World Heritage Serial Nominations and the Vital Role of Comparative Analysis

**Deadline:** Closed  

**Type:** Workshop  
**Location:** Hiroshima, Japan  
**Date:** 22 Apr 2013 to 26 Apr 2013  
**Duration of event:** 5 Days  
**Programme Area:** World Heritage Sites Management  
**Specific Target Audience:** No  
**Website:** http://www.unitar.org/hiroshima  
**Price:** $700.00  
**Event Focal Point Email:** berin.mckenzie@unitar.org  
**Event Focal Point Contact Number:** +81-82-511-2424

**BACKGROUND**

The UNITAR Series on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites, launched in 2003, has thus far comprised nine annual Workshops held in Hiroshima and one in-country Workshop in India. The Series, with over 300 Alumni to date, offers a set of innovative approaches to heritage conservation, including:

- A values-based management approach examining the significance of the sites to be conserved  
- The fusion of cultural and natural heritage management  
- The recognition of both the tangible and intangible aspects of heritage sites  
- Focused analysis of specific areas of the nomination process

The 2013 Workshop, entitled World Heritage Serial Nominations and the Vital Role of Comparative Analysis, examines in detail the expectations and requirements needed to effectively address this essential part of World Heritage nominations. The comparative analysis helps demonstrate there is scope in the World Heritage List for inclusion of a nominated property, and it is a vital part of understanding the potential Outstanding Universal Value of a property. Serial properties are an increasingly common form of nomination, and the comparative analysis in such cases presents additional challenges which must be addressed.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

The specific objectives of the 2013 Workshop will be to:

- Review the key elements of the World Heritage Regime, incorporating updates and current trends  
- Explain the principles of “Values-Based Heritage Management”
Examine World Heritage Serial Nominations and the Vital Role of Comparative Analysis, identifying best practices and lessons learned
Through reality-based practical exercises, extract key concepts and common issues for given sites
Enhance long-term peer learning and exchange among the participants

CONTENT AND STRUCTURE
Interactive presentations will include:

- Principles and Objectives of the World Heritage Convention
- The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
- World Heritage Nomination and Evaluation Processes: From Tentative List to Committee’s Decision
- Identifying and Defining Potential Outstanding Universal Value: The Importance Of Comparative Analysis
- Criteria for the Assessment of Outstanding Universal Value
- Preparing a Comparative Analysis
- The Nomination Format
- Writing and Preparing the Nomination File

METHODOLOGY

INTERACTIVE LECTURES:
Lectures will be delivered by representatives of UNITAR, UNESCO, IUCN, and ICOMOS.

STUDY TOURS:
Underscoring the theoretical introductions and analyses presented, Study Tours form an integral part of the training methodologies utilised by UNITAR. Visits will be made to the World Heritage Atomic Bomb Dome and its attendant museums, as well as to the World Heritage Itsukushima Shinto Shrine.

PRACTICAL EXERCISE:
Key to the facilitation of learning at the Workshop is a major Practical Exercise whereby participants work in small groups to analyse real world Case Studies and apply the theoretical and practical knowledge gained in the Workshop.

TARGETED AUDIENCE
The participants (up to 25) will consist of:

- Those involved in the preparation of World Heritage nominations;
- Potential or current World Heritage site managers
- Natural/cultural conservation specialists and trainers
- Decision makers and government officers
- Representatives of academic institutions, think-tanks, and civil society

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PARTICIPATION COST
The USD 700 participation fee covers all accommodation, tuition, material, study-tour, breakfast and lunch costs for the duration of the programme (Monday 22 April – Friday 26 April).

- Please note that all travel costs to and from Hiroshima are the responsibility of the participant and/or their organisation.

CASE STUDY
Each participant is required to submit a one page (maximum) Case Study describing a heritage site with which they have experience.

Please note:
These Case Studies will be distributed to all faculty, as well as being incorporated into the Workshop literature; please ensure this document does not exceed the maximum page limit.

* Please submit this document in Word format to berin.mckenzie@unitar.org.
* Please ensure all documents are saved with the following name format: WHS13-country-familyname-document, e.g.: WHS13-newzealand-smith-casestudy.
* Some selected Case Studies may be used at the Workshop. In such cases, the participant who submitted the Case Study will act as a ‘data provider’ to the team.

The Case Study must contain, at a minimum, the following sections, under the same headings (the percentages indicate relative importance of each section):

**DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND CORRESPONDING DATA ON THAT SITE (40%)**

- This should include the description/definition of the spatial area. The Site could be an already designated World Heritage Site, a site included on a national tentative list, or not listed at all but a site that the applicant believes to have “Outstanding Universal Value”. Please identify the values of the Site.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM, AND PROBLEMS OBSERVED (40%)**

- This should contain a description of the existing management system (international, national, local, indigenous, etc.). Please analyse whether or not the existing system and overall trends protect and promote the values of the Site and avoid (potential) threats to the Site’s values.

**SUGGESTION FOR A PROJECT (20%)**

- The Case Study should suggest one or more discussion topics or projects in order to tackle the problems or threats to the Site. Only if the Case Study is selected will topics or project proposals be discussed and elaborated in plenary or by working teams; therefore the Case Study does not need to contain a full project document and maps or data do not need to not be presented at this stage.