Andrea Strauss and Tim Badman (Eds.)

Enhancing the IUCN World Heritage Programme

Proceedings of the Expert Workshop

BfN-Skripten 342

2013

Enhancing the IUCN World Heritage Programme

Proceedings of the Expert Workshop

Workshop held from 17 - 21 February 2013 at the International Academy for Nature Conservation on the Isle of Vilm, Germany

organised by
the IUCN World Heritage Programme
in cooperation with the
German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)

**Editors
Andrea Strauss and Tim Badman**

BfN
Federal Agency
for Nature
Conservation

About the workshop

The aim of the workshop was to strengthen IUCN's work on the World Heritage Convention during the new IUCN Programme 2013-2016, and specifically IUCN's regional networks, World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), and engagement with its partners, including UNESCO, ICCROM and ICOMOS. The meeting strived:

- To strengthen IUCN engagement as an Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee, in order to increase credibility in the work of the Convention;

- To identify the challenges facing listed World Heritage sites, and the means of engaging IUCN to support action to address conservation issues and to recognise successful World Heritage site management and governance;

- To encourage successful nominations to the World Heritage List, and improve the quality of nominations, whilst respecting IUCN's formal role as the evaluator of new nominations to the World Heritage List; and

- To position World Heritage clearly within the wider delivery of IUCN's work on protected areas, and on conservation and sustainable development.

A set of agreed actions for IUCN and partners to address on the following issues were expected as outcomes of the meeting:

- Influencing greater credibility in the work of the World Heritage Committee;

- Strengthening World Heritage work within the IUCN WCPA;

- Launching and getting action in response to IUCN's new global assessment of the Conservation Outlook for natural World Heritage Sites;

- Launching and getting action in response to new global assessment of World Heritage biodiversity priorities;

- Ensuring a systematic rights based approach to IUCN's duties and interventions within the framework of the World Heritage Convention;

- Promoting greater synergies between approaches to conservation and rights in both natural and cultural heritage in designated sites;

- 2-3 priorities for 2013-16 for each IUCN region to move forward World Heritage delivery.

The target group for this workshop was IUCN's core network of support on World Heritage, including regional World Heritage focal points in the Union, the World Commission on Protected Areas, other IUCN Commissions, and IUCN partners ICCROM, ICOMOS (advisory bodies to the Convention on cultural heritage), and the World Heritage Centre (Secretariat to the World Heritage Convention).

The workshop was organised by the IUCN World Heritage Programme and the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) with its International Academy for Nature Conservation. The workshop was funded by the German Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) and by IUCN.

The workshop report presents a summary of conclusions from a rich exchange of views. Comments expressed in this report do not necessarily represent the views of either IUCN or any individual participant, and will be incorporated as far as possible into the development of the IUCN World Heritage Programme 2013-16. Comments and further ideas on the findings of the meeting are welcome, and can be addressed to the report editors.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

AB	Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM)
BIOPAMA	IUCN Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme
CEESP	IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
CEL	IUCN Commission on Environmental Law
COA	Conservation Outlook Assessment
EoH	Enhancing our Heritage
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GPAP	IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme
ICCA	Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IUCN HQ	IUCN Headquarters
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PoWPA	CBD Convention on Biological Diversity's Programme of Work on Protected Areas
CSVPA	WCPA Specialist Group on Cultural and Spiritual Values of Protected Areas
SGPL	WCPA Protected Landscapes Specialist Group
SSC	IUCN Species Survival Commission
TILCEPA	WCPA Theme on Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas
UICN SUR	IUCN Regional Office for South America (UICN-Sur)
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WCC	IUCN World Conservation Congress
WCPA	IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas
WHC	World Heritage Centre
WH	World Heritage
WHP	World Heritage Programme of IUCN
WHS	World Heritage Site
WPC	IUCN World Parks Congress

1. Summary Recommendations

One Programme

- There is the need for IUCN's work on World Heritage to integrate with activities of many units of IUCN, including the IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme (GPAP), World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), IUCN Global Policy Unit and Social Policy Adviser. Ideally every IUCN component programme would have defined a connection to the World Heritage Convention within its work.

- The IUCN Programme should convey a clear logic for recognising WH sites as focal flagships within wider projects. WH sites should be focal areas to strengthen the link between Management Effectiveness and Governance (science, management and social policy integration). There are some immediate practical opportunities to do this, e.g., cooperating with BIOPAMA.

- The linkages between World Heritage and IUCN protected area categories should be identified.

- Coordination with other conventions and programmes should be a priority. E.g. framing World Heritage action within the framework of the Aichi targets and Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) tools and resources;

- Although a focus on WCPA is a priority, other Commissions have valuable technical roles to play on World Heritage, e.g. Rights based approaches, natural resource governance, etc.

Stronger regional IUCN programmes

- Stronger and consistent regional programmes are a priority for developing the effectiveness of the IUCN WH Programme. There is a need to strive towards coherence and consistency of approach across all IUCN regions - currently there is a diverse state of play in regions.

- Regional programmes in the IUCN Secretariat and Commissions should be linked to both the global World Heritage Programme and Global Protected Areas Programme. At the regional and global level there needs to be a clear and consistent connection between WH and wider PA goals and activities.

- Regional staff time needs to be secured on a consistent basis, and fundraising to enable this should be a focus for the regions, in partnership with GPAP and WHP.

- It is important to coordinate and find synergies with partners in the region, e.g. UNESCO regional offices, and UNESCO WHC Regional Desks, ICOMOS national committees and ICCROM regional training programmes and other activities.

- The World Heritage periodic reporting process is an entry point for regional programmes in IUCN.

- There is a need for a model "regional MoU" between World Heritage Programme and regions, notably in relation to governance of conflict of interest between IUCN's Advisory Body Role to the WH Committee, and engagement of IUCN on WH matters in support of States Parties to the World Heritage Committee.

- Priorities do vary between regions for work, including the balance of emphasis between conservation of sites, and the promotion of new WH listings. There are also potential priorities regarding which countries to work with first. These issues need to be addressed in the new regional prorammes.

- A key requirement to extend regional work is the ability of IUCN to work in a range of national and regional languages, and create stronger networks in different languages. The limitation of the WH Convention to only two working languages (English and French) is a constraint.

- There is a need to identify and engage consistently with national focal points for natural World Heritage in different countries, and to also coordinate with the focal points for other Conventions.

