure, IUCN should formalize its procedural rules on process. In the long run, the organization should move as quickly as is feasible to a system that separates evaluators in a given year from Panel membership.

Current practice to approve the Panel recommendations is somewhat informal. Accountability clearly rests with IUCN. Normally, the Director of the Programme on Protected Areas advises the Director, Global Programme, who then approves the recommendations. Given the political nature of the World Heritage Convention and its importance as a UNESCO flagship program, IUCN should consider whether the final approval of the recommendations from the World Heritage Advisory Panel would not more appropriately reside with the Director General of IUCN.

Recommendation 16: IUCN should develop and make public its Terms of Reference for the World Heritage Advisory Panel and expand its membership to better reflect regions and the global scientific community.

Recommendation 17: The function of Chairperson to the World Heritage Advisory Panel should be separate from the secretariat function.

Recommendation 18: As an interim measure, IUCN should formalize its procedural rules on the participation of evaluators as Panel members. The organization should move as quickly as is feasible to a system that separates evaluators in a given year from Panel membership.

Recommendation 19: Given the political nature of the World Heritage Convention and its importance as a UNESCO flagship program, IUCN should consider whether the final approval of recommendations from the World Heritage Advisory Panel would not more appropriately reside with the Director General of IUCN.

D.iii Presentations to World Heritage Committee

Panel recommendations are presented to the World Heritage Committee through the IUCN written reports and through oral presentations made during the meeting. Most interviewees praised IUCN presentations, noting that information is well-organized, consistent and clearly presented to focus on the criteria for Outstanding Universal Value as well as the conditions of integrity, boundaries and management practices. In the interests of objectivity, one interviewee suggested that it would be preferable not to have the IUCN person who evaluated a specific site present it to the Committee. Others stressed that all aspects of the evaluation, both positive and negative, should be presented clearly, noting that IUCN often does just that. The IUCN presenters are strongly advised

to state that the conclusion is not individual, but corporate, and that the presenters are not in a position to change the recommendation.

It is important to recall that the primary audience for these presentations is the World Heritage Committee. Given the rotational nature of Committee membership and the relatively low number of natural heritage experts present on State Party delegations, IUCN could enhance its communications by using plain, less scientific language and by explaining in more detail earlier applications of criteria by previous Committees in similar situations (case law approach). Clear explanations are particularly important when IUCN is recommending against inscription.

An issue that has emerged is that of similar sites. When IUCN states that a site is similar to one already inscribed on the World Heritage List, IUCN recommends against inscription; by contrast, some interviewees believe that if a site is similar, that this similarity is the justification for adding it to the List.

An element that undermines the credibility of IUCN is consideration of new information by IUCN staff subsequent to the Panel's work. The decision to eliminate Bureau consideration of nominations has had an impact on the evaluation process because there is no longer an opportunity to deal with additional information during the evaluation year. The situation is especially uncomfortable when IUCN changes the published Panel recommendations as a result of new information or lobbying efforts, without the Panel's endorsement. To some degree this diminishes the role of the Panel. Several interviewees expressed the strong view that IUCN presenters should resist political pressure, "stick to their guns" and not change the Panel position during the meeting. In theory, the situation should no longer arise, since the 2005 Operational Guidelines ask IUCN not to take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after March 31⁵.

Recommendation 20: IUCN presenters should state that their conclusions are not individual, but corporate. They should not change IUCN recommendations without seeking endorsement from the Panel.

Recommendation 21: IUCN presenters should communicate the recommendations in plain language and explain in detail earlier applications of criteria by previous Committees in similar situations (case law approach).

E. CORPORATE IUCN

In the course of conducting interviews, a number of elements have arisen that touch on IUCN's administration and organization. Important issues include the structure of the Programme for Protected Areas, the relationship with WCPA, involvement of other IUCN programmes, capacity building and communications.

Some interviewees regret the loss of a senior program officer as a focal point for World Heritage at IUCN. The current structure of the Programme for Protected Areas no longer has such a position. However, World Heritage work is very demanding and would benefit from a single focal point within the Programme. IUCN should give some consideration to re-instating a senior program officer position in the Programme for Protected Areas with exclusive responsibility for World Heritage.

Several interviewees were confused about the role of WCPA in the World Heritage process. It would be useful to clarify the roles between the WCPA (Chair of Panel? Source of reviewers?) and the Programme for Protected Areas (management of evaluation process, Secretariat to the Panel, liaison with States Parties, etc.). They called for a greater involvement of the WCPA in order to enlarge conservation efforts on behalf of World Heritage. While many reviewers are drawn from

⁵ Operational Guidelines, 2005, art. 148 (h).

WCPA, the current lack of focal point for World Heritage (usually the Vice-Chair) within the WCPA is regrettable, given WCPA's capacity to reinforce relationships between States Parties and IUCN. The role of the Vice-Chair, World Heritage in WCPA provides leadership for promoting and advancing World Heritage interests, especially through communications, publications, delivery of training modules and mobilization of regional networks. IUCN is encouraged to fill this gap as quickly as possible.

