United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture

World Heritage Centre

Report on the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on the Mainstreaming of the methodological approach related to the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in the *Operational Guidelines*

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 3-5 September 2013

Introduction

1. The International Expert Meeting on the mainstreaming of the methodological approach related to the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in the *Operational Guidelines* was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 3 to 5 September 2013 and was generously hosted by the government of Brazil under the aegis of the National Historical and Artistic Heritage Institute (IPHAN), the Ministry of Culture of Brazil and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre with the support of the UNESCO Category 2 Regional Heritage Management Training Centre "Lucio Costa".

2. The meeting was attended by 40 experts from all regions of the world (from 21 countries), including 2 representatives chosen from the electoral groups, as well as ICOMOS, ICCROM, IFLA, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and IPHAN/Brazil. The programme of the meeting is enclosed as annex 1, and the list of participants as annex 2 of this report.

3. The meeting provided an opportunity for rich debates in the framework of the specific decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session, St Petersburg, 2012 (Decision 36 COM 13.II) and 37th session Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 2013 (Decision 37 COM 12.II) and within the wider framework of the Revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*.

4. The meeting proceeded with in-depth reflection through three thematic working groups, which reflected upon the appropriate revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*, together with the proposed redrafting of Annex III for examination by the World Heritage Committee when establishing the next cycle of revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*. It also reflected on the guidance required for the nomination, evaluation and management of urban heritage and the necessity to develop an action plan of activities to better mainstream the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape into the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

5. The participants reaffirmed the inter-linkages between the heritage values of historic cities and social-cultural sustainable development and noted the results and recommendations of the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Integrity for Cultural Heritage (12 to 14 March 2012, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates) and the International World Heritage Expert meeting on Visual Integrity (6 to 8 March 2013, Agra, India).

6. The meeting agreed on a series of conclusions and recommendations provided in this document, following the discussions in the three working groups:

Group 1: revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*';
Group 2: revisions to relevant sections of Annex III of the *Operational Guidelines;*

Group 3: additional guidance required for the nomination, evaluation and management of urban heritage.

Summary of Key Considerations from the Meeting

7. The participants acknowledged the critical role played by historic cities and their urban heritage as drivers for the improvement of local living standards, adaptation to changing environmental and socio-economic conditions and wider processes of sustainable development. In this light, participants reaffirmed the importance of giving a role and function to heritage in contemporary society, as advocated by the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* (Article 5). To ensure continuity of identity, the management of change is essential.

8. The meeting acknowledged that the conservation of urban heritage is an integral part of contemporary urban development and modernization processes. To create synergies, reduce conflicts and foster opportunities, urban heritage conservation should be integrated into national and local planning frameworks. The participants underlined that the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape was developed and adopted by UNESCO's General Conference to support these aims.

9. The participants confirmed that the Historic Urban Landscape is an approach to heritage management, and not a separate heritage category. Furthermore, it was reemphasized, that the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape applies to all urban heritage and not only to World Heritage properties.

10. The Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape is a policy guideline for national and local authorities; however for implementation it must be adapted to the local context. A six step Historic Urban Landscape action plan has been developed (annex 3 of this report) to facilitate this process and the tool kit as defined in the Recommendation was reaffirmed by these experts as urgently needed.

11. In the mainstreaming of the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in the process of implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, the Historic Urban Landscape action plan and tool kit will be of critical importance to ensure the preservation of heritage values. Therefore, the meeting discussed the Historic Urban Landscape action plan as set out in the UNESCO General Conference Resolution and tool kit in relation to concrete activities and programmes focusing on capacity building of national and local authorities.

Recommendations of the meeting

12. The participants addressed the following general recommendations to the World Heritage Committee, State Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, the Advisory Bodies and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, as appropriate:

- Adapt the *Operational Guidelines* at the next cycle of revision of the *Operational Guidelines;*
- Completely rewrite relevant sections of Annex III of the *Operational Guidelines* to harmonize it with the Historic Urban Landscape approach;
- Develop an action plan of activities, employing the Historic Urban Landscape tools, to better mainstream the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape into policies and actions of heritage conservation.

The detailed recommendations are enclosed in annexes 4 and 5 of this report.