Conserving sites

- The new programme to assess the Conservation Outlook of all natural WH Sites by WHP is an entry point for IUCN's work on WH site conservation. This is the highest priority project to make a long-term change in the effectiveness of IUCN's WH work.

- More capacity is needed for conservation action, and more consistent approaches are required, focused on the needs and opportunities presented by specific WH sites.

- Management effectiveness tools that exist, including those such as Enhancing our Heritage (EoH) developed specifically for WH sites, should be used consistently in all natural WHS, and are also of interest to cultural WH.

- There is an opportunity to draw on cultural and spiritual values to promote conservation of WH sites where IUCN has an interest. The WH Convention offers particular opportunities to explore this potential.

Filling gaps on the World Heritage List:

- Regional "upstream advice" programmes of work (not just studies) is a further priority for the development of a more effective IUCN programme on WH. "Upstream" here refers to jargon in use in the WH Convention and means helping States Parties, interested IUCN NGO members, communities and rights-holders engage with design issues before the site reaches nomination stage when it is difficult to correct process problems;

- Global analyses and thematic studies of WH gaps provide an important baseline, and means of promoting opportunities for effective nominations. They are a starting point for regional gap analyses and regional programmes of support, but on their own are an insufficient strategy to encourage effective support to nominations.

Show best practice:

- There are discrete opportunities for WH work in IUCN to show leadership in areas of challenging practice. Two opportunities identified are:
  a) for work on rights based approaches, and there should be a programme of activities on this leading to WCC in 2016, following the motion approved at WCC in 2012
  b) demonstration of effective approaches linking protection of nature and culture, where a programme of work needs to be developed, notably in partnership with ICCROM and ICOMOS.

Communicate and advocate:

- Communicate more! Much more effective communication and advocacy on WH is required, and IUCN should be doing more in these areas, coordination with the other Advisory Bodies (AB) and UNESCO WHC. There are a wide range of regional and global events leading to the WPC (e.g. WIN 2013, WILD 10), and beyond. A coordinated and consistent approach to WH messaging and advocacy at these events is required.

- An important need is to show conservation success and the positive use of the Convention, e.g. good results for sites from action taken following inclusion on the WH Danger List.

Stronger WCPA:

WCPA's work on WH should be strengthened including through:

- Database of experts within IUCN (staff, members and Commissioners), including WH site managers;

- Formalise TILCEPA database of rights and governance experts;

- Deliver the diverse expert network of WCPA members that WHP needs to deliver its official functions as Advisory Body (Accreditation of WCPA experts should be considered);

- A greater emphasis on advocacy to enhance credibility is needed in WCPA's work;

- Engaging with other specialist groups and IUCN commissions

- Establishing a written protocol for WCPA members how and when to engage (role of WCPA vs. IUCN WH Programme);

- Help convene the NGO community on governance / advocacy, and encourage them to attend the World Heritage Committee meetings, and including through providing prior briefings on key issues;

- A WCPA and World Heritage 1-2 pager on role is needed;

- Capacity building for WCPA on World Heritage (evaluation, monitoring etc.), and on WCPA members' experience with COA;

- The experience of WCPA members working on the COA work to date needs to be evaluated.

- WCPA has a key role in assisting with gap analyses / regional workshops (Tentative Lists).

- WCPA also can take a greater role in awareness raising, including with donors, NGOs, governments.

2. Introduction to the IUCN World Heritage Programme and the World Heritage Convention

IUCN - TIM BADMAN (see Powerpoint)

The presentation introduced the IUCN Programme framework 2013 – 2016 in the view of the 40 years anniversary of the WHC. Last years have witnessed less consistency of WHC decisions with technical advice provided by IUCN. Continuing number of sites are listed as endangered in the list of WH in danger. With current USA withdrawal from funding UNESCO there is a tighter budgetary situation for IUCN WH programme, and UNESCO. Indigenous peoples, local communities and NGOs are having more influence in WH processes than previously and have a central role in new nominations. Another need for action is in filling the gaps on WH list. There will be a shift to proactive monitoring instead of reactive monitoring within IUCN's work, defining the Conservation Outlook for every natural site on the WH list (state, values, threats, management effectiveness). A sustainable network of IUCN regional and Commission WH focal points, with clear ToR, is needed.

WCPA - CYRIL KORMOS (see Powerpoint)

The presentation introduced WCPA and its role in WH processes. Members act as experts, independent of their institutions. They have a unique position, in being able to speak freely, comparable to academia, as respected experienced experts. WCPA supports the IUCN WH programme, e.g., by advocacy work (analysis of Committee decisions, in response to increasing threats from industrial activities, policy briefs) to raising the profile of the WHC. Recently, the idea of establishing a WH Specialist group within WCPA has been under discussion.

World Heritage Centre - GUY DEBONNET (see Powerpoint)

The presentation introduced the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and recent changes in its processes. The main actors of the almost universal convention - with 190 state parties - are state parties, WH Committee, UNESCO WHC (votes the budget, establishes WH list and WH list in Danger, reviews state of conservation of inscribed sites), and the advisory bodies IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM. Focal points are mostly from ministries of culture, which can present a limitation for natural site processes. WH Committee has changed its character from being more of an expert committee to being more politically oriented. For nominations, UNECO WHC conducts a completeness check before forwarding the nomination to the relevant advisory bodies for evaluation. The UNESCO WHC organizes periodic reporting and coordinates state of conservation reporting (role of advisory bodies), mobilizes extra-budgetary funds for conservation activities and coordinates the WH Fund. So far, no official role is foreseen for civil society / NGOs, but greater engagement is welcome and encouraged.

ICCROM - JOSEPH KING (see Powerpoint)

ICCROM is an intergovernmental organisation providing technical expertise and capacity building. Besides advising on WH sites, ICCROM's work is focused on disaster management, wood / stone conservation, museum collections and people-centred approaches to conservation. The third advisory body to the WHC, ICOMOS (who were not able to attend the workshop), is an NGO, with individual expert members coming from national committees, and international scientific committees.

