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ICAHM
International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management
In 1972, UNESCO adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The Convention established a World Heritage Committee to create and maintain a World Heritage List. Examples include The Pyramids, Egypt, and Borobudur, Indonesia.
911 Properties

- 704 cultural
- 180 natural and
- 27 mixed properties
- in 155 States Parties
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World Heritage Organizational Structure

- World Heritage Committee
  - ICCROM
  - IUCN
  - National Committees
  - ICOMOS
  - Scientific Committee Council
  - ICUCH
  - ICAHM
  - World Heritage Center
  - Earthen Architecture
Advisory Bodies provide evaluations to the World Heritage Committee:

- **Cultural Sites**
  - ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites)
- **Natural Sites**
  - IUCN (the World Conservation Union)

Also: Expert Advice on Conservation of Sites

- (ICCROM) International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
Nomination Process

- States Party Tentative List: inventory of sites that a states party might nominate in the next five to ten years
- A Nomination File is prepared with documentation and maps. The World Heritage Center sends the file to Advisory Bodies for Evaluation
The World Heritage Committee makes final decision about inscriptions.
- Meets once per year
- Can defer decision, ask for additional information

They apply the criteria for selection
- “Outstanding Universal Value” and one more of 10 others
2007 to 2010

Then 830, Now 911
10% increase in three years

- **Cultural:** Then 644, Now 704 (9% increase)
- **Natural:** Then 162, Now 180 (11% increase)
- **Mixed properties:** Then 24, Now 27 (1% increase)
- **States Parties:** Then 138, Now 155 (12% increase)
What are the changes about?

- In 2001, UNESCO adopted the Universal Declaration of Universal Cultural Diversity
  - Acting on concerns that a disproportionate number of World Heritage Sites were located in Europe and North America.
Africa is underrepresented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>WHL</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe/North America</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America/Caribbean</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td>866</td>
<td></td>
<td>1443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why are there so few African properties on the World Heritage List?
ICAHM’s Interest

- To assist in providing a representative WHL
- To increase appreciation for scientific and historical values
- To utilize archaeological research and scholarship in doing this
- To enhance public understanding of how cultures across the world are connected
- To widen the network of archaeologists engaged in these tasks
ICAHM’s Increased Participation

- Desk reviews of nominations
- Visits to nominated sites to evaluate especially, management
- Developing more effective site management
- Propagating archaeological and management expertise
- Assisting and advocating for the nomination of archaeological sites
ICAHM’s Strategic Involvement Suggested by Three Documents

- Final report of the Expert meeting on "Upstream Processes to Nominations: Creative Approaches in the Nomination Process", 27–29 April 2010, Phuket, Thailand

Relevant documents will be posted on the ICAHM website
Working “Upstream,” as Proposed
Comparative analyses — comparative analyses are one of the most common challenges facing States Parties in preparing nominations, and better guidance is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Possible solutions</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Comparative analyses are a common area of problem for all States Parties while preparing nominations (Para. 124 to 127 and Para. 132.3 of the Operational Guidelines)</td>
<td>4.1 Clearer guidance in a variety of languages on comparative analyses, with broad dissemination, such as through the Nominations Resource Manual under production</td>
<td>4.1 ABs with WH Centre</td>
<td>4.1 Moderate, manual in English and French is under production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Greater help from ABs in advising the scope of CA before preparation of a nomination</td>
<td>4.2 ABs</td>
<td>4.2 Modest-Significant depending on number of requests and level of advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Highlight ability to search for other relevant comparative analyses through advanced search tool on WHC website</td>
<td>4.4 WH Centre with ABs</td>
<td>4.4 Moderate to significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Develop template for best practice comparative analyses</td>
<td>4.5 ABs, with WH Centre</td>
<td>4.5 Moderate to Significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Options for Protection and Recognition of Heritage Values

All of these steps provide recognition of a site's importance, especially with the concurrence of advisory bodies.

The consultation process can be used to devise means of protection and develops arguments used in the nomination and in immediate interpretation.
Possible ICAHM Assistance

- Comparative Analyses
  - facilitated by our Nomination Assistance Committee
- Assistance in evaluating tentative lists
- Assist States Parties and regions in developing lists of important archaeological sites
  - These might or might not be included on Tentative Lists
- Collaborate in identifying
  - best management practices
  - economic and social benefit strategies
- Much of this could be done by making greater use of research done by universities and other scholarly organizations
Other Upstream Processes being considered:

- Assist States Parties and regions in developing lists of important archaeological sites
  - These might or might not be included on Tentative Lists
- Collaborate in identifying best management practices
- Collaborate in identifying economic and social benefit strategies