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28 sites

- 18 in England
- 1 in Northern Ireland
- 5 in Scotland
- 3 in Wales
- 3 in Overseas Territories
UK system

• DCMS responsible for Convention
• Advised by English Heritage on general policy and on English sites
• Devolved governments deal with their own sites
• Sites protected by existing designations and spatial planning system
• Funding sources varied
1999 UK Tentative List

- Prepared by experts and then put out to consultation
- Thematic approach
- Deliberate attempt to avoid over represented categories
- Focus on themes where the UK could offer something truly of Outstanding Universal Value
1999 Themes

• NATURAL SITES
• Estuarine sites
• Species-rich habitats – created by the interaction of man and nature
• Geological Sites

• CULTURAL SITES
• Cultural landscapes
• The Origin of Early Man
• Insular Contribution to early Medieval Europe
• Landscape Gardens
• Industrialisation
• Britain’s Global Influence
Outcomes of 1999 Tentative List

- 25 sites on List
- 10 sites inscribed from List
- 2 sites nominated but did not progress
- Antonine Wall added to list as extension to transnational Frontiers of the Roman Empire
- One existing natural site added cultural criteria
- 13 sites did nothing
Issues

• Too many sites on Tentative List
• Number of nominations possible annually reduced
• Some of these would never make it
• Some no longer wanted to try
• Many nominations took longer than planned
• Cost and time taken in preparing nominations
• Subsequent management concerns, particularly related to development pressure in setting
2011 UK Tentative List

- Bottom up process
- Applications assessed by independent Expert Panel
- Catalogue of sites which may be nominated over 10 year period
- 13 sites in all – 11 selected by Panel + 2 still being dealt with by UNESCO
- Some may not have OUV
Technical Evaluations

- Decisions on World Heritage taken by UNESCO World Heritage Committee
- Introduced by UK government to reduce uncertainty in nomination process
- Technical evaluation covers all aspects of nomination in abbreviated form.
- Entries prepared by candidate sites and assessed by government panel
- If it passes the panel, site is allocated provisional nomination year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Study</th>
<th>Maximum no. pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the site</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Justification of Outstanding Universal Value</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Criteria for Outstanding Universal Value</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Authenticity (cultural sites only)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Integrity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comparative study</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Protection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resourcing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

At time of inscription, World Heritage Committee now adopts a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as baseline for future management

Summarises in one or two pages why a place is on World Heritage List

Basis for future management of site both by UNESCO and by state party

- Summary of factual information
- Summary of qualities (values, attributes)
- Criteria (values and attributes which manifest them)
- Integrity (all sites)
- Authenticity (criteria i – vi)
- Protection, & management & protection requirements
Outstanding Universal Value

• Have to show your site really is of importance to whole world
• For natural sites have to compare with whole world
• For cultural sites need to show significance at least in geo-cultural region
• Many sites of national or even international importance will not have OUV
Criteria

• 10 criteria – 6 cultural, 4 natural
• Site has to be justified by at least one criterion
Comparative Study

• Essential to demonstrate that your site does have OUV and fills a gap on the List
• Too many comparative studies do not look sufficiently outside own country
• Essential to examine comparisons widely and authoritatively
• Good comparative studies are very difficult to do
Integrity

• Wholeness – is site of sufficient size?
• Intactness – are its components sufficiently complete to show OUV?
• Level of threat – what pressures threaten site and can they be dealt with?
Authenticity = truth of evidence (Cultural sites only)

- form and design;
- materials and substance;
- use and function;
- traditions, techniques and management systems;
- location and setting;
- language, and other forms of intangible heritage;
- spirit and feeling;
- other internal and external factors
Protection Management and Resources

• World Heritage Convention is primarily about conservation
• Essential that site is properly protected
• Need to demonstrate that protection will actually work
• Need to show how often complex sites will be managed
• Once inscribed, failures in protection or management can have major consequences
• Adequate resources essential to make system work
Conclusion

• Technical Evaluation introduced in UK to save resources and help sites
• Technical Evaluations relatively cheap to produce but need promoters of site to address all the major issues
• If they demonstrate *prima facie* case, then government is justified in allowing them to go forward to full nomination process
• Early days and waiting to see how well it works in practice