3. Issues & Need for Action regarding IUCN's work on World Heritage

Main points to be tackled within IUCN's work on World Heritage were identified in the introductory session and first work group sessions. They include questions of:

- how WCPA can support World Heritage and how expertise in WCPA on World Heritage can be increased;

- the role of regional actors including regional IUCN offices and NGOs in supporting the World Heritage Committee;

- how to make World Heritage site identification, nomination and monitoring processes more effective;

- how to better reflect World Heritage and other values in the actual management of the sites / protected areas;

- capacity building and advocacy at the World Heritage Committee, and more widely regarding the Convention;

- the cooperation with indigenous peoples and local communities on World Heritage governance and rights based approaches;

- how to link natural and cultural World heritage and address management of natural values in cultural WH sites and cultural values in natural WH sites;

- planning of regional and global action for the next years.

4.   Key Recommendations on World Heritage processes

World Heritage nominations and filling the gaps on the World Heritage List

- In order to work with the instrument of tentative list more efficiently, properties should ideally stay on it for longer time, e.g., 2-3 years, providing more time for input and discussion before nomination. Consider a phased approach for nominations with two, or ideally three-stages, including a first stage on basis of values, a second on basis of management issues and a third on rights and governance.

- Capacity-building is essential for participation in the upstream processes. Provide training on establishing tentative lists, nomination, management of sites, etc.

- Conduct feasibility studies to support gap analysis. States could carry out feasibility studies of nominations on the tentative lists with the help of the advisory bodies – thus IUCN (regional offices) could be engaged sooner in the process. Within the current procedures, there is a lack of opportunity for IUCN to provide comments before the actual nomination is put forward. This is based on IUCN's role as Advisory Body in the upstream processes (see §56 OG).

- Regional offices could have a stronger role in the area of tentative lists, e.g., harmonizing them regionally. Streamline existing tools (e.g., gap analysis) and communicate how to adapt them to the regional context. Use regional workshops as a means to adapt and get input into tentative lists.

- A proactive role of WCPA in regard to filling gaps in the World Heritage list is called for: enlarge expertise and diversity, e.g. by consolidating a network of indigenous experts. Consider WCPA accreditation of members to participate in World Heritage.

- Establish expertise on cultural aspects of natural features and make use of cultural aspects in mixed and natural World Heritage sites.

Management of sites and capacity building

The values of a World Heritage site are often not reflected in the actual Protected Area management plans.

- Provide capacity building and improved knowledge of WH for site managers, especially on management implications of World Heritage nomination / inscription.

- Promote awareness of proper consultations, inter-sectoral planning particularly looking at the larger landscape planning, and involving rights-holders and stakeholders in governance design.

- Ensure proper IUCN PA category assignment to protected areas which are World Heritage Sites.

How can IUCN play a role in improving the effectiveness of the World Heritage Committee monitoring processes?

The main World Heritage Committee monitoring instruments are reactive monitoring, periodic reporting and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

- Engage full IUCN membership and regional offices in monitoring. Bring in civil society organizations by providing a better understanding of the World Heritage Convention via education and awareness-raising. Work towards greater civil society and NGO presence at World Heritage Committee meetings.

- Prepare monitoring missions well and support experts sent to those missions, and strengthen and diversify IUCN's register of WH experts (especially through a focused approach with WCPA).

- Streamline reporting between different Conventions (§42 OG).

- Support drawing up solutions to developments in the regions with potential adverse effects before a list is put on Danger list. IUCN to broaden its role from just recommending danger listing, but also

accompanying the State party through the process so that they can see the benefits. Use monitoring results to catalyze support.

- Build on the third pillar of OUV (the requirement for effective protection and management). Historical role of IUCN in insisting on/reinforcing the importance of management and governance in supporting OUV. IUCN can play a role in advising on best practice and management effectiveness. Ideally WH sites are exemplars of best practice. "If we want to do something for PAs globally, let's get it right in these sites!" This is a key entry point for positioning WH with wider PA efforts, and linking between the work of WHP and GPAP.

IUCN/WCPA Conservation Outlook Assessments

IUCN is introducing desk-based Conservation Outlook Assessments (COA) as a pro-active global monitoring system to track the status of World Heritage sites. Mariam Kenza Ali, World Heritage Conservation Officer, introduced the IUCN concept for the COA and the planned online Information Management System (see Powerpoint). In the following discussion, there was consensus about the beneficial effect of a general approach where all state parties are assessed - instead of individual ones being singled out as in reactive monitoring of specific World Heritage properties that are known to be under threat. The quality of the tool was regarded as excellent, representing a step forward, well beyond an In Danger listing.

- Communicate benefits of COA to state parties as a tool for finding solutions, not for conveying criticism or performance evaluation. Give state parties opportunity to comment on the specific COA and to express their agreement, or not, and to provide further information. Make sure the full spectrum of government agencies and other stakeholders involved in site management is represented in the process.

- Regarding the mandate for conducting COA, there is a need to be careful to clearly identify the relationship to IUCN's role as Advisory Body. An unbiased and independent expert opinion could be seen to be provided by WCPA, who should be associated and jointly govern this process. Since in any case COA processes are likely to be implemented mainly with WCPA assessors, build networks for COA in WCPA, including both experts for social assessments and regional experts.

- Provide guidance to assessors, carry out quality control, i.e., to ensure consistency of assessments across regions.

- Regarding making the tool operational, more time and resources may be needed than currently allocated. The tool should be consistently adapted over time.

- In relation to World Heritage processes, COA might also offer lessons relevant to periodic reporting methods and effectiveness over time. In that case, the COA could include a way that State Parties have direct input into the assessment.

- A fundamental requirement is to look into options how to get action from Conservation Outlook Assessments.

- Communicate the new tool at the Asia Parks Congress (session on World Heritage and Conservation Outlook Assessment; Protected Planet Asia report). Use Regional Workshops to address the draft assessments and give feedback on them.

5. Key Recommendations on Cooperation between the IUCN World Heritage Programme and Partners in the Regions

See Powerpoints contributed by James Hardcastle (for GPAP) and Geoffroy Mauvais (on experience and lessons learned from regional working in IUCN ESARO and PACO regional offices, in Africa).

Need for working on World Heritage issues at the regional and country level

On a national basis, there is high interest in WH, though not in all cases is this interest accompanied by a sufficient understanding of the actual mechanisms of World Heritage. IUCN is looked to for advice, especially on management of sites. IUCN's regional presence in the past helped raising the profile of WH sites, and identifying natural WH focal points. Regional IUCN offices, well aware of the local context and languages, can keep communication channels open, and tend to give IUCN better access to information on sites. That way, regional offices are well-placed to help bring in the "best sites" of the region into the WH system. Synergies between WH and other conventions can also be tackled effectively on a national or regional level.

