This Annex includes:

A. **THE ICOMOS PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

B. **THE IUCN PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF NATURAL PROPERTIES**

C. **ADVISORY BODY COLLABORATION - PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES AND OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES**

For further information please also refer to Paragraphs 143-151 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

**A. THE ICOMOS PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

In carrying out its evaluation of nominations of cultural properties ICOMOS (the International Council of Monuments and Sites) is guided by the *Operational Guidelines*; (see Paragraph 148).

Once new nominations have been checked for completeness by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the nomination dossiers that are deemed as complete are delivered to ICOMOS, where they are handled by the ICOMOS World Heritage Unit. From this point, dialogue and consultation with the nominating States Parties may begin and will continue throughout the evaluation process. ICOMOS will use its best endeavours to allocate its available resources equitably, efficiently and effectively to maximise the opportunity for dialogue with all nominating States Parties.

The ICOMOS evaluation process involves the following stages as illustrated in figure 1:

1. **Requests for further information**

   When it has identified that further information or clarification of existing information is needed, ICOMOS starts a dialogue with States Parties in order to explore ways to meet the needs. This may involve letters, face-to-face meetings, teleconferences or other forms of communication as agreed between ICOMOS and the State Party concerned.

2. **Desk Reviews**

   Each nomination is assessed by up to ten experts who are knowledgeable about the property in its geocultural context and who advise on the proposed “Outstanding Universal Value” of the nominated property. This is essentially a “library” exercise undertaken by specialist academics within the membership of ICOMOS, its National and International Committees, or by individuals within many other specialist networks or institutions with which it is linked.

3. **On site missions**

   These are carried out by experts who have practical experience of the management, conservation, and authenticity aspects of individual properties. The process of selecting these experts makes full use of the ICOMOS network. The advice of International Scientific Committees and individual members is sought, as is that of specialist bodies with whom ICOMOS has partnership agreements, such as The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), and the International Committee for the Documentation and Conservation of Monuments and Sites of the Modern Movement (DoCoMoMo).
In selecting experts to carry out on-site missions, the policy of ICOMOS is wherever possible to choose someone from the region in which the nominated property is located. Such experts are required to be experienced in heritage management and conservation of the type of property concerned: they are not necessarily high academic experts. They are expected to be able to talk to site managers on a basis of professional equality and to make informed assessments of management plans, conservation practices, visitor handling, etc. They are provided with detailed briefings, which include copies of the relevant information from the dossiers. The dates and programmes of their visits are agreed in consultation with States Parties, who are requested to ensure that ICOMOS evaluation missions are given a low profile so far as the media are concerned. ICOMOS experts submit their reports in confidence on practical aspects of the properties concerned, and may also comment in their reports on other aspects of the nomination.

3. bis Other sources of information

Other relevant institutions, such as UNESCO Chairs, universities and research institutes may also be consulted during the evaluation process, and listed, as appropriate, in the evaluation report.

4. Review by the ICOMOS Panel

The ICOMOS World Heritage Panel comprises individual ICOMOS members who collectively represent all regions of the world and possess a wide range of relevant cultural heritage skills and experience. Some of these members serve on the Panel for a fixed term while others are appointed for one year only according to the characteristics of the nominated properties to be examined. ICOMOS will include within its Panel membership some experts who have past experience as members of State Parties delegations, but who are no longer serving as members of the World Heritage Committee. These experts will serve in a personal and professional capacity.

The Panel meets twice, first in December and then in March. At the first meeting, the Panel evaluates each nomination, based on the reports of Desk experts and of the site missions.

The Panel aims to reach its recommendations on nominations by consensus.

The first Panel may come to final collective recommendations on some nominations while for others further dialogue with States Parties may be agreed related to the need for more information or the need for adjustments to the approach of the nomination. In cases where the Panel has concluded that the nomination has no potential to justify Outstanding Universal Value, ICOMOS will contact States Parties at this stage. A short interim report for each nomination, in one of the two working languages of the Convention, outlining the status and any issues relevant to the evaluation process, and any further requests for supplementary information, will be provided in January to the nominating States Parties and copied to the World Heritage Centre for distribution to the Chair of the World Heritage Committee.

The second Panel undertakes further evaluation of nominations for which a recommendation has not yet been reached based on the receipt of further information or the outcome of dialogue with States Parties. The Panel then agrees the remaining collective recommendations. Following the second Panel meeting, the text of all evaluations is finalised and sent to the World Heritage Centre for distribution to the Chair of the World Heritage Committee.

The ICOMOS evaluations provide an assessment of Outstanding Universal Value, including the applicability of the criteria and the requirements of integrity and authenticity, assessment of the adequacy of legislative protection, management, and the state of conservation, and finally draft recommendations to the World Heritage Committee with respect to inscription.
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B. THE IUCN PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION OF NATURAL PROPERTIES

1. In carrying out its evaluation of nominations of natural properties, IUCN (the International Union for Conservation of Nature) is guided by the Operational Guidelines (see Paragraph 148). The evaluation process (see Figure 2) involves five elements:

   (i) Data Assembly. Following receipt of the nomination dossier from the World Heritage Centre, a standardised analysis is compiled on the property using the World Database on Protected Areas and other IUCN global databases and thematic studies. This may include comparative analyses on biodiversity values undertaken in partnership with the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). Key findings of data analysis are the subject of dialogue with the State Party during the evaluation mission, and at other stages of the process.

   (ii) External Review. The nomination is sent for desk review to independent experts knowledgeable about the property and/or the values that are the subject of the nomination, who are primarily members of IUCN's specialist Commissions and networks, or expert members of partner organisations of IUCN. The documents used to guide IUCN desk reviews are publicly available on the IUCN website: www.iucn.org/worldheritage.

   (iii) Evaluation mission to the property. One or two appropriately qualified IUCN experts visit each nominated property to clarify details about the area, to evaluate site management and to discuss the nomination with relevant authorities and stakeholders. IUCN experts, selected for their global perspective on conservation and natural history as well as their knowledge of the Convention, are usually experienced members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas. (This field inspection is undertaken jointly with ICOMOS in certain situations - see Part C below). The format of IUCN field evaluation mission reports is publicly available on the IUCN website: www.iucn.org/worldheritage.

   (iv) Other sources of information. IUCN also consults additional literature and may receive comments from local NGOs, communities, indigenous peoples and other interested parties in the nomination. Where relevant IUCN will also coordinate with other international conservation instruments such as the Ramsar Convention, the Man and Biosphere Programme and the Global Geoparks Network, and will consult with universities and research institutes as appropriate.

   (v) IUCN World Heritage Panel Review. The IUCN World Heritage Panel is established by the Director General of IUCN to provide high quality and independent technical and scientific advice to IUCN on its work as an Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee and strategic advice to IUCN’s work on World Heritage throughout the IUCN Programme. Specific Tasks of the World Heritage Panel are to conduct a rigorous evaluation of all nominations of natural and mixed properties to the World Heritage List, leading to a panel recommendation on the IUCN position in relation to each new nomination, in line with the requirements established in the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention. The Panel also provides comment where relevant to ICOMOS in relation to nominations of cultural landscapes to the World Heritage List. The Panel normally meets at least twice in the evaluation process, once in December (year 1) and a second meeting in March/April (year 2); The members of the Panel comprise senior IUCN staff, IUCN Commission members and external experts selected for their high level of experience and recognised leading expertise and knowledge relevant to IUCN’s work on World Heritage, including a balance of particular thematic and/or regional perspectives. It includes some experts who have past experience as members of State Party delegations, but are not current serving members of the World Heritage Committee. These experts will serve in a personal and professional capacity. The IUCN World Heritage Panel reviews all field evaluation reports (and normally hears direct feedback from the mission team), reviewers' comments, the UNEP-WCMC and other analyses and all other background material before finalising the text of the IUCN evaluation report for each
Each evaluation report presents a concise summary of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the property nominated, a global comparative analysis with other similar sites (including both World Heritage properties and other protected areas) and a review of integrity and management issues. It concludes with the assessment of the applicability of the criteria, and a clear recommendation to the World Heritage Committee. The names of all experts involved in the evaluation process are included in the final evaluation report, except in the case of reviewers who have provided confidential reviews.

IUCN undertakes dialogue with the nominating States Party/ies at all stages of the nomination process. IUCN will use its best endeavours to allocate its available resources equitably, efficiently and effectively, to maximise the opportunities for dialogue with all nominating States Parties. Dialogue starts early in the evaluation process and intensifies after the meeting of the IUCN World Heritage Panel in December, and includes the following:

i) Prior to the evaluation mission, IUCN may request additional information on questions in the nomination document that require clarification, and will always contact the State Party to prepare for the evaluation mission.

ii) During the evaluation mission the IUCN mission team is able to undertake in-depth discussions on site with representatives of the State Party and with stakeholders.

iii) After the evaluation mission, IUCN may discuss issues that have been identified by the mission team, and request further information from the State Party as required.

iv) After IUCN’s first World Heritage Panel meeting, normally held in December, IUCN will discuss issues raised by the Panel, and request further information from the State Party as required. A short interim report outlining the status, and any issues relevant to the evaluation, and detailing any requests for supplementary information, in one of the two working languages of the Convention, is sent to the nominating State Party/ies, and copied to the World Heritage Centre, for transmission to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. Dialogue and consultation takes place either through teleconference and/or face-to-face meetings, as mutually agreed.

IUCN takes into account in its evaluation all information that is officially submitted by the State Party in writing to the World Heritage Centre by the specified deadline (see paragraph 148 of the Operational Guidelines). However, at all of the above stages any stakeholder in the nomination is also at liberty to contact IUCN to provide information if they wish.

IUCN also always considers fully all past decisions of the World Heritage Committee relevant to the nomination, such as in cases of nominations that have been previously referred or deferred by the Committee, or where the Committee has taken any position in relation to issues of policy.

In the case of renominations, extensions and boundary modifications to an existing World Heritage property, IUCN also considers all matters regarding the state of conservation of that property that have been previously reported to the World Heritage Committee. IUCN may also consider bringing to the attention of the Committee, through the state of conservation reporting process, any significant matters regarding the state of conservation of that property, when such are identified for the first time during the evaluation process.

**Biogeographic classification systems as a basis for comparison**

2. In the evaluations, IUCN uses biogeographic classification systems such as Udvardy’s “Biogeographical Provinces of the World” (1975) and the more recent terrestrial, freshwater and
marine ecoregions of the world as a central element of its approach to the global comparative analysis. These systems provide an objective means of comparing nominated properties with sites of similar climatic and ecological conditions.

3. It is stressed, however, that these biogeographical classification systems are used as a measure for comparison only and do not imply that World Heritage properties are to be selected solely on this basis, nor that the representation of all such classification systems is the basis for the selection process. The guiding principle is that World Heritage properties must be of Outstanding Universal Value.

Systems to identify priority areas for conservation

4. IUCN also uses systems which identify priority areas for conservation such as the World Wide Fund for Nature's (WWF) Global 200 Ecoregions, WWF/IUCN's Centres of Plant Diversity, Conservation International's Biodiversity Hotspots and High-Biodiversity Wilderness Areas, Birdlife International's Endemic Bird Areas and Important Bird Areas, and other Key Biodiversity Areas such as Alliance for Zero Extinction sites. These systems provide additional information on the significance of the nominated properties for biodiversity conservation; however it is not assumed that all such sites should be included on the World Heritage List. The guiding principle is that World Heritage properties must be of Outstanding Universal Value.

Systems to evaluate properties for earth science value

5. In evaluating properties which have been nominated for their geological value, IUCN consults with a range of specialised organisations such as the UNESCO Earth Sciences Division, International Association of Geomorphologists, the International Union of Speleology and the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS).

Additional reference publications used in the evaluation process

6. The evaluation process also includes consideration of key reference publications on the world's protected areas published by IUCN and a range of international conservation organisations. These documents together provide system-wide overviews which allow comparison of the conservation importance of protected areas throughout the world. IUCN has also undertaken a range of thematic studies to identify gaps in natural World Heritage coverage and properties of World Heritage potential. These can be viewed on the IUCN website at www.iucn.org/worldheritage.

IUCN also draws upon references specific to the nominated properties in order to gain insights into site values and conservation issues.

Evaluation of Cultural Landscapes (see also Annex 3)

7. IUCN has an interest in many cultural properties, especially those nominated as cultural landscapes. For that reason, it will on occasion participate in joint field inspections to nominated cultural landscapes with ICOMOS (see Part C below).

8. In accordance with the natural qualities of certain cultural landscapes identified in Annex 3, Paragraph 11, IUCN's evaluation is concerned with the following factors:

(i) Conservation of natural and semi-natural systems, and of wild species of fauna and flora
(ii) Conservation of biodiversity within sustainable use systems (farming, traditional fisheries, forestry);
(iii) Sustainable land and water use;
(iv) Enhancement of scenic beauty;
(v) Ex-situ collections, such as botanic gardens or arboreta;
(vi) Outstanding examples of humanity's inter-relationship with nature;
(vii) Historically significant discoveries
The following table sets each of the above list in the context of the categories of cultural landscapes in Annex 3, thereby indicating where each consideration is most likely to occur (the absence of a consideration does not mean that it will never occur, only that this is unlikely):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Landscape type (see also Annex 3)</th>
<th>Natural considerations most likely to be relevant (see Paragraph 16 above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed landscape</td>
<td>(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organically evolving landscape - continuous</td>
<td>(i) (ii) (iii) (iv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organically evolving landscape - fossil</td>
<td>(i) (vi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative landscape</td>
<td>(vii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 2: SUMMARY OF IUCN EVALUATION PROCEDURE
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C. ADVISORY BODY COLLABORATION

Nominations of mixed properties

1. Properties that are nominated under both natural and cultural criteria entail a joint IUCN and ICOMOS mission to the nominated property. Following the mission, IUCN and ICOMOS prepare separate evaluation reports of the property under the relevant criteria (see above), and harmonise and coordinate their evaluations to the extent possible.

Cultural Landscapes

2. Properties nominated as Cultural Landscapes are evaluated by ICOMOS under criteria (i) - (vi) (see Paragraph 77 of the Operational Guidelines). IUCN may provide advice when relevant on the natural values and the conservation and management of the nominated property, and addresses any questions that are raised by ICOMOS. In some cases, a joint mission is required.

Linkages between nature and culture

3. As most properties nominated to the World Heritage List include aspects of management related to the interaction of nature and culture, IUCN and ICOMOS, to the extent possible, discuss any such interactions during their evaluation processes.