During the interviews, several IUCN staff expressed strong support for World Heritage. Nonetheless, there remains a perception that IUCN has failed to engage its other programmes in World Heritage issues. IUCN clearly has more science within its organization than is accessed by World Heritage. There is a need and desire to tap into the larger scientific community (e.g. Species Survival Commission and geological science group). Science itself is not the problem. The ability to marshal it may be.

IUCN has not incorporated World Heritage into its mainstream programs. It treats World Heritage as isolated contracted work carried out in its Headquarters program. So far, regional staff have not been engaged effectively. Despite the prestige and high profile of World Heritage, it is not mentioned once in the recent strategic direction-setting document IUCN Programme 2005-2008: Many Voices, One Earth. This suggests that there is little connection between World Heritage and the wider IUCN agenda. IUCN country and regional offices, if they were appropriately trained and resourced, could significantly expand IUCN influence in World Heritage, as well as conservation activities generally. An occasional unintended consequence of this lack of engagement is that IUCN country and regional offices have inadvertently provided support for nominations of unworthy projects. This results in confusing mixed messages from the organization. IUCN occupies a unique and privileged position in the World Heritage system, but to date the organization has chosen a narrow delivery model. IUCN could improve its performance on World Heritage and further its relationships with States Parties if it engaged the larger IUCN in World Heritage nominations. This would presumably require the IUCN leadership to identify World Heritage as an organizational priority or flagship.

Throughout this evaluation, it has been apparent that there is a need for skills development and capacity building in order to enable professionals from many parts of the world to participate in IUCN's evaluation processes. A number of ideas have been suggested including some form of State Party apprenticeships, a certification process or fostering university networks. Whatever methods are chosen, it will be important to identify the skills and credentials required to carry out the work and to match the training offer to these needs.

The Corporate Communications staff at IUCN indicated that they rarely get involved with World Heritage matters, except in crisis situations like the Kakadu incident. There may well be benefits both inside IUCN and outside to develop an awareness and engagement strategy for IUCN's World Heritage work. In a context where World Heritage has become more and more political, IUCN needs to prepare itself to defend the quality of its scientific advice. IUCN should develop a communications strategy to promote IUCN's technical role in World Heritage matters, to demonstrate the importance of the Convention to the corporate goals of IUCN, and to present information about the quality of IUCN's scientific research as applied to World Heritage sites.

Recommendation 22: IUCN should give some consideration to re-instating a senior officer position in the Programme for Protected Areas with exclusive responsibility for World Heritage.

Recommendation 23: IUCN is encouraged to fill the position of Vice-Chair, World Heritage at the WCPA as quickly as possible.

Recommendation 24: IUCN should engage its country and regional offices in World Heritage matters.

Recommendation 25: IUCN should examine ways and means to build skills and capacity in order to broaden involvement in all stages of the nomination process.

Recommendation 26: IUCN should develop a communications strategy to promote IUCN's technical role in World Heritage matters, to demonstrate the importance of the Convention to the corporate goals of IUCN, and to present information about the quality of IUCN's scientific research as applied to World Heritage sites.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. IUCN is encouraged to complete its strategy for assessing cultural landscapes as quickly as possible, in consultation with ICOMOS.
2. Senior management from IUCN and the World Heritage Centre should clarify their respective roles in evaluating nominations and communicate the results to their staff.
3. IUCN should expand its preparation of framework/thematic studies in areas of priority to the Committee (the Sahara, micro-climates, marine environments etc.)
4. As resources permit, IUCN should translate its framework/thematic studies into other languages as appropriate, to render them more accessible.
5. IUCN should develop and implement a communications strategy to heighten awareness and promote the use of the World Heritage framework/thematic studies.
6. IUCN should present to the World Heritage Committee for discussion and endorsement the scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites.
7. IUCN should document, disseminate and take into consideration the history of the Committee's application of natural criteria in the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.
8. IUCN should produce a specific guideline on the basic requirements and available resource materials for preparing a comparative analysis for natural World Heritage Sites.
9. IUCN should make available the names and credentials of all specialists involved in evaluating the natural heritage values of nominations.
10. IUCN should revise its selection process for reviewers to increase participation from different regions and to access the broader scientific community beyond WCPA and SSC.
11. IUCN should increase global participation in conservation by broadening the selection process for evaluators.
12. IUCN should initiate a strategy to develop a cadre of evaluators from all regions and major linguistic groups.
13. IUCN should consider the feasibility of sending two or more field evaluators to investigate a site, thereby offering opportunities for mentoring and for combining regional and non-regional participation.
14. IUCN evaluators should take part in feedback sessions with States Parties at the end of their site visit in order to share their general observations, raise questions and request further information. The feedback session should form part of the record of the site visit.
15. Evaluators should not be asked to make definitive recommendations on Outstanding Universal Value.
16. IUCN should develop and make public its Terms of Reference for the World Heritage Advisory Panel and expand its membership to better reflect regions and the global scientific community.
17. The function of Chairperson to the World Heritage Advisory Panel should be separate from the secretariat function.