- Many of IUCN's roles with supporting the WHC can all be delivered more effectively when working in closer cooperation with its regional offices.

- IUCN regional offices need a clear idea how to handle national requests for support with WH nominations etc. without getting into a conflict of interest regarding IUCN's role in the upstream processes.

What should a regional IUCN World Heritage programme look like?

In most of IUCN's regional offices, no strategic approach as such exists regarding WH issues. World Heritage issues are dealt with as they arise. It would be desirable to take a more strategic approach to World Heritage in the regional offices.

- Build World Heritage into IUCN Regional Offices' programme portfolio in a strategic and structured way. Activities need to be tailored to specific conditions and needs on the national level. Support in terms of advice and communication is needed from the global IUCN WH programme.

- Key activities proposed for the regional level include institutional strengthening, awareness raising, capacity building, networking, mainstreaming WH with CBD and PAME approaches, and providing input to periodic reporting. Regional offices may also want to use World Heritage to pilot work on new themes, e.g. climate change, targeting work on species.

- Other activities, such as promoting key gaps identified in thematic studies, assistance with tentative lists and nomination process.

- Regarding Tentative lists, IUCN regional offices can provide advice on how they should be developed, but avoid making pronouncements on specific sites. Regional offices may have to make clear that upstream processes may not automatically lead to inscription of a site. For the ROWA region, e.g., it is not recommended for IUCN regional offices / country offices to get involved in the nomination process. To clarify IUCN's role with national partners, a MoU could state that IUCN's role is advisory, WH issues are national responsibility. Moreover, WCPA may play a valuable role with potential conflict of interest situations, as long as the distinction between IUCN and WCPA is clear.

- Improve networking between regional offices on World Heritage issues.

- There is scope to enhance cooperation with UNESCO national committees. Periodic reporting offers an entry point for IUCN – UNESCO – ICOMOS collaboration at regional level.

- Regarding the cooperation with the GPAP: GPAP is well-placed to integrate WH into its work, including communications, BIOPAMA, Green listing, links with PoWPA or the World Parks Congress. In each region WH& GPAP should work together at least on two sites.

How to engage civil society, indigenous peoples and NGOs?

There was consensus that more civil society, indigenous peoples and NGO involvement in the WH processes could be beneficial to the implementation of the convention by bringing in civil society and public opinion. Many NGOs are already members of IUCN.

An NGO forum "NGOs in Support of the World Heritage Properties", with a strong role of Greenpeace Russia, met prior to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in St. Petersburg in 2012. However, NGO involvement in WH Committee sessions is in general low so far. Representing different parts of civil society, NGO positions may, but will not always coincide with IUCN's expert advice.

Speaking with one voice, NGOs could be an important advocate for conservation of World Heritage sites in media and at committee meetings.

- As a first step, there is a need for setting up a strategy for IUCN (and WCPA) for cooperating with NGOs on World Heritage issues. A clear idea is needed about the possible role of IUCN in such cooperation and the potential extent of mutual support. Communicate the IUCN positions on key issues regarding World Heritage.

- Provide capacity building for civil society and NGOs on Committee meeting procedures, critical documents and options for intervention etc. Organize consultations prior to WH Committee Sessions as well as side events during WH Committee sessions.

- As civil society is a larger concept than NGOs, and indigenous peoples in particular do not see themselves as NGOs, then complementary and specific initiatives will be needed to reach out to and engage them in the Convention. This is also discussed below in the report.

6.   Key Recommendations on WCPA and World Heritage

WCPA work on World Heritage is organised around five components, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Programme and key priorities:

1. Support IUCN's Advisory Role under the World Heritage Convention

2. Support Management Effectiveness and Conservation Outlook

3. Support to identification of suitable sites and advice on the listing processes

4. Capacity Building and recognition (not separated out in the World Heritage Programme)

5. Awareness and advocacy.

The priority is greater mobilization of the World Heritage experts within WCPA, which requires fit for purpose systems to manage contacts (IUCN CRM and the new WH information management system). This also includes the identification of who is currently involved in the WH network. It has been recommended that this action plan should go to the regional vice chairs at the next WCPA Steering Group meeting in April 2013 to discuss regional implementation

Why does WCPA work on WH?

Historically, there has been a World Heritage vice-chair within WCPA, but work on World Heritage has been ad-hoc and unstructured. The key reasons why WCPA should work on World Heritage are outlined below:

- World Heritage is ideal to promote and communicate Protected Areas and their benefits and should be a flagship for WCPA's work (public awareness, Aichi target 1). Through World Heritage, WCPA can set standards and communicate examples of good management and best-practice.

- World Heritage covers all Protected Area types, categories, and includes different designations, including Ramsar, MAB etc – World Heritage issues, such as governance, are ultimately Protected Area issues.

- World Heritage sites face enormous challenges and need expert help. WCPA is ideally placed to provide this.

- World Heritage is the "canary in the coal mine" – if the international community cannot protect WH, what can it protect?

- World Heritage is the primary global instrument that links the protection of culture and nature.

What is the WCPA role?

What is WCPA's role on World Heritage in relation to tasks, responsibilities, relationship to WH Programme, relationship to other Commissions. Key roles for WCPA include:

1. (possible priority) Provide technical advice and support on management effectiveness and good governance, particularly to regional institutions. Importantly, WCPA could provide support to management authorities in suggesting alternatives to damaging projects.

2. (possible priority) Provide advice on upstream processes, but clarify roles and put in place clear communication lines and capacity building/training

3. (possible priority) Support harmonization of tentative lists at national level to deliver a credible and balanced list

4. Promote rights-based approach through the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, TILCEPA & SPICEH;

5. Provide advice on EIAs, particularly early on (e.g. TORs)

6. Involve indigenous traditions, mainstream religions, and the general public in support and conservation of World Heritage sites for cultural and spiritual reasons, CSVPA

Other points to consider:

- Work on World Heritage goes beyond WCPA – and WHP needs to also link to other Commissions (and WCPA also need to). E.g. In terms of engaging civil society, this is an area where CEESP could support rather than only WCPA directly.

Structure – how do we organize ourselves?