Revisions to the *Operational Guidelines*' main text:

13. The group recommended modifying specific paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines* (see annex 4 of this report).

14. Based on the changes proposed, other parts of the *Operational Guidelines* will need to be examined to ensure concordance with the new wording. This will especially be true for Annex V of the *Operational Guidelines* and its sections on authenticity, integrity, and protection and management.

15. The group recommends adding an additional box [3.1.b bis] to come between the section on Criteria [3.1.b] and the section on Integrity [3.1.c] that asks the State Party to clearly specify the main attributes that carry the Outstanding Universal Value. It may be necessary to provide categories for the attributes in order to provide guidance (for example, visual attributes, functional attributes, structural attributes, material attributes, intangible heritage, etc.) This list and map (visual evidence may be very useful for this section) will need further consideration and a list relevant for natural heritage would need to be developed.

16. The meeting may want to recommend a new annex to the Operational Guidelines including the text of the Historic Urban Landscape recommendation, along with additional commentary and bibliography on its links to the World Heritage Convention. This approach is not unprecedented as it has been done already for the Nara Document. It could be recalled that the process for developing the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation was started within the context of the Convention and while its scope is larger, strong links and relevance remain.

17. The meeting recommends that in the future it would be preferable for historic cities, towns, and urban areas to be nominated as "sites" rather than "groups of buildings" within the definition of cultural heritage provided in Article 1 of the Convention. The meeting expressed the idea that, as all urban areas are works of humans[1] or the combined works of nature and humans[2], the category of sites is a more appropriate way of expressing the layering and attributes as laid out in the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. It is felt that the definition of groups of buildings is much more limiting as it refers only to the physical attributes of the group and emphasizes homogeneity rather than the complexity and diversity found in most urban areas.

18. The meeting further recommends that the *Operational Guidelines* should be thoroughly checked for consistency between the two working languages (English and French), as there have been a number of inconsistencies have been discovered in preparing for the meeting.

Revisions to relevant sections of Annex III of the *Operational Guidelines;*

19. The meeting made the following recommendations:

Terminology: to revise the terminology concerning the categories, types, sub-categories of World Heritage Properties, in order to reach a consistent hierarchy, in accordance with the Convention and the text of the Operational Guidelines;

General introduction: Introduce reference to Historic Urban Landscape recommendation, considering Historic Urban Landscape as an approach and not as a category (or type) of Heritage. (see proposed text in Annex);

Categories: Revise the present typology of Annex III of the *Operational Guidelines* [*cultural landscapes – historic towns and town-centers, heritage canals, heritage routes*]

[1] The meeting agreed to apply a gender-neutral terminology by replacing the word "man" by "human".
[2] *Idem*

adding other categories in order to have a more comprehensive document reflecting the overall approach of the Historic Urban Landscape recommendation;

Cultural Landscapes: no consensus was reached regarding the inclusion of a new approach on urban cultural landscape;

Historic Towns and Town-centres:

- Change the name of the existing category (Historic Towns and Town centres) to become "Urban Heritage" to better reflect Historic Urban Landscape approach.
- The category of sites is a more appropriate way of expressing the layering and attributes as laid out in the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.
- Change the present sub-categories (towns which are no longer inhabited, historic towns which are still inhabited, new towns of the twentieth century) in the light of Historic Urban Landscape recommendation. A reflection is needed based on new studies to be undertaken and on recent experiences.

Additional guidance required for the nomination, evaluation and management of urban heritage.

20. The meeting undertook a broader and critical reflection on Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming. The group was compelled to both affirm the depth and breadth of the Historic Urban Landscape approach, and to move beyond this to point out some issues and opportunities. These reflections included:

- Concepts of the territory, scale and dimension, of Historic Urban Landscape - urban and context as a broader territory that is influenced, interrelated, and inseparable, this broader notion transcending the area of impact and influence that is commonly applied to property and buffer zone;
- Type and categories used are an issue, and the outcomes of the discussion on the *Operational Guidelines* Annex III are relevant, and the group agrees that the types and categories need to be revisited and improved for understanding and operational application;
- Routes and methods of transmission, top down, bottom up, and horizontal, need better pathways for broader and more effective communication that leads to better understanding and fosters cooperation;
- Reinforce a need to move beyond the heritage community and embrace other actors, as reflected in Historic Urban Landscape, as a large sphere of influence and number of people can benefit from and serve as agents to mainstream the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation;
- Informed communities can bring their concerns and influence the political decision makers and processes, through greater transparency and more routes of transmission, were Historic Urban Landscape knowledge can aid to bring informed communities a better understanding
- Coordination and cooperation, between levels and among ministries and departments are implicit in Historic Urban Landscape, as integration of culture/heritage, economy, ecology, and society/community are required to result in sustainable cities and settlements of all types to address the historic urban landscape as a broad territorial construct;
- An integrated Action Plan is necessary to manage heritage of all types at local, regional and national levels, toward improved quality of urban life, alongside conservation as one function of sustainability. The Action Plan needs to define objectives as well as measures of protection, use and development that are compatible and employ methods to carry out a strategy for effective dissemination.

21. Following the request of the World Heritage Committee to address the mainstreaming of Historic Urban Landscape, one important aspect is to link an understanding of Historic Urban Landscape to related World Heritage Committee decisions and recommendations, such as

state of conservation, Periodic Reporting exercise, Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, heritage impact assessment, and so forth.

22. Today there is limited understanding of the Historic Urban Landscape approach throughout society. A broader dissemination into the coming years will put forward concrete proposals, and responses to methodology that bring forward greater integration.

23. The meeting made de following recommendations:

(i) Endorsing the tool groups and request efforts in each area to define more fully the diversity of the tools and their applications:

- Community Engagement Tools
- Knowledge and Planning Tools
- Regulatory Systems
- Financial Tools

Further, the meeting recommends that these tools would prove useful in the World Heritage nomination process as well as local, regional and national level heritage property inscriptions, planning, management and monitoring.

(ii) Defining the broad community to engage that can benefit from Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming will aid in activating the Community Engagement Tools at the municipal, regional and national levels. For the purposes of Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming the broad community may include people who live in city and region, users of the heritage city, site managers, custodians and caretakers, traditional leaders, elected officials who serve as community leaders and voices, public officials, for example leader of Department of Public Works, Public Schools Superintendent, etc., developers, contractors, members of professional organizations, state parties to the World Heritage convention, and others. The engagement processes and methods should be employed from the beginnings of work, and need to be fine-tuned or adjusted to reach these varied communities.

(iii) Reaching this broad community through diverse methods that are inclusive. The base structure would employ the World Heritage Centre, state parties, World Heritage and heritage site managers, and disseminate to regional and local levels. The means of reaching this broad community include publication in print and on the web, regional workshops, thematic training, public debates, convening peer to peer meetings, city to city, public works to public works, convening state parties to exchange with each other, bilateral and multi-lateral gatherings, mass media, outreach that goes to all levels such as local elections for candidates who use Historic Urban Landscape based planning as platform items, universities to convey content and enrich research themes, media examples such as true confessions, advertising in different ways such as preparing and disseminating short Historic Urban Landscape messages toward better cities, and public service informational messages such as a world heritage map and public input process on the public transportation system. Affirming the use of already existing networks for discussion and exchange, such as council/conference of mayors, professional societies like unions of town planners, etc., employing social networks, mass digital social media for forum discussion, community radio station programs, and working through schools to address local history curriculum by collaborating with the ministry of education to bring a Historic Urban Landscape focus.

(iv) Bringing forward knowledge and planning tools to address Historic Urban Landscape scope and breadth by using and innovating research study formats and content, to include mapping the attributes and values that relate to the heritage and authenticity or in the case of World Heritage to Outstanding Universal Value, more completely; also to explore and refine the practices addressing impact studies to include the visual, structural and functional integrity, and for the visual considering views, axes, panoramas and silhouettes, and to address societal impacts such as the impact on poverty alleviation; as well as to study the broader setting of urban heritage with regard to the direct relationships between city and territory. The development of regional resource manuals addressing Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming is an urgent need to fill, which can be developed in partnership with UNESCO Category II Centres on World Heritage. Making knowledge and planning best practices guidance, resource manuals, training and other vehicles more readily available and updated so that new examples can be uploaded and made accessible.