18. As an interim measure, IUCN should formalize its procedural rules on the participation of evaluators as Panel members. The organization should move as quickly as is feasible to a system that separates evaluators in a given year from Panel membership.
19. Given the political nature of the World Heritage Convention and its importance as a UNESCO flagship program, IUCN should consider whether the final approval of Panel recommendations would not more appropriately reside with the Director General of IUCN.
20. IUCN presenters should state that their conclusions are not individual, but corporate. They should not change IUCN recommendations without seeking endorsement from the Panel.
21. IUCN presenters should communicate the recommendations in plain, less scientific language and explain in more detail earlier applications of criteria by previous Committees in similar situations (case law approach).
22. IUCN should give some consideration to re-instating a senior program officer position in the Programme for Protected Areas with exclusive responsibility for World Heritage.
23. IUCN is encouraged to fill the position of Vice-Chair, World Heritage at the WCPA as quickly as possible.
24. IUCN should engage its country and regional offices in World Heritage matters.
25. IUCN should examine ways and means to build skills and capacity in order to broaden involvement in all stages of the nomination process.
26. IUCN should develop a communications strategy to promote IUCN's technical role in World Heritage matters, to demonstrate the importance of the Convention to the corporate goals of IUCN, and to present information about the quality of IUCN's scientific research as applied to World Heritage sites.

NOTE:

In recognition of the fact that this is an extensive list of recommendations that will take time, energy and money to implement, priority should be given to those recommendations that improve the decision-making process (16, 17, 18), those that contribute to expanding the network (10, 11, 12, 24) and those that provide guidance to States Parties (1, 4, 7).

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference

Review of IUCN's work in the evaluation of World Heritage (WH) nominations

Draft of 29 October 2004

Objective

To review and advise on how to improve IUCN's performance related to the evaluation of WH nominations for natural and mixed sites as well as cultural landscapes (hereafter referred to as WH nominations)

Work Description

Taking into account the responsibilities of IUCN under the WH Convention, review IUCN's work related to the evaluation of WH nominations and develop recommendations to the Director of IUCN's Global Programme and the Head of IUCN's Programme on Protected Areas.

The review to include the processes used by IUCN in preparing and presenting evaluations of WH nominations, with special emphasis on:

- i) the working arrangement with the WH Centre;
- ii) the interaction between IUCN and States Parties during the evaluation process;
- iii) the selection and briefing of field evaluators;
- iv) the selection and role of reviewers;
- v) the operations of the IUCN WH Panel;
- vi) the application of the WH Global Strategy and other Thematic Studies;
- vii) the interpretation of Outstanding Universal Value and the Conditions of Integrity;
- viii) the treatment of supplementary information provided by States Parties; and
- ix) the presentations, both verbal and written, to the WH Committee.

Key Outcomes

The key outcomes will be recommendations to improve the way in which IUCN undertakes its advisory role in relation to evaluation of WH nominations.

Implementation of this Review

- (a) This Review will be undertaken by Mrs Christina Cameron in consultation with relevant persons from IUCN and other relevant organisations
- (b) the Clients for this Review are the Director of the IUCN Global Programme (Bill Jackson) and the Head of IUCN's Programme on Protected Areas (David Sheppard)
- (c) The final report should be an internal report of no more than 10 pages to the Clients by May 31, 2005
- (d) Subject to agreement from the Clients, the Report will be made available for wider consultation and distribution
- (e) The Review will involve a desk study with telephone interviews. It is anticipated that the Review would also involve travel to: (a) participate in the IUCN WH Panel Meeting on 16 and 17 December, 2004; and (b) to the Meeting on Outstanding Value, proposed to be held in Russia in April, 2005.

Appendix 2

List of Persons Interviewed

IUCN

Achim Steiner, Director General
Bill Jackson, Director, Global Programme
Jean-Yves Pirot, Senior Co-ordinator, Global Programme

Programme for Protected Areas

David Sheppard, Head
Pedro Rosabal, Senior Programme Officer
Georgina Peard, Project Officer

World Heritage Panel

Tim Badman, Dorset and East Devon Coast, UK
Stuart Chape, UNEP-WCMC
Adrian Phillips, former Vice-Chair, World Heritage, WCPA
Harald Placter, former Vice-Chair, World Heritage, WCPA
Jim Thorsell, World Heritage Senior Advisor, IUCN

World Commission on Protected Areas

Nikita Lopoukhine, Chair

World Heritage Centre

Francesco Bandarin, Director
Kishore Rao, Deputy Director
Mechtild Rossler, Chief, Europe and North America

Former Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee

Tamas Fejerdy (Hungary)
M. A Touri (Morocco)
Vera Lacoecilhe (Saint Lucia)
Adul Wichiencharoen (Thailand)

ANNEX A:

IUCN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

TO

**The External Evaluation of IUCN's Work in World
Heritage Nominations (August 2005) carried out by
Christina Cameron**

21 December, 2005



Introduction

Following more than 30 years of experience in the implementation of the World Heritage (WH) Convention, it was considered timely to review IUCN procedures in relation to the evaluation of WH nominations. The situation and functioning of the Convention has evolved considerably in recent years, resulting in greater attention and pressure on the evaluation process. With the responsibility of this important task lying with IUCN and particularly IUCN's Programme on Protected Areas (PPA), it is essential to ensure that the highest standards are employed and that all parties have full confidence in the methodology and processes which are applied.

Accordingly, IUCN commissioned an external review in 2005 of its WH work which aimed to improve IUCN's performance related to the evaluation of WH nominations for natural and mixed sites as well as cultural landscapes. This review was jointly commissioned by the Director Global programme and the Head of PPA. IUCN wishes to express its deep appreciation to Christina Cameron for the time and energy that she voluntarily devoted to carrying out this review, and also to those who contributed to the review through interviews and discussions with Christina.

This review has helped to consolidate current discussions and thinking on the evolution of the evaluation process and the need to adapt to the current requirements of the Convention. It should also help to build confidence amongst parties and stakeholders of the WH Convention, building on the reputation that IUCN has maintained to date in its technical advisory role to the WH Committee.

The review includes 26 recommendations and notes that: *"priority should be given to those recommendations that improve the decision-making process (16, 17, 18), those that contribute to expanding the network (10, 11, 12, 24) and those that provide guidance to States Parties (1, 4, 7)."*

This response includes: (a) comments on the recommendations from PPA; (b) key actions suggested to respond to the recommendation and timelines; and (c) PPA views on the priority of the recommendation.

Of the 26 recommendations outlined in the review IUCN: (a) agrees with 20 recommendations; (b) agrees with 3 recommendations but with qualification – recommendations 6, 9 and 20; and (c) does not agree with 3 recommendations – recommendations 17, 18 and 19. It is noted that most of these recommendations will require additional resources if they are to be effectively implemented.

In general we are pleased to note that the report is very positive about the work of IUCN and Christina Cameron specifically notes that: *"IUCN enjoys a high reputation for professionalism and scientific rigour. I hope that my report contributes to solidifying that reputation and enhancing IUCN's reputation where appropriate"*. IUCN commits itself to the effective implementation of this report and feels that it will enhance and improve IUCN's important work in relation to World heritage.

A. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. IUCN is encouraged to complete its strategy for assessing cultural landscapes as quickly as possible, in consultation with ICOMOS.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. We note that cultural landscape issues fall under the responsibility of ICOMOS and that IUCN's input is focused on cultural landscapes which have important natural values. A draft IUCN strategy for cultural landscapes was prepared in early 2005 and has been sent to ICOMOS for review and discussion at the next meeting of Advisory Bodies in January 2006. In addition, dialogue has started with the Head of the IUCN/WCPA Taskforce on Protected Landscapes to ensure effective engagement of this Taskforce in IUCN's WH cultural landscape work. IUCN has been involved with WH cultural landscape issues since the early 1990s and has prepared a number of papers and internal guidelines for evaluating natural values of cultural landscapes. IUCN currently participates in evaluation missions to cultural landscapes with important natural values, (usually 2 to 3 missions per year) and undertakes desk reviews of cultural landscape nominations (usually 2 to 3 reviews per year). In general, many cultural landscape nominations tend to have very little information on natural values and there is an overall need to raise the standard of cultural landscape nominations in this regard.

Increased involvement in the evaluation of cultural landscapes is likely to have implications on workload and budget. For example, it may require including a cultural landscape expert on the WH Panel and would increase the number of nominations we evaluate in the field each year. It is therefore important to increase the involvement of the WCPA Taskforce in this area and to focus action on a limited number of important issues, such as: (a) clarifying the roles of IUCN and ICOMOS; (b) agreeing on how to present IUCN recommendations to the Committee; (c) preparing guidelines for IUCN reviewers and evaluators; and (d) preparing guidelines to States Parties on how to prepare better cultural landscape nominations and on other topics related to cultural landscape issues.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Finalise IUCN Position paper for cultural landscapes, which will address the above issues (target date: adoption by December 2006). This will provide an input into the development of a joint IUCN-ICOMOS strategy for cultural landscapes in due course.

(2) Ensure increased involvement of the IUCN/WCPA Task Force on Protected Landscapes in IUCN's WH cultural landscape work (target date: involvement of Task Force substantially increased by December 2006)

(3) Prepare guidelines to States Parties on preparation of cultural landscape nominations (target date: by December 2007, jointly with ICOMOS)

Priority

Medium

2. Senior management from IUCN and the World Heritage Centre should clarify their respective roles in evaluating nominations and communicate the results to their staff.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. IUCN's role in evaluating nominations is set out under the terms of the annual contract we have with UNESCO. Problems involving the WH Centre can arise where: (a) there is involvement/lobbying from staff of the WH Centre based on disagreement with

recommendations of the IUCN evaluation; and (b) when staff from the WH Centre may be involved in encouraging inappropriate nominations from States Parties. There is a need to more clearly define the roles of IUCN and the WH Centre in relation to evaluation. This should be addressed through a revision of the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between IUCN and the UNESCO WH Centre. The meeting between the IUCN Director General and the Director of the WH Centre in June 2004 was also useful for clarifying roles and should be followed up.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Prepare and adopt a revised MOU between IUCN and the UNESCO WH Centre which will include, inter alia, the identification of respective roles in the nomination process (target date: adoption by December 2006)
- (2) Implement periodic meetings between the IUCN Director General, the Director of the WH Centre, Director, Global Programme and Head Programme on Protected Areas to encourage greater cooperation and reinforce the respective roles of both organisations in the evaluation process and other related activities. (target date: on-going, with the first meeting to be held at a mutually convenient date in late 2006)
- (3) Implement periodic meetings between PPA/WH staff and staff of the WH Centre working on nature issues to encourage greater cooperation on World Heritage issues (target date: on-going, with the first meeting to be held at a mutually convenient date in 2006, tentatively at the time of the World Heritage Panel)

Priority

High

B. SCIENCE

3. IUCN should expand its preparation of framework/thematic studies in areas of priority to the Committee (the Sahara, micro-climates, marine environments etc.)

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. Additional resources will be required for it to be implemented. It is essential that future work build on IUCN's existing thematic studies (8 studies have been prepared by IUCN since 1995). The preparation of future thematic studies should be based on a clear strategy which responds to the findings of relevant World Heritage strategy meetings such as the Kazan meeting (April 2005) and the IUCN and UNEP-WCMC Global review of the WH List. This strategy should identify specific topics for thematic studies and mechanisms to ensure they are effectively applied. In relation to specific topics, it is noted that some of the areas identified in this recommendation - Sahara and micro-climates - have not been identified as priorities by the Committee. It is understood these topics were mentioned in the course of interviews undertaken for this review. It is also important to ensure that existing regional and thematic studies are more effectively applied, promoted and distributed. There needs to be particular attention given to the implementation of recommendations within existing studies.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Prepare and adopt a strategy for the development of future regional and thematic studies, as well as updating of existing studies, including mechanisms to ensure they are effectively applied (target date: adoption by December 2006)

(2) Prepare and submit a proposal for additional funding from the World Heritage Committee to ensure this strategy can be implemented (target date: submission of proposal to 2007 World Heritage Committee – to be confirmed with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre)

Priority

Medium

4. As resources permit, IUCN should translate its framework/thematic studies into other languages as appropriate, to render them more accessible.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. At present resources provided in the World Heritage budget do not allow for translation of framework/thematic studies into other languages and additional funding is required for this recommendation to be implemented. Opportunities for external funding would need to be explored with WH States Parties and other potential donors and partners. Options for placing translated documents on the web (as distinct from printing translated documents) could be explored.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Seek funding for updating and translation of framework/thematic studies (target date: adoption by December 2006)

(2) Ensure future proposals for the preparation of framework/thematic studies include a budget for translation into at least French and Spanish (target date: on going). This will be included within the IUCN WH Strategy.

Priority

High

5. IUCN should develop and implement a communications strategy to heighten awareness and promote the use of the World Heritage framework/thematic studies.

Note: The response to Recommendation 5 and recommendation 26 is dealt with jointly below

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. Additional budget would be required for its implementation. This will also require greater recognition from IUCN of the importance of WH as an asset to assist its overall communication of messages relating to conservation and sustainable development. Discussions have been initiated with the IUCN Global Communications Unit and PPA to develop and implement a communications strategy for World Heritage. More work is required and will occur. All PPA staff involved in WH and the WCPA Vice Chair for World Heritage need to increase their involvement in communication. This is also addressed under Recommendation 26 of the Cameron Review.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Prepare and implement a Communications Strategy for World Heritage, as a key element within the overall IUCN WH Strategy (target date: December, 2006)

(2) Include a communications component within future proposals for enhancing IUCN's work on World Heritage (target date: on going).

Priority

High

6. IUCN should present to the World Heritage Committee for discussion and endorsement the scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation, although with some qualifications. IUCN includes a description of the process used in the evaluation of individual sites in its presentation made every year to the World Heritage Committee. The process used is also included in greater detail in the IUCN Evaluation Report. IUCN has also provided elaboration on the scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites in its presentations to the Committee on the Global Strategy and also to expert meetings such as the Kazan WH Strategy meeting (April, 2005). If invited by the Committee, IUCN would be delighted to provide further elaboration to the Committee or to other forums considered appropriate. IUCN notes the importance of maintaining a scientifically rigorous and objective process.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Seek approval from the WH Committee to provide a more detailed presentation on IUCN's scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites (target date: approval sought for inclusion in the 2007 WH Committee's agenda)
- (2) Publish and distribute the IUCN World Heritage Strategy, including the UNEP-WCMC Review of the WH List, which provides, inter alia, guidance on the scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites (target date: December, 2006)
- (3) Review and revise the IUCN evaluation presentation made to each WH Committee to ensure it provides adequate information and guidance on the scientific program used in the evaluation of individual sites by IUCN (target date: revised presentation to be made to 2006 WH Committee Meeting).

Priority

High

7. IUCN should document, disseminate and take into consideration the history of the Committee's application of natural criteria in the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. IUCN takes previous decisions of the Committee into account when considering its assessment of Outstanding Universal Value. However this can and should be more rigorously documented, particularly within the evaluation reports on individual nominations and in presentations made to the WH Committee. This is particularly important as membership of the WH Committee rotates and there is thus a need to reinforce "case law" as represented in previous decisions of the WH Committee. Previous "case law" can and should also be considered by meetings of the IUCN WH Panel. "Case law" should consider sites inscribed and not inscribed and the response of the States parties. It should be developed for each natural criterion and should be undertaken in partnership with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. This could ideally be developed as a joint student project.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Document the history of the Committee's application of natural criteria in the assessment of OUV, particularly within evaluation reports on individual nominations and also in relation to supporting documentation of the IUCN WH Panel (target date: programme and timetable for preparation to be discussed and agreed with the WH Centre by June 2006)

Priority

High

D. NOMINATIONS

8. IUCN should produce a specific guideline on the basic requirements and available resource materials for preparing a comparative analysis for natural World Heritage Sites.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. IUCN is preparing a Resource Manual on how to prepare WH nominations for natural properties, which includes guidance on how to undertake a comparative analysis for natural WH sites. The draft Manual has been circulated to the WH Centre and Advisory Bodies for comment. It is expected that a revised draft will be ready for distribution in 2006 for testing and comment by States Parties. Parts of the manual, such as the guidelines for comparative analysis, could also be prepared into "information sheets" that could be separately distributed. IUCN notes the independence of its evaluation process must be maintained and that preparation of this manual does not imply that it will be more directly involved in the site nomination process of States Parties.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Prepare and distribute a draft Resource Manual on how to prepare WH nominations for natural properties, which includes guidance on how to undertake a comparative analysis for natural WH sites. (target date: document available for the 2006 WH Committee)

(2) Test the draft Resource Manual at training/capacity building workshops (target date: at least one training/capacity building workshop to be implemented by December 2006, tentatively to be held at the Wildlife Institute of India)

Priority

High

9. IUCN should make available the names and credentials of all specialists involved in evaluating the natural heritage values of nominations.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation but with some qualification. IUCN has always made the names of the field evaluators public (unlike ICOMOS which in the past has kept the names confidential). However IUCN has not made the names of reviewers public. This is to encourage the provision of advice without any fear or implication of retribution on the individual who provides review comments. In some countries, for example, a review comment from an individual from that country which may be negative in relation to the nomination could result in negative reactions against this individual. This situation has, in fact, happened. One option would be to include one list of all reviewers in the evaluations report without saying on which sites people commented, or

what their comments were. Reviewers would be asked whether or not they were happy to be included in this list and if not, the number of people not included in the list would be noted. This would give some transparency to this process and it would also give some recognition to reviewers, if they agree.

It is also noted that some organisations, such as the European Commission, maintain a list of expert reviewers which is publicly available by web site. This may also provide a useful model for future development of transparent systems relating to the provision of names of expert reviewers.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Continue to include the names of evaluators within the IUCN Evaluation Report (target date: on going)
- (2) Better document the general process for selection of reviewers within the IUCN Evaluation Report to ensure the process is more transparent (target date: include in the 2006 IUCN Evaluation Report and then on going)
- (3) Consider the option of including one list of all reviewers in the IUCN Evaluation Report, without saying on which sites people commented, or what their comments were. (target date: include the names of all reviewers, subject to their agreement, in IUCN Evaluation Reports from 2007)
- (4) Review other systems used for identification of expert reviewers, such as that used by the European Commission, and use this as a basis for further development of mechanisms for increasing transparency and effectiveness in relation to reviewers. (target date: review by December, 2006)

Priority

Medium

10. IUCN should revise its selection process for reviewers to increase participation from different regions and to access the broader scientific community beyond WCPA and SSC.
--

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. This is an important point and IUCN has taken steps in this direction in 2005, such as increasing the involvement of reviewers with geological expertise and increasing the involvement of reviewers from different regions from the WCPA network. However, more can be done and the support of the WCPA Vice Chair for World Heritage is essential in this process. In 2006 a new system will be considered, such as making nominations available on a password controlled website, which will also help in reducing printing and postage costs, as well as actively seeking reviewers through the website. The guidelines for reviewers will be revised in 2006 in line with the 2005 WH Operational Guidelines.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Continue to increase the range and number of reviewers who contribute to the IUCN evaluation process, with particular emphasis on increasing participation from different regions and the broader scientific community, in particular with SSC (target date: on going)
- (2) Review options for development of a new web based system for reviewers to improve the range and quality of review comments received on nominations. (target date: implementation of trial system by December 2006 and on-going improvement)

(3) Develop a brief strategy on selection of reviewers including a pro-active internal IUCN wide communication strategy to promote interest in the reviews (target date: December 2006)

Priority

High

- 11. IUCN should increase global participation in conservation by broadening the selection process for evaluators.**
- 12. IUCN should initiate a strategy to develop a cadre of evaluators from all regions and major linguistic groups.**
- 13. IUCN should consider the feasibility of sending two or more field evaluators to investigate a site, thereby offering opportunities for mentoring and for combining regional and non-regional participation.**

IUCN Comment

We agree with these recommendations. Actions have been progressively undertaken to address these points and there have been significant changes from the situation 10 years ago where one person carried out virtually all of the IUCN evaluations. However it is recognized that more can be done, particularly to ensure that a wider range of evaluators are involved. This will take time and a constant effort to engage and train new people. Involvement of the WCPA Vice Chair for World Heritage and WCPA Regional Vice Chairs will also be important in recruiting suitable evaluators from all regions. It is increasingly common for two or more evaluators to be involved in evaluation missions, subject to the available budget and the complexity of the issues involved at each site.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Ensure a wider range of evaluators are involved in IUCN evaluation missions and that they are effectively trained and briefed (target date: on going)
- (2) Ensure that evaluators are effectively briefed and trained, including through periodic training programmes such as the Island of Vilm (Germany) Workshop (target date: on going, with first training workshop implemented in November 2005)
- (3) Involve two or more evaluators on IUCN evaluation missions, subject to the available budget and the complexity of the issues involved at each site (target date: on going).
- (4) Revise and improve the guidelines for evaluators (target date: guidelines revised and distributed by December 2006)

Priority

High

- 14. IUCN evaluators should take part in feedback sessions with States Parties at the end of their site visit in order to share their general observations, raise questions and request further information. The feedback session should form part of the record of the site visit.**

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. This is already carried out during many missions but should be carried out in all cases. This has been included in the guidelines for evaluators as well as those for States Parties, which cover all evaluations implemented in 2005-6.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Ensure all IUCN evaluation missions include a feedback session with States Parties at the end of the site visit (target date: all missions to include feedback session from the 2005-6 Evaluation Cycle)

Priority

High

15. Evaluators should not be asked to make definitive recommendations on Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. Evaluators are already informed in their TOR that the final decision on OUV lies with IUCN and the IUCN World Heritage Panel. Also, that they are not to make definitive recommendations on Outstanding Universal Value during or after their evaluation mission. However, evaluators are encouraged to provide views on this subject in their internal report to IUCN after the mission as this is useful input for the final considerations of the IUCN WH Panel.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Reinforce with all IUCN evaluators that they are not to make definitive recommendations on Outstanding Universal Value during or after their evaluation mission. (target date: on going)

Priority

Medium

16. IUCN should develop and make public its Terms of Reference for the World Heritage Advisory Panel and expand its membership to better reflect regions and the global scientific community.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. Steps are currently being taken to expand the membership of the IUCN WH Panel to better reflect regions and the global community. This will be undertaken as soon as possible after the new WCPA Vice Chair for World Heritage is appointed. The membership and TOR for the IUCN WH Panel will be made publicly available on the web site as soon as possible.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Revise membership and TOR of the IUCN WH Panel and make this information publicly available (target date: December, 2006)

Priority

High

17. The function of Chairperson to the World Heritage Advisory Panel should be separate from the secretariat function.

IUCN Comment

We do not agree with this recommendation. The IUCN WH Panel has been chaired by a member of the Secretariat since its inception and this has not given rise to any particular problems or issues. This is a corporate responsibility of IUCN, thus the Chair of the Panel should be a member of the Secretariat, and a strong chairperson. The view of PPA is that the Chair of the Panel should be the Director of the Global Programme or, in his/her absence, the Head of PPA. This reflects the role of the Panel as advisory and role of the Secretariat (IUCN/PPA) as decision making.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Replace the current chair of the IUCN WH Panel (Head PPA) so that the Chair of the Panel is the Director, Global Programme (target date: April, 2006)

Priority

High

18. As an interim measure, IUCN should formalize its procedural rules on the participation of evaluators as Panel members. The organization should move as quickly as is feasible to a system that separates evaluators in a given year from Panel membership.

IUCN Comment

We do not agree with this recommendation. There are currently clear rules and processes in place to ensure that Panel members who also have carried out evaluations during the year under review are not involved in Panel decisions on the sites in question. The rules and processes allow for Panel Members who have undertaken evaluations to provide a brief presentation on the site they evaluated and then for the Panel Member to leave the Panel Meeting and take no part in decision making by the Panel in relation to that specific site.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Ensure the continued implementation of the existing rules and processes which ensure that Panel members who also have carried out evaluations are not involved in Panel decisions on the sites in question. Also ensure that these rules and processes are communicated. (target date: on going).

Priority

High

19. Given the political nature of the World Heritage Convention and its importance as a UNESCO flagship program, IUCN should consider whether the final approval of Panel recommendations would not more appropriately reside with the Director General of IUCN.

IUCN Comment

We do not agree with this recommendation. It is logistically quite difficult (since there are up to 20 reports, they are not all ready at same time and we often have little time for turn-around) and would be very time consuming for the DG to personally approve all of the evaluation reports. This

would also put the DG on the front line of “political advocacy” by IUCN members interested in having a positive recommendation from the IUCN WH Panel. As the Panel is an objective, technical forum, PPA considers it would be better if these recommendations are approved by the Director, Global Programme and then formally endorsed by the DG. This procedure would still ensure that there is IUCN “ownership” of the Evaluation Report at the highest levels

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Revise the existing system so that recommendations are approved by the Director, Global Programme and endorsed by the DG. (target date: process to be applied for the 2006 IUCN WH Panel)

Priority

High

20. IUCN presenters should state that their conclusions are not individual, but corporate. They should not change IUCN recommendations without seeking endorsement from the Panel.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation but with some qualification. IUCN currently states in its report that its conclusions are corporate, not individual, and this is reinforced in the verbal presentation to the WH Committee. Regarding changes to the panel recommendations, this would be only undertaken in exceptional circumstances. In all cases attempts will be made to obtain the views of the Panel if there is a need to re-consider the original recommendation, such as happens for example when more information is received. The points noted above are also reinforced i.e. that the role of the Panel is advisory and the role of the Secretariat is decision making. This issue will also be addressed by holding two panel meetings per year and by strictly adhering to the Operational Guidelines clause that no supplementary information from States Parties can be accepted after 31 March.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Implement two meetings of the IUCN WH Panel each year (target date: from December 2006)

(2) Strictly adhere to the Operational Guidelines clause that no supplementary information can be accepted after 31 March.

Priority

High

E. CORPORATE IUCN

21. IUCN presenters should communicate the recommendations in plain, less scientific language and explain in more detail earlier applications of criteria by previous Committees in similar situations (case law approach).

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. This is what we try to do at all WH Committee meetings but we will take steps to improve this even further and make it systematic in presentations. It is noted that IUCN evaluation presentations are often praised by WH Committee Members for their clarity and focus. It is essential that the written IUCN evaluation reports are at the highest level of

technical excellence and that these provide the basis for clear easily understood presentations at the WH Committee Meetings.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Ensure all IUCN presentations are as clear as possible (target date: all WH Committees starting with the 2006 WH Committee)
- (2) Develop a set of guidance notes and templates (for reports and power points) as well as a list of “do’s and don’ts” for reporting (target date: December 2006)
- (3) Undertake annual assessment of the performance of presenters and presenters this to the WH Panel for their review. This would draw on the views of a range of persons including influential persons on the WH Committee (target date: December 2006)

Priority

Medium

22. IUCN should give some consideration to re-instating a senior program officer position in the Programme for Protected Areas with exclusive responsibility for World Heritage.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. Implementation of a senior position would require additional budget – approximately 150,000 Sfr each year – and would require additional funding. Options for obtaining this funding will be reviewed and this will be included within fundraising targets developed for IUCN’s work on World Heritage. This position would report to the Head of the Programme on Protected Areas and would not be associated with the setting up of a separate World Heritage Programme within IUCN.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Continue to seek funding for an additional permanent position for World Heritage (target date: on going)
- (2) Include a specific funding target for this within overall fundraising targets developed for IUCN’s work on World Heritage. (target date: December 2006)

Priority

Medium

23. IUCN is encouraged to fill the position of Vice-Chair, World Heritage at the WCPA as quickly as possible.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. An open process calling for expressions of interest in this position was initiated in November and it is anticipated that this position will be filled by January 2006.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Fill the position of Vice Chair World Heritage, following the open call for expression of interest (target date: January 2006)

Priority

High

24. IUCN should engage its country and regional offices in World Heritage matters.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. PPA takes a number of measures to increase the involvement of IUCN Regional and Country Offices (RCOs) in World Heritage work, including presentations to regional staff when opportunities arise and involving local staff in evaluations where possible. A consistent constraint has been the need to fund the involvement of IUCN RCOs in WH matters and these funds are not currently available. There are opportunities to use the position of IUCN under the Convention to support project development and implementation in WH sites. An example of this is the China World Heritage Biodiversity Programme – a model which has scope for application in other regions. PPA will explore avenues for such initiatives, within available resources and will also produce a general information pack on World Heritage for distribution to RCOs. It is also important that there is a message sent from senior management to RCOs on the importance of World Heritage and the need for them to allocate time and resources to this area.

Key Actions and Timelines

- (1) Prepare and distribute an information pack on World Heritage for distribution to IUCN Regional and Country Offices. (target date: December, 2006)
- (2) Developing fund raising proposals for World Heritage with IUCN Regional and Country Offices (target date: on-going)
- (3) Message to be sent from Senior Management to IUCN Regional and Country Offices on the importance of World Heritage and the need for them to allocate time and resources to this area. This would also identify incentives to encourage their increased involvement (target date: December, 2006)

Priority

High

25. IUCN should examine ways and means to build skills and capacity in order to broaden involvement in all stages of the nomination process.

IUCN Comment

We agree with this recommendation. Again it has budget implications and funds are not currently available. A good manual and training should assist with this process and the training workshop on the Island of Vilm (November, 2005) is a step in this direction. Additional resources are required. A State Party supported apprenticeship/secondment system, mentioned in the review, could be a very useful way of supporting work load and engaging more with States Parties. A State Party internship or secondment programme could be promoted at the WH Committee meeting in 2006, with one internship or secondment offered each year at IUCN. Costs would need to be borne to a large extent by the State Party. This proposal will need to be discussed and developed further internally.

Key Actions and Timelines

(1) Develop a fundraising strategy to support training and capacity building on World Heritage (target date: on-going)

(2) Request support from States Parties for a secondment programme to assist with developing a capacity building programme (target date: launch at 2006 WH Committee)

Priority

High

26. IUCN should develop a communications strategy to promote IUCN's technical role in World Heritage matters, to demonstrate the importance of the Convention to the corporate goals of IUCN, and to present information about the quality of IUCN's scientific research as applied to World Heritage sites.

Note: The response to Recommendation 5 and recommendation 26 is dealt with jointly as set out on page 5 of this response (refer recommendation 5)