The structure is secondary to deciding the actions. Some initial thoughts on structure include:

- How does WCPA structure ourselves to deliver quality advice?

- Does WCPA need a specialist group on World Heritage? Split views. Some think this is essential, others note that list serves are sometimes more useful than specialist groups. Task forces could be set up for specific tasks.

- Conservation Outlook Assessments are a good tool to involve WCPA and enable better engagement.

- There was a suggestion to establish oversight of COA in a separate group to the IUCN World Heritage Panel – it could be better to keep this separate, different date. There is a need to examine the overall work of the IUCN WH Panel as IUCN's governance for WH, to ensure it is fit for purpose in guiding the programme. Can the Panel provide strategic direction and also review nominations etc?

- Design and put in place a WCPA World Heritage contact database, including contacts from other Commissions (through IUCN CRM and the new WH info management system).

- Invite all World Heritage site managers to become members of WCPA.

- Communicate to IUCN members that they can benefit from free advice from WCPA on World Heritage (perhaps channeled through the secretariat)?

Proposed WCPA actions

Support to IUCN's Advisory Role, leading to conservation and credibility gains for the World Heritage Convention:

- Produce a "one-pager" on the role of WCPA in World Heritage, and how it relates to IUCN's formal Advisory role and that of the World Heritage Programme. Circulate this within IUCN and send out in the WH newsletter?

- Prepare a standard TOR for WCPA experts getting involved in WH processes.

- Put in place a briefing session for nature focal points at the World Heritage Committee (and encourage their participation in Committee meetings).

- Verify WCPA membership in the 21 World Heritage Committee member countries and leverage this.

- Prepare a flow chart of the WH and IUCN Advisory functions that would help staff, members and Commissioners understand better where there are opportunities for engagement and how cooperation inside IUCN or with local rights-holders and stakeholders can be most effective. This should also include recourse opportunities within the Convention or within the UN system overall.

- Collect existing useful IUCN documents, such as the Rights-Based Approach to World Heritage paper (Oviedo et al) and make these available on the IUCN website.

- Develop a guide for indigenous peoples and NGOs on the structure of World Heritage decision making – an organogram to invite more active and effective lobbying by civil society.

Support Management Effectiveness, improved Governance standards and Conservation Outlook, to improve the conservation status of World Heritage Sites, reduce threats and help achieve and recognize good, equitable management:

- Continue support to Conservation Outlook Assessments - (including as assessors and reviewers).

- Profile World Heritage at key meetings: Wild 10 (Nov 2013); Asia Parks Congress (Nov 2013); Meso-American Park Congress; World Park's Congress (Nov 2014).

- Provide support on conservation topics, e.g. the development of policy guidelines for the Convention, environmental assessment advice note.

- Engage better with ICCROM on management effectiveness of natural/cultural values. Develop ICCROM workshops with CSVPA on taking cultural values of natural features into account in nomination, reviews, and management of natural, cultural and mixed World Heritage sites. Consider convening a workshop to assess experience in developing the Conservation Outlook monitoring system (at Vilm?).

Support work that could benefit new nominations of appropriate sites, to support the development of effective conservation strategies for significant natural areas prior to consideration of their possible inscription on the World Heritage List:

- Support the revision of Tentative Lists – through regional workshop?

- Revise and promote thematic studies, particularly regionally.

- Need for clear guidance on communication with States Parties on tentative lists and nominations (see above).

Capacity Building and recognition to consolidate and increase WCPA's capacity to work on World Heritage.

How WCPA is currently involved in WH, or planning to be involved.

Supporting formal Advisory Body activities

- ☐ Representing IUCN on monitoring and evaluation missions
- ☐ Providing input and drafting State of Conservation reports
- ☐ Should advise on development of policy guidelines for the Convention
- ☐ Representing IUCN at UNESCO and other events
- ☐ Members of the IUCN WH Panel

Supporting the development of the IUCN Programme

- ☐ Supporting conservation outlook assessments (assessors and reviewers)
- ☐ Making links with other Conventions – Ramsar, POWPA, MAB
- ☐ Reviewing and preparing policy notes – EIA, Mining, Dams, Legal aspects
- ☐ Input to EIAs (should get input for TORs)
- ☐ Supporting gap analysis
- ☐ IUCN Senior social policy advisor &TILCEPA & SPICEH

---

7. Key Recommendations on Indigenous Issues

The following recommendations are made to IUCN:

- Since the UN adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007, the concerns and rights of indigenous peoples are more and more recognized at the international level. Some indigenous networks are members of IUCN. There is a need for IUCN to engage in dialogue with them to find a shared and progressive approach to improving WH nominations, governance, rights and benefit issues.

- When looking at rights-based approaches, create links between different relevant IUCN Commissions.

- Indigenous peoples' consultation and rights-based approaches often are a two-tiered process, with on-site discussions and exchange with institutional assemblies. Both parts of that process are necessary. IUCN should investigate a process or platform for mediation or arbitration related to World Heritage disputes noting that the national institutional platforms and the local peoples platforms may not always be fully in synergy with one another.

- There is a need to consolidate a network of indigenous experts within IUCN bodies.

- For the upstream processes, consider establishing a mediated communication mechanism with indigenous peoples and local communities appropriate for the local / national context.

8.   Key Recommendations on Linking Natural & Cultural World Heritage

The 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, is about protection of both cultural and natural heritage. Better links between cultural and natural heritage are needed to improve the efficiency of the Convention. This can apply to cultural landscapes within natural site designations, nature conservation for cultural sites, and greater support for mixed site definition and conservation.

Background for engaging in linking nature and culture in World Heritage

All WH sites have values apart from their specific OUV. This includes natural WH sites with cultural values and vice versa. For example, cultural sites may include rare breeds and old varieties of high biodiversity value, while natural sites usually include natural features such as mountains, rivers, and forests that have cultural, sacred or spiritual value for various stakeholders, ranging from indigenous peoples to mainstream religions and the general public. Management of natural values in cultural sites is in some cases insufficient. On the other hand, there are gaps in expertise, recognizing and making use of cultural aspects in natural and mixed nominations. In many cases, joint work is necessary and concrete partnerships with ICOMOS and ICCROM would prove beneficial both in terms of protection of the WH site values and of pooling resources.