(v) Applying and innovating around regulatory systems that embrace the holistic constructs of Historic Urban Landscape and the component parts. Share and learn from traditional systems that regulate community land uses and cooperation that employs long-held methods to sustain communities. Catalogue and make available legal codes and regulatory structures that foster Historic Urban Landscape constructs and integration. Innovate to provide regulatory platforms with contemporary methods such as an open GIS database that forms an integrated system of regulatory vehicles and factual data to serve as a public interface on the web, which takes into account all laws, plans and existing data, toward harmonizing these regulatory systems into the future, as a representative application.

(vi) Employing financial tools in both traditional and new ways to create synergies in funding actions toward Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming. Entities and individuals who bring monetary resources to the Historic Urban Landscape, should be encouraged to understand and integrate the objectives of Historic Urban Landscape in their projects. Heritage and development can be entirely compatible if harmonized. Funding from private, civic, and public sources can work together to build on an integrated approach to Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming.

(vii) Employ the Historic Urban Landscape approach to improve application of the aspects of authenticity as qualifying conditions of heritage sites to convey their significance over time and to secure and sustain their significance within the integrated model of sustainability that includes environment, economy, society, with culture as a permeating aspect.

(viii) Proceed with a Historic Urban Landscape action plan, using the framing of the four tool groups, addressing both identified and yet to be discovered needs. Integration of all sectors to address urban and territorial needs and desires using the Historic Urban Landscape process will gain momentum and result in positive performance. ``Recommends that Member States and relevant local authorities identify within their specific contexts the critical steps for implementing the historic urban landscape approach, which may include the following:

- Comprehensive Mapping of Assets (Natural, Cultural, Human)
- Reach Consensus on Values to retain & carriers
- Assess Vulnerability to Socio-Economic stresses & climate change

- Develop a Vision on City Development
- Prioritize Policies and Actions for Conservation & Development
- Establish Partnerships and Management Frameworks
- Work to streamline activities, reporting, and dissemination toward fruitful international cooperation and exchange at the local, regional and national levels.

24. The expert group benefitted from broad regional representation and offers its gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and to IPHAN the host and to the World Heritage Committee for requesting this expert meeting, which gave the group the opportunity to work together on the important task of mainstreaming Historic Urban Landscape.

Report annex n°1

International World Heritage Expert Meeting on the mainstreaming of the methodological approach related to the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in the *Operational Guidelines*

Rio de Janeiro - Brazil, from 3 to 5 September 2013

Provisional program / agenda

Tuesday 3 September

09:00 – 09:30 Opening of the meeting

Welcome address by M. Andrey Rosenthal Schlee, Director of the Department of Material Heritage Surveillance and Substitute President of IPHAN

Opening remarks Mr. Kishore Rao, Director of the World Heritage Centre

Presentation of the meeting organization

Chair: Mr. Kishore Rao

Rapporteur: Mr. Joseph King

09:30 – 10:00 Introduction of the participants

10:00 – 10:45 Conservation of the urban cultural heritage in the global context of the urbanization of the world – UNESCO's action within the United Nation's common response (WHC)

Mrs. Marie Noel Tournoux and Mr. Ron van Oers

10:45 – 11:15 Brazil: approach from Rio de Janeiro's experience

Mr. Andrey Rosenthal Schlee, Director of Material Heritage and Surveillance, IPHAN.

11:15 – 12:15 Open discussion on regional perspectives on Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming

12:15 – 12:30 Morning session rapporteur summary

12:30 – 13:00 Regional groups' summary remarks

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch break

14:30 – 14:45 Challenges and opportunities for mainstreaming Historic Urban Landscape ;

Introduction Historic Urban Landscape tool groups: Community engagement, Advisory tools, Regulatory systems, and financial mechanisms

Chair: Mrs. Patricia O`Donnell

Rapporteur: Mohamad Juma Mohamad

14:45-15:15 Brazil challenges on managing the Urban Landscape of Rio de Janeiro

Mr. Ivo Barreto, Superintendent of IPHAN in Rio de Janeiro

15:15 – 16:15 Open discussion on regional perspectives on Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming

16:15 – 16:45 Current issues in managing urban World Heritage

Mr. Joseph King, ICCROM

16:45 – 17:15 Afternoon session rapporteur summary

Regional groups' summary remarks

17:15 Departure for MAR – Museum of Art of Rio de Janeiro

Wednesday 4 September

8:15 *Departure from Hotel*

09:00 – 11:00 ~~*Visit to the Guanabara Bay*~~ (cancelled because of bad weather conditions)
Proposal for mainstreaming Historic Urban Landscape

11:30 – 13:00 Proposal for mainstreaming Historic Urban Landscape
Chair: Mr. Alfredo Conti
Breakup into 3 groups:
1) Operational Guidelines; 2) Operational Guidelines Annex III; 3) Guidance, resources and tools

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch break

14:30 – 17:00 Proposals for mainstreaming Proposal for mainstreaming Historic Urban Landscape: Group work
1) Operational Guidelines; 2) Operational Guidelines Annex III; 3) Guidance, resources and tools

17:00 – 17:30 Closing of the day`s discussions

Chair: Mr. Alfredo Conti and group chairs

17:30 – 18:30 Groups reconvene to finalize afternoon reports

Thursday 5 September

8:15 *Departure from Hotel*

Morning session: Group work summary
Chair: Adam Muniz
Rapporteur: Mrs. Marie-Noël Tournoux & Mr. Ron Van Oers

09:00 – 10:00 Group work

10:00 – 10:30 Group 1 Presentations by rapporteur

Mr. Joe King

10:30 – 10:45 Discussion

10:45 – 11:15 Group 2 Presentations by rapporteur

Mr. Jade Tabet

11:15 – 11:30 Discussion

11:30 – 12:00 Group 3 Presentations by rapporteur

Mrs Patricia O'Donnell

12:00 – 12:15 Discussion

12:15 – 13:00 Outcomes on Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch break

Afternoon session: Historic Urban Landscape mainstreaming products to be proposed in the framework of the revision of the meeting

14:30 – 17:00 Elaboration of the meeting document (chairs and rapporteurs)

17:00 – 18:00 Presentation of the meeting document

Conclusion and Closure by Mrs. Jurema Machado president of IPHAN and Kishore Rao, Director of the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO

Report annex n°2

List of Participants

Adele CESI
(Architect Project coordinator, Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Activities and Tourism, Italy. adele.cesi@beniculturali.it)
Alberto QUINTELA
(General Director, Commission of Cultural Heritage of the Nation, Uruguay, alberto.quintela@patrimonio.mec.gub.uy)
Alfredo CONTI
(Vice-President ICOMOS, Argentina, alfredo.conti@icomos.org alfredolconti@gmail.com)
Ould Sidi ALI
(Site manager, Timbuktu Cultural Mission, Mali National Cultural Heritage, Mali, ouldsidi_ali2003@yahoo.fr)
Birgitta RINGBECK
(World Heritage Coordinator, Federal Foreign Office, Germany, birgitta.ringbeck@diplo.de)
Clarisse María Sol INSFRÁN ECHAURI
(Director of Cataloging of Cultural Heritage, General Direction of Cultural Heritage, Paraguay, dgpatrimoniocultural@gmail.com)
Daniele PINI
(Full Professor of Urban Planning Deputy Director of the Department, Department of Architecture, University of Ferrara, Italy, daniele.pini@unife.it)
Edda GRULLON
(Director, Monumental Heritage National Board, Domican Republic, patrimonum@hotmail.com)
Emilio DE LA CERDA ERRÁZURIZ
(Executive Secretary, National Monuments Council, Chile, edelacerda@monumentos.cl)
Jad TABET
(Co-Chairman, TABET Architects and Planners, France, jstabet@wanadoo.fr)
Joseph KING
(Sites Unit Director, ICCROM, Italy, jk@iccrom.org)
Juan Carlos LEÓN HERNANDEZ
(Director de Protección Integral, Cultural Heritage Institute, Venezuela, asistentepresidencia@ipc.gob.ve)
Juan Diego BADILLO
(Director de Conservación y riesgo, Ministry of Culture and Heritage, Equator, jbadillo@ministeriodecultura.gob.ec)
Juan Luis ISAZA LONDOÑO
(Director de Patrimonio, Ministerio de Cultura de Colombia, Colombia, jisaza@mincultura.gov.co)
Inho SONG
(Director, Institute of Seoul Studies and ICOMOS Korea, South Korea, inos@uos.ac.kr)
Kishore RAO
(Director World Heritage Centre, UNESCO, k.rao@unesco.org)
Marie-Noël TOURNOUX
(replaced Karim HENDILI) Cities team, World Heritage Centre, UNESCO)
Muhammad Juma MUHAMMAD
(Director, Department of Urban and Rural Planning, Government of Zanzibar, Tanzania, m.juma@smole.or.tz)
Patricia O'DONNELL
(Owner/Principal, Heritage Landscapes LLC, International Federation of Landscape Architects and Cultural Landscapes Committee, US ICOMOS, odonnell@heritagelandscapes.cc)
Rachida ZADEM
(Chargée d'études et de synthèses, Ministry of Culture, Algeria, rachida.zadem@gmail.com)
Ramón GUTIERREZ
(National Scientific and Technical Research Council and Latin American Architecture Documentation Centre, Argentina)
Ronald VAN OERS

(World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for Asia-Pacific (WHITRAP), China, expert for the World Heritage Centre, ronvanoers@tongji.edu.cn)

Sanja SABAN
(Assistant Minister, Ministry of Culture, Croatia, sanja.saban@min-kulture.hr)

Thabo KGOMOMMU
(Deputy Director, World Heritage Management, Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa, tkgomommu@environment.gov.za)

Sergiy TSELOVALNIK
(Department Head, City Architect for Kyiv Municipal State Administration, Ukraine. s.tselovalnik@tselina.kiev.ua)

Brazil

Adam Jayme MUNIZ
(Second Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Brazil to UNESCO, a.muniz.br@unesco-delegations.org)

Ana Clara GIANNECCHINI
(Assistant at International Affairs Advisory, IPHAN, Brazil, ana.giannecchini@iphan.gov.br)

Andrea ZARATTINI
Chico Mendes Institute of Conservation of the Biodiversity/ICMBIO, Brazil, andrea.zarattini@icmbio.gov.br)

Andrey SCHLEE
(Director Department of Material Heritage/DEPAM, IPHAN, Brazil, andrey.schlee@iphan.gov.br)

Cláudia STORINO
(Director Sítio Burle Marx, IPHAN, Brazil, claudia.storino@iphan.gov.br)

Isabelle CURY
(Architect IPHAN in Rio Janeiro, Brazil, isabelle.6sr@iphan.gov.br)

Ivo BARRETO
(Superintendent IPHAN in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ivobarreto@iphan.gov.br)

Jurema ARNAUT
(Lucio Costa Centre, jurema.arnaut@iphan.gov.br)

Letícia PIMENTEL
(Architect IPHAN in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, leticia.pimentel@iphan.gov.br)

Lia MOTTA
(Lucio Costa Centre, lmotta.pgc@iphan.gov.br)

Luis Fernando DE ALMEIDA
(Museu de Arte do Rio. Brazil, nandodealmeida@uol.com.br)

Marlon DA COSTA SOUZA
(Sítio Burle Marx, IPHAN, Brazil, marlon.srbm@iphan.gov.br)

Mônica MONGELLI
(Coordinator Cultural Landscape (DEPAM), IPHAN, Brazil, monica.mongelli@iphan.gov.br)

Marcelo BRITO
(International Affairs Advisor, IPHAN, Brazil, marcelo.brito@iphan.gov.br)

Paula PAOLIELLO
(Head Paraty Office, IPHAN, Brazil, paula.cardoso@iphan.gov.br)

Paulo VIDAL
(General Director Estate Institute of Cultural Heritage/INEPAC, Representative Rio de Janeiro Estate Government in the Management Committee of Rio de Janeiro World Heritage, paulo.vidal@inepac.rj.gov.br)

Rafael VOLOCHEN
(Coordinator Presidency Office, IPHAN, Brazil, rafael.volochen@iphan.gov.br)

Report annex n°3

Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape Action Plan and Tools

Action Plan

1. Comprehensive Mapping of Assets (Natural, Cultural, Human)
2. Reach Consensus on Values to retain & carriers
3. Assess Vulnerability to Socio-Economic stresses & climate change
4. Develop a Vision on City Development
5. Prioritize Policies and Actions for Conservation & Development
6. Establish Partnerships and Management Frameworks

Tools

A - Civic Engagement Tools
B - Knowledge & Planning Tools
C - Regulatory Systems
D - Financial Tools

Report annex n°4

Revisions to the *Operational Guidelines'* main text:

Proposed Modifications to the Body of the Text Additions: underlined and highlighted in yellow Deletions: strikethrough and highlighted in blue Comments: italics and highlighted in green

[…]

II.E Integrity and/or authenticity

Add the following footnote to the title "Integrity and/or Authenticity":

In order to determine authenticity and/or integrity, it is necessary to clearly justify the criteria and values for which the property is being nominated and then identify the attributes that carry those values. The qualities (including visual and others) of those attributes related to the values should then be clearly stated and mapped. Limits or rules should then be included in the management system for the property to ensure the protection of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. Monitoring should take place over time to ensure the protection. For more information on the application of the conditions of authenticity and integrity, see the relevant annexes to the *Operational Guidelines* and the resource manuals on nominations and management. (Footnote from the Agra Meeting recommendation.)

80. The ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depends on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage and their meaning as accumulated over time, are the requisite bases for assessing all aspects of authenticity.

82. Depending on the type of cultural heritage, and its cultural context, properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural values (as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including:

- form and design;
- materials and substance;
- mass and scale;
- colour and texture;
- use and function;
- traditions, techniques and management systems;
- location and setting;
- language, and other forms of intangible heritage;
- spirit and feeling; and
- other internal and external factors.

88. Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore requires assessing the extent to which the property:

a) includes all elements necessary to express its Outstanding Universal Value;

b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes, which convey the property's significance;

c) suffers from adverse effects of ~~development~~ social, economic and other pressures or changes, conflict and disaster risks, and/or neglect.

This should be presented in a statement of integrity.

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

a) For properties nominated as urban heritage, consideration should be given to the fact that they are living and dynamic and that their integrity should be considered within the framework of the need to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, while its people maintain a good quality of life.

(i) The elements of the Historic Urban Landscape approach (see the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes) should be used to assess the conditions of integrity including topography, geomorphology, hydrology and natural features; its built environment both historic and contemporary; its infrastructure above and below ground; its open spaces and gardens, its land use patterns and spatial organization; perceptions and visual relationships both internal and external); building heights and massing as well as all other elements of the urban character, fabric and structure.

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

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

Delete the following footnote: ~~*Examples of the application of the conditions of integrity to properties nominated under criteria (i) - (vi) are under development.*~~

Note: Additional paragraphs will need to be developed for other types of heritage. The results of the Al Ain meeting can be used as a starting point for some heritage types.

[…]

98. Legislative and regulatory measures at national and local levels should assure the ~~survival~~ protection of the property ~~and its protection against development and~~ from social, economic, and other pressures or changes that might negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value, ~~or~~ including the integrity and/or authenticity of the property. States Parties should also assure the full and effective implementation of such measures.

99. The delineation of boundaries is an essential requirement in the establishment of effective protection of nominated properties. Boundaries should be drawn to ~~ensure the full expression of~~ incorporate all of the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value ~~and~~ including the integrity and/or authenticity of the property.

[…]

102. The boundaries of the nominated property may coincide with one or more existing or proposed protected areas, such as national parks or nature reserves, biosphere reserves or protected cultural or historic districts or other areas and territories. While such established areas for protection may contain several management zones, only some of those zones may satisfy criteria for inscription.

[…]

111. In recognizing the diversity mentioned above, common elements of an effective management system could include:

a) a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders including the use of participatory planning and stakeholder consultation processes;
b) a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;
~~c) the monitoring and assessment of the impacts of trends, changes, and of proposed interventions;~~
c) an assessment of the vulnerabilities of the property to social, economic, and other pressures and changes, as well as the monitoring of the impacts of trends and proposed interventions;
~~d) the involvement of partners and stakeholders;~~
d) the development of mechanisms for the involvement and coordination of the various activities between different partners and stakeholders;
e) the allocation of necessary resources;
f) capacity-building; ~~and~~
g) an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.

112. Effective management involves a cycle of short, medium and long-term actions to protect, conserve and present the nominated property and express how conservation polices may constitute a means for promoting sustainable development. An integrated approach to planning and management is essential to guide the evolution of properties over time and to ensure maintenance of all aspects of their Outstanding Universal Value. This approach goes beyond the property to include any buffer zone(s), as well as the broader setting.

112bis. The broader setting consists of the wider context which may include the property's topography, geomorphology, hydrology and natural features, its built environment, both historic and contemporary, its infrastructure above and below ground, its open spaces and gardens, its land use patterns and spatial organization, perceptions and visual relationships, as well as all other elements. It also includes social and cultural practices and values, economic processes, and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to diversity and identity. This broader setting encompasses the territorial dimension at large.

Add Footnote: Reference the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

Proposed Modifications to Annex V of the *Operational Guidelines*

Section 2.a: Description of the Property

This section should begin with a description of the nominated property at the date of nomination. It should refer to all the significant features of the property with particular reference to the attributes that carry its Outstanding Universal Value.

In the case of a cultural property this section will include a description of whatever elements make the property culturally significant. It could include a description of any building or buildings and their architectural style, date of construction, materials, etc. This section should also describe important aspects of the setting such as gardens, parks etc. For a rock art site, for example, the description should refer to the rock art as well as the surrounding landscapes.

In the case of ~~an historic town or district~~ urban heritage, undertaking comprehensive surveys and mapping of the property's natural, cultural, and human elements should be carried out. It is not necessary to describe each individual building, but important public buildings should be described individually and an account should be given of the planning or layout of the area, its street pattern and so on.

Cities, towns, and urban areas may appropriately be considered to be "sites" within the definition of Cultural Heritage found in Article 1 of the Convention, as they are works of man or the combined works of nature and man which are of OUV from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological, or anthropological point of view.

In the case of a natural property the account should deal with important physical attributes, geology, habitats, species and population size, and other significant ecological features and processes. Species lists should be provided where practicable, and the presence of threatened or endemic taxa should be highlighted. The extent and methods of exploitation of natural resources should be described.

In the case of cultural landscapes, it will be necessary to produce a description under all the matters mentioned above. Special attention should be paid to the interaction of man and nature.

The entire nominated property identified in section 1 (Identification of the Property) should be described. In the case of serial nominations (see Paragraphs 137- of the *Operational Guidelines*), each of the component parts should be separately described.

Section 3.1.b: Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

Note: The group recommends adding an additional box [3.1.b bis] to come between the section on Criteria [3.1.b] and the section on Integrity [3.1.c] that asks the State Party to clearly specify the main attributes that carry the OUV. It may be necessary to provide categories for the attributes in order to provide guidance (for example, visual attributes, functional attributes, structural attributes, material attributes, intangible heritage, etc.) This list and map (visual evidence may be very useful for this section) will need further consideration and a list relevant for natural heritage would need to be developed.

Report annex n°5

Revisions to relevant sections of Annex III of the *Operational Guidelines*

The UNESCO General Conference adopted at its 36th session in November 2011 the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.
This recommendation reflects the fact that the discipline and practice of heritage conservation have evolved significantly in recent decades, enabling policy-makers and managers to deal more effectively with new challenges and opportunities.
It provides the basis for a comprehensive and integrated approach for the identification, assessment, conservation and management of historic urban landscapes and addresses the need to better integrate and frame heritage conservation strategies within the larger goals of overall sustainable development, in order to support public and private actions aimed at preserving and enhancing the quality of the human environment.
The following should be taken into consideration for the inscription, conservation and management of World Heritage properties:

- The Historic Urban Landscapes the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting.
- This wider context includes notably the site’s topography, geomorphology, hydrology and natural features; its built environment both historic and contemporary; its infrastructures above and below ground; its open spaces and gardens, its land use patterns and spatial organization; perceptions and visual relationships; as well as all other elements of the urban structure. This context encompasses the territorial dimension at large.
- It also includes social and cultural practices and values, economic processes and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to diversity and identity.
- It considers cultural diversity and creativity as key assets for human, social and economic development and provides tools to manage physical and social transformations and to ensure that contemporary interventions are harmoniously integrated with heritage in a historic setting and take into account regional contexts.
- The Historic Urban Landscape approach learns from the traditions and perceptions of local communities while respecting the values of the national and international communities