- ICCA are legitimized in CBD PoWPA etc., but other cultural site types not. Important to seek CBD recognition of sacred natural sites;

- WCPA has key capacities with CSVPA, TILCEPA and SGPL able to contribute.

Entry points for linking nature and culture in the World Heritage Committee

The criteria (v), (vi) and (vii) can serve as entry points for cooperation of IUCN with ICOMOS and ICCROM. An exchange on mixed sites with ICOMOS and ICCROM at an early stage would be beneficial. For cooperation, the ABs should pick priorities and practical options.

Mixed sites are a particular focus. A good question is why are there so few mixed sites? There is a lack of understanding of mixed sites and cultural landscapes. Natural or cultural sites are simpler. Cultural component of management of natural sites is also important – but also need to be careful to not to confuse with mixed sites.

How to link nature and culture in the World Heritage Committee

Site management should consider all values that make up the site significance. States need to prove the main case of the OUV, but this does not prevent including reference to the other characteristics of the site, complementary characteristics associated with the integrity or uniqueness of the nomination, including cultural values of natural sites and natural values of cultural sites that are not necessarily of OUV.

IUCN should cooperate with ICOMOS on providing input to cultural landscapes, i.e., on monitoring (e.g., management effectiveness evaluations) and ICOMOS and IUCN Specialist Groups such as the CSVPA could provide input on cultural aspects of natural World Heritage site nominations, management, and monitoring. That could happen, e.g., in a shared ICOMOS and IUCN panel set up for mixed sites as well as natural and cultural sites. Further options include considering re-nominations from cultural or natural to cultural and natural WH sites in certain cases, where the statement of OUV proves to be too limited to reflect the sites values.

There is a good potential to work with BfN and Vilm in this area, and a proposal is being made to The Christensen Fund to advance work between IUCN and ICOMOS in this area.

It was noted that the absence of ICOMOS participation in this workshop greatly limited opportunities to advance on this issue.

9.   Key Recommendations on World Heritage and Species

A brainstorming session on one of the workshop evenings was dedicated to bring together ideas and suggestions regarding World Heritage and species conservation, and this should be a basis for further interactions with SSC and the Species Programme.

Linkages:

- Strengthen the relationship between the IUCN World Heritage Programme and SSC/the IUCN Species Programme, at both global and regional levels.

Field Activities

- Use WH sites as pilot sites for mitigating human-wildlife conflict and developing best practice models;
- Use WH sites as pilot sites for preventing, controlling and eradicating invasive alien species, and developing best practice models;
- Use WH sites as pilot sites to look at the impacts of climate change on species.

Communications and Advocacy

- Use flagship species which have a high proportion of their total population in WH sites (e.g., gorillas and tigers) to highlight the role of natural World Heritage sites in the conservation of threatened species;
- Undertake a piece of work to determine the number of threatened species protected by World Heritage sites, and publicize the results.

Upstream Advice on nominations

- Use Red List data to inform upstream processes and the targeting of new priority sites for inscription. There is a particular need to look at freshwater biodiversity.

10. Key Recommendations on Need for Regional and Global Action 2013 – 2016

World Parks Congress – brainstorm on WH inputs

- Reaching conservation goals –> WH contribution to Aichi targets. WH on the new IUCN Green List. Conservation Outlook Assessment.

- Responding to climate change –> Hot List climate learning sites. COA.

- Improving health and well-being –> COA outputs.

- Supporting human life –> Linking livelihoods and the WH engagements – COA outputs.

- Reconciling development challenges –> World Heritage vs. No Go areas for extractive industries.

- Broadening participation –> Inclusion of Conservation NGOs in World Heritage processes. Contribution to COA system.

- Respecting cultural landscapes and Sacred Sites –> Cultural and spiritual significance of World Heritage sites. COA results on benefits assessment.

- Inspiring a new generation -> Results of Go4BioDiv initiative with UNESCO, GIZ and others, and forward plans for this.

Regional Action Planning

Small groups of regional representatives engaged in action planning on selected regional or thematic priorities (e.g. IUCN and Cultural Landscapes) for the years 2013 – 2016 (see table 1 below).

The overview of regional action planning reflects the diverse situation in the different regional programmes. The next 2-3 years will need to be used to get towards a more coherent and consistent approach to WH.

The idea of the UICN SUR (South America) to set up an institutionalized coordination body for meetings of the Advisory Bodies should be considered by other regions as well.

Table 1: Action planning 2013 – 2016

		2013	2014	2015	2016
		Main events 2013 - 2016 related to World Heritage			
		WH 37 COM	WH 38 COM	WH 39 COM	WH 40 COM
		Marine Meeting Mozambique October 2013 including a focus on MPAs	World Parks Congress	George Wrights Society, IUCN presence	IUCN WCC
		George Wright Society, IUCN presence	3rd cycle of Periodic Reporting launches	Rights: UNPFII and EMRIP	Rights: UNPFII and EMRIP
		Asia Parks Congress	Mesoamerican Park Congress		
		UN permanent forum on indigenous peoples	IUCN North-Africa Congress (IUCN Med)		
		WIN Conference Darwin May 2013 (prep to VI WPC)	Regional conservation forum for the ROWA region		
		WILD 10	CBD COP in Korea		
		IMPAC 3	Colombian Park Congress		
		Need for action by region			
Africa		Some sites in danger may eventually be removed from the World Heritage List. Sites being on the process towards endangered listing should be accompanied, provided with guidance on mitigation measures and alternatives to damaging developments.	Reduce sites in danger. Threats mainly linked to exploitation of resources of the sites.	What next after EOH?	
		Ensure strong link BIOPAMA - World Heritage sites.	Review of EOH impact.		
		Support new nominations and monitoring missions for existing sites.			
		WCPA Specialist Group meeting.			
		Capacity building (risk preparedness, access to small scale funds, monitoring Outstanding Universal Value, nomination, extractives).			
		EOH (Banc d'Aguin, Tai, Simien, Turkan, Serengeti, Ngorongoro).			
		SOC & monitoring mission support.			
		Selous - management planning mining, Burundi - management planning; Namibia - transboundary conservation.			
		Marine Meeting Mozambique October 2013.			

		2013	2014	2015	2016
Europe (covering Central Asia and Russia)	Try to set up small coordination group on World Heritage to oversee key World Heritage processes, possibly associated with WCPA. WH component integrated into WCPA Europe programme (April 2013; European SG meeting). Europarc conference in October at Hortobagy / HUN with option for an event.	Build up a regional database of World Heritage experts in Europe. Lots of expertise concerning WH worldwide in Europe.	Define concrete actions for Europe derived from PR & COA.	
	SEE office to streamline regional WH activities into the work of the WHP			
	In Europe there are some particular opportunities presented by WH in the overseas territories (of countries such as UK, France)	Use the Brussels office to organize briefing for different target audiences on WH sites and processes to sensitize people in the region and get them involved, including NGOs, donors, government?		
	Deliver advice into 2 Up-stream processes DINARIC ARC and OHRID (continuous).	Present COA results and Periodic Reporting at Europarc conference 2014, creating an action plan for the future.		Deliver advice into 2 Up-stream processes (DINARIC ARC and OHRID).
Latin America (SUR)	Have preliminary coordination meetings with UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN in every country.	UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM regional and national coordination bodies to meet regularly.		
	Project proposal for improving management effectiveness in selected WH sites.	Implementation of approved projects.	Mid-term evaluation of WH projects.	
	Project proposal for regional GAP analysis on WH.	Project proposal supporting national PA systems in the region.	Implementation of approved project (PANS).	
	Technical support offered to Protected Area national systems (PANS).	Involvement of SUR WH in Go4Biodiv.		
		At the WPC, present experiences from Coordination bodies as means to improve the governance in the WHC.		
		Presentation of exemplary well managed WH site in South America.		
Arab states	Recently drafted World Heritage programme for the Arab states existing. Strengthen WH component in that programme.	Present achievements of the regions at WPC.	Document best practices (e.g., Banc d'Aguin), and share with other sites. nslate COA into action.	

		2013	2014	2015	2016
	Maintain communication channels with WH stakeholders	Translate regional studies on Arab region into national and regional gap analyses.	Undertake Management Effective Assessments with Enhancing our Heritage tool on two sites.	
	Exchange information with IUCN HQ and regional offices.	Translate relevant documents to Arabic language.	Enhance World Heritage legal framework in Arab countries (conduct workshop).	
	Build regional WH expert network based on WCPA network.	Update national focal points on main activities at global level, and get information on activities in the region.	Support creation of World Heritage National committee.	
	Support data collection and build up data base.	Strengthen Tentative List representativity (regional / national work).	Strengthen focal points for WH with regional offices.	
	Training: mainstream WH into NBSAP.	Adapt global thematic studies to regional context (produce brochure / document involving local / regional experts).	Connect with other IUCN major initiatives for identifying sites or doing COAs.	
		Upstream advice to potential site candidates.	Update COA info.	
		Explore new potential site.	Enhance management (Sorotra).	
		Continue Iraqi marshland project.	WCPA expert network.	
		Participate in relevant events to raise the profile of WH and IUCN WHP.	Connect with other tools - Red List, Red list ecosystems, KAAs.	
Asia	Asia no staff time and funding dedicated to WH in Asia, actions limited.	New category II center to be established at WII in India.		
	Assist Myanmar with process (feasibility, Tentative List, capacity building) of World Heritage on natural sites. Carry out feasibility assessment of a candidate natural site. Help with Tentative List, and run a capacity building workshop on World Heritage.	Consider doing training needs assessment.		
	Run a workshop session on Asia WH at APC.	Consider side event at CBD COP.		

	2013	2014	2015	2016
	At WHC in Cambodia, do side event highlighting regional IUCN work on WH and Aichi targets.	Possible collaboration with CSVPA specialist Group.	Translating key World Heritage resources.	
	Run Green list and World Heritage workshop in China.	Assessment and monitoring of existing and potential threats to World Heritage sites.		
		Use RFP to promote World Heritage.		
		Carry out a regional gap analysis.		
		Establish a World Heritage coordinator post (50%).		
		Provide Asia with perspectives to WPC.		
		Develop a fully-fledged World Heritage programme.		
		Develop BAPs for Cultural World Heritage sites.		
		WPC session on cultural and spiritual significance of Protected Areas and WH sites.		
North America	Periodic reporting processes in the region have been carried out without involvement of Abs so far. Explore with the state parties on how to involve the AB more, e.g. arguing that IUCN and ICOMOS could benefit from the process.	Produces briefing for different target audiences on WH sites and processes to sensitize people in the region and get them involved, including NGOs, donors, government, World Bank etc.. Use IUCN office Washington DC, partnering with ICOMOS national committee, National park service. San Francisco another place to do it, webinars etc.		
	Building networks of WCPA members from the region who are experts in WH.			
Need for action by issue				
Indigenous Peoples	Make existing information on indigenous rights in relation to WH available online, e.g. on mechanisms available for indigenous peoples on which mechanisms can be used when there is an issue with a WH site.	Joint plan for work with ICCROM, WHC, ICOMOS Norway.		WH 40 COM introduces rights to OG.
	Have a dialogue with ICOMOS about rights-based approach, Implications of FPIC.	There should be an IUCN position on rights-based approaches to the WHC.		WCC: report on implementation on UNDRIP.
	Encourage indigenous representation to the WH Committee Meetings.	At WPC, have presentation involving indigenous peoples on their experiences with WH site nominations.		

		2013	2014	2015	2016
	Set up webpage on rights & World Heritage.		Simple briefing on how to input to WH processes (TILCEPA).		
	Briefing side event at 37 COM (+ UNPFII and EMRIP).		Membership plan for WCPA / commissions on IP & Community rights.		
	Consistent process in evaluation of nominations relating to rights.		Track direct input of communities and IP to IUCN evaluation.		
	Rights expert input to IUCN WH panel (ICOMOS).				

Reaching out further

A brainstorm produced the following incomplete list of partners and / or currently missing voices at this workshop to reach out to in future:

Within IUCN

- IUCN Council
- Global Policy Unit IUCN
- IUCN Climate Change Leads
- Global Protected Areas Programme
- Global Drylands Programme
- CSVPA Sacred Natural Sites Initiative and Delos Initiative
- IUCN Global Marine and Polar Programme
- IUCN Commissions (SSC, CEESP, CEL mentioned)

Outside IUCN

- ICOMOS
- Private sector
- Donors
- CBD Life Web initiative
- FAO Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems
- WH site managers
- Category II centers of UNESCO
- European Commission
- National Focal Points UNESCO National Committee
- CBD Secretariat
- NGOs
- Universities
- UNEP-WCMC

11. Annex: Participants List

Name	Institution	Address	Country	Phone/ e-mail
Ali, Mariam	IUCN	28 rue Mauverney 1196 Gland	Switzerland	Tel.: 0041 22 999 0277 e-mail: mariam.ali@iucn.org
Badman, Tim	IUCN World Heritage Programme, IUCN Headquarters	Rue Mauverney 28 1196 Gland	Switzerland	Tel.: +41 22/999-0278 e-mail: Tim.BADMAN@iucn.org
Bernbaum, Edwin	CSVPA (IUCN, Cultural and Spiritual Values of Protected Areas) and The Mountain Institute	1846 Capistrano Ave. CA 94707 Berkeley	United States of America	Tel.: +1 /510/527-1229 e-mail: ebembaum@mountain.org
Brown, Jessica	New England Biolabs Foundation / WCPA Protected Landscapes Specialist Group	240 County Road, MA 01938 Ipswich	United States of America	Tel.: +1 /978 /998-7991 e-mail: brown@nebf.org
Crawhall, Nigel	TILCEPA (WCPA - CEESP)	Unit 12041 Bokkemanskloof, Blue Valley Ave, Houtbay 7806, Cape Town	South Africa	Tel.: +27 82 579 6868 e-mail: nigel.tilcepa@gmail.com
Debonnet, Guy	UNESCO World Heritage Centre	7, Place de Fontenoy 75352 Paris 07 SP	France	Tel.: +33 1/45 68 0765 e-mail: g.debonnet@unesco.org
Engels, Barbara	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	Konstantinstr. 110 53179 Bonn	Germany	Tel.: 0228/8491-1746 e-mail: barbara.engels@bfn.de
Erg, Boris	IUCN Programme Office for South Eastern Europe	Dr Ivana Ribara 91 11070 Belgrade	Serbia	Tel.: +381 11/2272-411 e-mail: boris.erg@iucn.org
Galland, Pierre	Consultant	Chésaulx 6 2035 Corcelles	Switzerland	Tel.: +41 32 725 5457 e-mail: pierre.galland@bluewin.ch
Inchausty, Victor Hugo	UICN Sur Director Regional (ad interim)	Quiteño Libre E15 12 y La Cumbre Quito	Ecuador	Tel.: +593 2/2261-075 e-mail: victor.inchausty@iucn.org
King, Joseph	ICCROM	Via di San Michele 13, 00153 Rome	Italy	Tel.: +39 06 585 53 313 e-mail: jk@iccrom.org
Kormos, Cyril	The WILD Foundation / IUCN – WCPA	P.O. Box 9451 94709 Berkeley	United States of America	Tel.: +1 510/883 1421 e-mail: cyril@wild.org

Name	Institution	Address	Country	Phone/ e-mail
Lefebvre, Thierry	IUCN French Committee	26, rue Geoffroy, Saint Hilaire, 75005 Paris	France	e-mail: thierry.lefebvre@uicn.fr
Londoño, Julia Miranda	National Natural Parks of Colombia	Carrera 10 No 20-30, Bogotá	Colombia	Tel.: +57 1/353-2400 e-mail: direcciongeneral@parquesnacionales.gov.co
Mahjoub, Maher	IUCN Mediterranean Cooperation Center	Malaga	Spain	Tel.: + 34 645 810 097 e-mail: maher.mahjoub@iucn.org
Mapesa, Moses Wafula	World Commission on Protected Areas	P.O.BOX 31 Busia	Uganda	Tel.: +256 700 844 018 e-mail: Mosesmaps2004@yahoo.com; Moseswmapesa@gmail.com
Perkin, Scott	IUCN-Asia Regional Office Head, Biodiversity Conservation Programme	63 Sukhumvit Soi 39; Wattana, Bangkok 10110	Thailand	Tel.: +66 2 662 4029 e-mail: scott.perkin@iucn.org
Sathyakumar, Sambandam	Wildlife Institute of India	Post Box 18, Chandrabani Dehradun 248 001	India	Tel.: +91 135 2640111 to 115 e-mail: ssk@wii.gov.in
Abed Alhaleem, Haifaa	International Union for Coservation of Nature Regional Office for West Asia	Um Uthainah, Tohama street building #6 Amman	Jordan	Tel.: +962 6/5546912-3 4 e-mail: haiffa.abdulhalim@iucn.org
Strauss, Andrea	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	Isle of Vilm 18581 Putbus	Germany	Tel.: +49 38301/86-147 e-mail: andrea.strauss@bfn-vilm.de

12. Annex: List of workshop presentations and documents provided on the workshop CD

Presentations held during the Vilm workshop:

- IUCN World Heritage 2013 – 2016. Tim Badman
- World Heritage Convention – The actors. Guy Debonnet
- WCPA Functions on World Heritage. Cyril Kormos
- ICCROM. Joseph King
- Biodiversity priorities and the World Heritage List. Bastian Bertzky & Yichuan Shi / Tim Badman
- World Heritage Nominations. Tim Badman
- Monitoring WH sites. Guy Debonnet
- IUCN's Conservation Outlook Process. Mariam Kenza Ali
- World Heritage and IUCN's Global Protected Area Programme (GPAP). James Hardcastle
- IUCN's regional work in Africa. Geoffroy Mauvais

Documents provided to Vilm workshop participants:

- Draft IUCN World Heritage Programme plan 2013 - 2016
- Proceedings of the IUCN-WCPA World Heritage Workshop at the International Academy for Nature Conservation Isle of Vilm, Germany, November 24th – 28th, 2005, titled: Enhancing the IUCN Evaluation Process of World Heritage Nominations. A contribution to achieving a credible and balanced World Heritage List
- UNESCO (1972): Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage. English text.
- UNESCO / ICCROM / ICOMOS / IUCN (2012): Managing Natural World Heritage. World Heritage Resource Manual. (English and French version)
- UNESCO / ICCROM / ICOMOS / IUCN (2011): Preparing World Heritage Nominations. World Heritage Resource Manual. (English and French version)
- WCC-2012-Res-046-EN: Strengthening the World Heritage Convention
- WCC-2012-Res-047-EN: Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the context of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention
- WHC (2012): Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention