

EFFECTIVE USE OF AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY AS WORLD HERITAGE QUALIFYING CONDITIONS*

Herb Stovel♦

Abstract

This paper contends that over the life of the World Heritage Convention, the use of authenticity has not been well understood as a qualifying condition for inscription; that introduction of the complementary integrity requirement has simply compounded confusion; that the ideas which lie behind the two concepts are however critically important for managing nominations to the World Heritage List and improving conservation activity on World Heritage properties; and finally that use of the concepts need to be restructured to improve their effective application for the benefit of World Heritage properties. The paper contends that the key to restructuring use of the concepts is first recognizing the critical conceptual distinction between authenticity and integrity in measuring and designing strategies for improving the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, namely that authenticity may be understood as the ability of a property to convey its significance over time, and integrity understood as the ability of a property to secure or sustain its significance over time. The paper shows how the restructuring of the two concepts, defined in this way, can provide tangible indicators for applying the unified concepts in a number of contexts. Finally, the paper extends this approach and proposes an illustrative framework which could be explored for application to a range of heritage typologies found on the World Heritage List (archaeological sites, historic towns, architectural monuments and complexes and cultural landscapes).

Key words: *world heritage, authenticity, integrity, qualifying conditions*

Introduction

The recent introduction of the integrity requirement for cultural heritage nominations to the World Heritage List (UNESCO - WHC, 2005) confirms the WH Committee's belief in the value of "qualifying conditions"¹, in assessing suitability of properties for the World Heritage List. The interest in looking at OUV through a filter which permits verification that the physical state of the property and its surrounding conditions are adequate to

* This paper was prepared for the Florence meeting of the ICOMOS Theory Committee, March 1-4, 2007, and was originally titled: "Authenticity, integrity, and "outstanding universal value" - the four "c"s - connections, conundrums, and confusion on the way to conservation.

♦ Heritage Conservation Programme Coordinator, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

¹ Until the adoption of the new Operational Guidelines of Feb. 2005, both integrity (for natural heritage sites) and authenticity (for cultural heritage sites), were described as "qualifying conditions" in the Operational Guidelines. This phrase disappeared in the Feb. 2005 version of the Guidelines.

meaningfully contain and express the OUV of the property is not new. This concern has been a part of the evaluation process since the beginning. The initial evaluation criteria developed in the early preparatory meetings in Morges, Switzerland (in 1976) and in Paris (in 1977) (Stovel, 1995: 395), prompted at least in part by Ernest Allan Connally, then Secretary-General of ICOMOS, included the “test of authenticity” for cultural heritage sites and the “conditions of integrity” for natural heritage sites as conditions which must be met for inscription.

While interest in authenticity may have been there since the beginning, understanding of what was implied in terms of evaluation requirements has generally lagged far behind. The working document prepared in 1978 for the first session of the World Heritage Committee provoked State Party responses which reflected that difficulty. “The interpretation given of authenticity was challenged by several members who did not consider that it necessarily entailed maintaining the original function of the property which, to ensure its preservation, often had to be adapted to other functions. (Von Droste, Bertilsson, 1995: 3)”.

In spite of strong efforts to increase understanding of authenticity on the part of the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies² over time, confusion has persisted. The report of the seventh session of the World Heritage Committee held in 1983, for example, noted that “...a certain number of criteria raise problems of interpretation... this would in particular be the case with regard tothe notion of authenticity” (Von Droste, Bertilsson, 1995: 5).

This lack of understanding has been evident in many of the nomination documents submitted by States Parties ever since. Many nominations have ignored this requirement entirely; many more have spoken of authenticity as if it were a value in its own right, (and therefore not evaluated authenticity in relation to the particular outstanding universal value proposed); and equally, many more nominations have not chosen to root their analysis in the four attribute areas defined initially for the test of authenticity: design, material, setting, workmanship, and hence have left their authenticity assessments unattached to anything tangible. This lack of understanding can also be found within many ICOMOS evaluations which offer similarly generalized overviews: “This property is undeniably authentic ...” is a favourite ICOMOS statement during the evaluations of the 1990s.

With the addition of a second qualifying concept – namely, integrity – to the formal WH requirements for cultural heritage properties, and the parallel rejection of the concept of authenticity in the new Intangible Heritage Convention (2003) – a Convention which defines the intangible to include very tangible “cultural spaces” – the potential for confusion has increased considerably. In the nominations submitted to ICOMOS for review in 2006, this area of the nomination document is perhaps the most troublesome. Although the requirements for authenticity and integrity are spelled out in great detail in the 2005 Operational Guidelines, many States Parties have not well grasped what is being requested. Many have written about something called “integrity/ authenticity” treating the two concepts as if they were one; and many of those who have realized that the two concepts are different have displayed very little clear understanding of what the

² Here I would single out Chapter 8 of Jokilehto and Feilden’s *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites* (1993) on “Authenticity and Treatment”² which demonstrates how each of the four authenticities named in the original Test of Authenticity can be used in practical ways to define needed “treatment”, and also the discussions preceding and following the writing of the Nara Document, which expanded the domains through which authenticity could be understood beyond the original four.

differences might involve, and virtually none have supplied the requested Statements of Authenticity and Integrity.

Readers could be excused at this stage for wondering, given the ongoing and perhaps even increasing confusion in application of these concepts within the World Heritage Convention, why bother? If communication of what is implied in using “qualifying conditions” has continuously failed, why continue to perpetuate these requirements? Why not give up on “qualifying conditions” and get back to the basics?

This paper argues that these qualifying conditions are essential both to ensure the quality of analysis employed for cultural heritage properties during the nomination phase, and equally importantly, to ensure the quality of guidance provided to management and conservation treatment decisions made subsequent to inscription. This paper argues further however that the concepts which lie behind the two qualifying conditions of integrity and authenticity need to be deconstructed and re-assembled in ways which would allow them to be more easily understood and used in conservation analysis for WH properties. The paper finally urges the WH Committee to strengthen efforts to build awareness of the importance of these concerns and to explore means to increase capacity for their practical use in preparing nominations and in post-inscription operations for cultural heritage properties.

1. Definitions, sources of confusion and a proposal

The two concepts of authenticity and integrity as applied to cultural heritage contain two strong and important ideas useful for nomination analysis, and for management/treatment. These underlying ideas however do not coincide precisely with the definitions of the two concepts, authenticity or integrity, as used in World Heritage activity. Understanding these two underlying ideas requires a return to the intentions of those who brought the words into the World Heritage framework.

1.1 Authenticity

The concept of authenticity enshrined within the first set of WH evaluative criteria in 1978 is derived from an American “qualifying condition” – integrity – applied since 1953 to the process of evaluating nominations to the American National Register of Historic Places. Integrity in the American system is meant to signify “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” (Andrus, Rebecca, 2002) This American approach, brought to the World Heritage table by ICOMOS Secretary-General Connally in 1977, as mentioned earlier, was readily accepted by all those involved in the late 70s discussions as an important consideration. It was believed that use of this concept would guarantee inscription of only those places offering genuine material testimony to important historic periods and manifestations, and would limit the placing of bogus or entirely reconstituted historic places on the WH List (Von Droste, Bertilsson, 1995: 4).

The American definition is reflected in the working definition of authenticity used during the Nara Document discussions: authenticity is a “measure of the degree to which the values of a heritage property may be understood to be truthfully, genuinely and credibly, expressed by the attributes carrying the values”(Stovel, 2004: 3). This idea is carried forward in para. 82 of the Operational Guidelines which comments on the relation between the property, its OUV and its defined attributes:

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

- 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; and
- other internal and external factors. (UNESCO, 2005: Paragraph 82)³

1.2 Integrity

The confusion in contemporary World Heritage use caused by the introduction of integrity as a new qualifying concept for cultural heritage nominations, is evident everywhere. A document recently introduced by the United States of America to guide Americans to analyse “integrity” in preparing a Tentative List application asks: “Do the authentic material and spatial evidence inside the proposed boundaries remain in sufficient quantity to convey the full significance of the site? To tell the full story of why the site is outstanding?”⁴ Here the Americans are defining integrity for World Heritage purposes in a way which closely resembles their approach to preparing National Register nominations, and very closely to the World heritage application of authenticity, rather than as requested by the 2005 Operational Guidelines (OP). The Operational Guidelines, Paragraph 88, states that:

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 and/or neglect. (Unesco- WHC, 2005, Paragraph 88)

OG Para. 89 continues for cultural heritage properties, that is, those “nominated under criteria (i) to (vi),” to note that:

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. (Unesco - WHC, 2005, Paragraph 89)

While the phrase “convey the property’s significance” is present in OG paragraph 88, it is only so in relation to efforts to ensure that all elements necessary to support the OUV of the property are present, but not in relation to all of the attributes of the property, and the overall ability of the property to express or support significance.

There are two basic ideas in play within the use of the integrity concept for cultural heritage in the 2005 Operational Guidelines:

³ The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO WH Centre, Feb. 2005. Para 82. It is worth noting that in the most recent edition of the Operational Guidelines, the “Test of Authenticity” has disappeared and been replaced by the “Conditions of Authenticity”.

⁴ Application for inclusion of a property in the U.S. World Heritage Tentative List, National Park Service.

- “Wholeness” (are all the elements necessary to tell fully the story of the site? Is the property of sufficient size to hold all features and processes necessary to convey significance?), and
- “Intactness” (asking about the condition of the property in relation to the threats to its existence, and any risks in the environment surrounding the property).

The former relates to the ability of a defined property to convey significance and can be understood to be linked to concerns present in the authenticity discussion, and the ability of certain attributes (noted in OG para. 82 above) to credibly express or convey significance (Unesco - WHC, 2005: Paragraph 82). The other basic idea, “intactness”, is very different. Here the focus is on the state of the “physical fabric of the property and/or its significant features” which “should be in good condition”, while “the impact of deterioration processes [should be] controlled” (Unesco, 2005: paragraph 89).

The push to introduce integrity within the evaluation of WH cultural heritage sites derives in particular from the 1998 WH expert meeting in Amsterdam and its efforts to bring treatment of natural and cultural properties together. Hence the use of integrity for cultural heritage is modeled to some extent on its use for natural heritage properties; this approach to use of the concept may also be found in the practices of certain States Parties, most notably those of Canada, developed at the same time. In the early 90s, Parks Canada developed a new Cultural Resource Management Policy for properties of national historic significance. One of the features of the new policy was the use of a concept called “Commemorative Integrity” intended to mirror for properties of cultural heritage worth the management framework offered by the concept of ecological integrity for properties of natural heritage value. “Commemorative integrity describes the health and wholeness of a site and is achieved when:

- Resources directly related to the reasons for the site's designation as a national historic site are not impaired or under threat;
- The reasons for the site's designation as a national historic site are effectively communicated to the public; and
- The site's heritage values are respected in all decisions and actions affecting the site.” (Parks Canada: 1)

Here, the latter two points may be understood – as with WH integrity - to be linked to the ability of the property to convey its significance through communication efforts as much as through its physical reality, while the former point can be linked to the WH Committee 2005 Operational Guidelines search for “intactness” under use of the integrity concept. It is also worth noting that while the first of the two words used in the overview definition of Commemorative Integrity – health – can be understood to be linked to efforts to secure significance, the second word – wholeness – can be understood to relate both to conveying significance (are all elements present to convey significance?) and to secure significance (are all elements present to sustain significance?), this latter derived very much from natural heritage practice.

1.3 A proposal

In summary then, we could say that one of the concerns within both authenticity and integrity analysis, irrespective of which word we are using is directed to the ability of a property to convey significance. We could also say that there is a second concern, found within integrity analysis, focused on the ability of the site managers to secure or sustain the significance of the site.

I would contend that these two concepts – ability to convey significance, and ability to secure/sustain significance – could be much more useful during nomination analysis and also during post inscription management/ conservation treatment analysis than the words authenticity and integrity have proven to date for cultural heritage properties.

2. Challenges in improving use of integrity/ authenticity analysis for World Heritage properties

There are many challenges to overcome in strengthening use of integrity/ authenticity analysis for use with World Heritage properties. These include:

- Clarifying the extent to which authenticity and integrity analysis can be of practical utility in treatment/ management and conservation of World Heritage properties, as well as for analyzing the suitability of nominations.
- Recognizing that the discussion of what integrity and authenticity mean is not yet concluded and that there are both new approaches entering the integrity dialogue and unresolved issues concerning authenticity which will need to be addressed in the years ahead.
- Showing that shifting attention to the new framework for understanding authenticity and integrity to concern for conveying significance and securing/ sustaining significance can bring practical improvement to the quality of analysis of nominations and of approaches for site management. the two ideas underlying authenticity and integrity analysis (conveying significance, securing significance).

These three ideas are looked at in more detail in the sections which follow.

2.1 Practical utility for management

In general terms, it is now understood that integrity and authenticity can go both ways. Previously most emphasis on the cultural heritage side had been given to the use of authenticity – and by extension, integrity - as devices which could amplify understanding of what was important about a property during the nomination process. This is in distinction to the use of the conditions of integrity for natural heritage which have been understood since the beginning as both a prerequisite for inscription but also a cue for management – defining the conditions necessary for outstanding universal value to survive and be maintained. The initial difference between the two approaches was evident in the language initially linked to the concepts used; authenticity was limited to a “test” prior to inscription to verify genuineness, whereas the conditions of integrity once ascertained as present have always been used to establish a state which must be maintained within a property – that is, to become management goals and also to guide decision making to full respect for what is important in post-inscription management.

As noted earlier, interest in using authenticity to guide post-inscription decision making could first be found in Jokilehto and Feilden’s Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites (1993) on the chapter on “Authenticity and Treatment” which demonstrates how each of the four authenticities named in the original Test of Authenticity can be used in practical ways to define needed “treatment” for properties. The decision to demand that cultural heritage properties meet both the conditions of authenticity and of integrity bespeaks a new interest in using the presence of these qualifying conditions both as references that outstanding universal value is carried by attributes genuinely and credibly expressing that value, and that as references guiding

management decision making to priority concerns in sustaining outstanding universal value.

At present, this latter preoccupation is becoming even more important as the World Heritage Committee becomes ever more serious about establishing meaningful indicators and benchmarks for measuring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and the effectiveness of corrective measures adopted to improve conservation of these properties.

2.2 Unfinished explorations for integrity and authenticity analysis

2.2.1 *New approaches for integrity analysis*

Various issues within the Committee have opened up discussion of integrity in new areas in recent years. Although these discussions – many ongoing – are concerned with critical issues in protecting inscribed WH properties, the issues raised are not yet in the Operational Guidelines – at least not under the rubric of “integrity” - and therefore not codified in ways which States Parties could respond to at present in formulating nominations.

Examination of the use of integrity in these various contexts provides useful insights into some likely future modifications of the Operational Guidelines.

- The Nara Seminar for the Integrity and Development of Historic Cities, an expert meeting organized by the World Heritage Centre in Nara, Japan, in 1999, (Yang et al, 2000) explored how the concept of integrity could be useful in improving management of historic cities. The conclusions of this meeting are not reflected or considered in the current Operational Guidelines.
- Recent discussions within the WH Committee have addressed the negative impacts of proposed high rise developments on the visual integrity of inscribed historic districts and towns. The Committee has been searching for a methodologically sound and consistent way to assess the impact of such proposals to avoid the ambiguous nature of the discussion which has accompanied the apparent threat to OUV accompanying recent high rise proposals in Vienna, London, Liverpool, Cologne, Dresden, Isfahan, Riga, Vilnius, St. Petersburg and in other WH cities. While description of “visual integrity” is not included in the Operational Guidelines as a nomination requirement, Christina Cameron, in searching for references that could guide analysis, has noted (Cameron, 2007) that the Operational Guidelines suggest that the buffer zone “should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection” (UNESCO, 2005, Paragraph 104). This concern is further reflected in a statement contained within the current Tentative List application document prepared by the National Park Service (and referred to earlier above): “Is the integrity weakened by the intrusion of discordant and/or abundant elements or buildings that are unrelated to the significance and detract from the visual unity of the place?” (National Park Service, 2006).
- Jukka Jokilehto has been developing the possible future scope of integrity inquiry by looking at structural, functional and visual integrity in relation to places of heritage value. In a recent paper, Jokilehto notes:

Functional integrity is particularly obvious in the case of an industrial site, such as a factory, but it is equally relevant in urban fabric. Functional integrity provides the reference for the understanding of the meaning of the different

elements in built environment. Structural integrity instead defines the present-day reality in the field, i.e. the elements that survive in today's historical condition from the evolving functions of the past. Even a relict cultural landscape can be defined in terms of its historical integrity. At the same time, the question of functional integrity is relevant to living urban or rural areas and the planning and management of their present-day use. Visual integrity is the result of certain processes. Therefore, in order to properly appreciate the existing realities and eventual changes, it is useful to again refer the analysis to the functional and historical structural integrity. (Jokilehto, 2006: 2-3)

While a number of Jokilehto's papers on this subject have been presented in World Heritage forums, these formulations of integrity are also not yet included within the present Operational Guidelines.

All of the above three concerns can be related to the idea of "securing and/ or sustaining significance" and hence if the new framework proposed were adopted, their later introduction would not require scrambling around to find a way to accommodate them once they work their way towards acceptance by the Committee.

2.2.2 Unresolved or unclear issues in authenticity analysis

There are a number of sources of continuing confusion found in the interpretation and application of the authenticity concept by States Parties. The sources of confusion named below all derive from a lack of recognition of the importance of maintaining the critical relationship between authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value.

Let's look at each of these points in turn.

- **Continuing perception that authenticity is related to the "original" state of a place.**

This perception has its origins in the original formulation of the integrity concept within the American National Park Service Administrative Manual of 1953, which noted in speaking of landmarks, that "an essential consideration is that each one should have integrity – that is, there should be no doubt as to whether it is the original site or structure, and in the case of a structure, that it represents original material and workmanship." (Stovel, 1995: 396) This point is reinforced in the current American National Park Service Tentative List application definition of authenticity which maintains the emphasis on the original: "Does the property retain its original design, materials, workmanship and setting?" (National Park Service, 2006).

From the beginning however, most of those involved argued that authenticity analysis was a relative concept and must be used in relation to the historical context of the messages being expressed. Those involved in preparing the original Operational Guidelines noted that: "due recognition should be given to "progressive authenticity", that is to say, to buildings and constructions , in which, although having been modeled throughout time , some of the original intentions were retained." (Von Droste, Bertilsson, 1995: 3).

Although the Committee's interpretation – authenticity not concerned with an original - has been consistently maintained over time, it is clear that this message has not yet been absorbed by many of those involved.

- **Treating authenticity as if it were a value in its own right.**

Many nominations have been prepared in which States Parties discuss authenticity as if it were a concept entirely unrelated to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property. This may be related to the concerns of those who on the one hand feel that loose interpretations of authenticity may encourage "practicing architectsto

flirtation with history and its values” (Dushkina, 1995: 308) and on the other hand, the preoccupations of those prepared to acknowledge the great complexity of authenticity judgements, relating several simultaneous and interconnected spheres of human understanding and perception: the temporal, the experiential, etc. – and all in the end highly subjective interpretations intended to inform the decisional sphere.

Natalia Dushkina, ICOMOS Russia, argued in her paper for the Nara meeting of 1994, that the material (form, setting, techniques, techniques) and the non-material (function, use, tradition, spirit) “used to be the bearers of authenticity in a monument...” that “they transmitted authenticity to us and thus are relative to it...” and that “authenticity is a value category of culture” (Dushkina, 1995: 310). However Annex 4 of the new version of the Operational Guidelines prepared by the Advisory Bodies in March 2003 stated the following:

Authenticity is not a value itself. Properties do not merit inscription on the World Heritage List simply because they are greatly authentic; rather, inscribed properties must demonstrate first their claim to “outstanding universal value”, and then demonstrate that the attributes carrying related values are “authentic”, that is, genuine, real, truthful, credible. (Stovel, 2003: Annex 4).

But again, without full agreement on this point, it is very difficult to expect consistency of treatment from States Parties treating authenticity in the nomination documents they prepare.

- **Attempting to look for authenticity in all attributes identified in the Operational Guidelines.**

Early discussion of the four authenticities (adapted from the American seven integrities) acknowledged that these were to be treated “as a composite” (Stovel, 1995: 395).

While Dr. Connally argued for this interpretation in dealing with WH sites, current practice in nominating sites to the American National Register argues the contrary, namely that, “To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant” (Andrus, Shrimpton, 2002).

Again this point is not well understood by States Parties as there are countless examples of both approaches in nominations forwarded to the Committee: authenticity reviewed in relation to all possible attributes, and authenticity reviewed in relation to a selected set of attributes.

- **Treating authenticity as if it were an absolute concept – either present or not.**

This insistence on the absolute approach is present in the current American National Register practice for evaluating integrity: “Historic properties either retain integrity (that is, convey their significance) or they do not” (Andrus, Shrimpton, 2002). While this approach, as with the idea above that authenticity must be present in all attributes “as a composite”, may have been present as an objective in the original American concept grafted on to World Heritage practice, it has long since disappeared in use, and authenticity analysis has been very much concerned with relative measurement, measuring” the degree to which”... specific defined attributes may credibly, truthfully and genuinely express Outstanding Universal Value.

Natalia Dushkina draws a useful distinction in attacking this problem by trying to link absolute assessments to assessments focused on individual attributes:

Authenticity can be easily diagnosed, when each of its bearers will be examined independently of each other. It is different, when all the components are studied simultaneously. This pattern provides for partial loss of authenticity in each of them (e.g., material authenticity is intact, but the function has changed, there is a loss of the original form, etc.). The examination has a relative character and can add to the dissonance of the whole. Here it is necessary to find the threshold before which the monument authenticity is not yet lost and can be perceived as it is. (Dushkina, 1995: 310)

The difficulty with Dushkina's sleight of hand is that human beings can not readily perceive this magical absolute threshold – at least not altogether, in the same way, at the same time - and all that pragmatic practitioners can hope to do, is measure the relative authenticity of various attributes defined, one by one. We don't have a computer smart enough to perform the intangible sums.

The March 2003 Advisory Bodies version of Annex 4 of the Operational Guidelines suggests that:

Authenticity is not an absolute qualifier. It is meaningless to state that such and such a property is "undeniably authentic". Authenticity is a relative concept, and must always be used in relation to the ability of particular attributes to express clearly the nature of key recognized values. (Stovel, 2003: Annex 4)

Again while the Operational Guidelines have been very clear on this point, understanding and interpretation of this point varies greatly among States Parties concerned with preparing nominations.

Having failed to find ways to bring States Parties to understand authenticity in completely consistent fashion among themselves over 30 years of nominations, it may be useful to refocus the debate by re-directing attention to analyzing how the various attributes bearing a site's outstanding universal value convey significance.

2.3 Possible ways forward – applying the proposed new framework

Having established the importance of qualifying conditions for both the evaluation process and also perhaps even more importantly for guiding post inscription management, and having established the open ended nature of dialogues surrounding use and development of the integrity and authenticity concepts, it is now important to turn our attention to ways in which the proposed new framework for authenticity and integrity analysis (concerned with conveying significance and also with securing/sustaining significance) could strengthen the quality of nomination analysis for the World Heritage List, and also the quality and scope of references in place for improving management of World Heritage properties.

In thinking about ways to improve, it is useful to look at how the application of integrity for natural heritage sites has been developed in the examples contained within paragraphs 92-95 of the Operational Guidelines. Integrity is defined in relation to each of the four natural heritage criteria. The relevant paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines are shown below:

92. Properties proposed under criterion (vii) should be of outstanding universal value and include areas that are essential for maintaining the beauty of the property. For example, a property whose scenic value depends on a waterfall, would meet the conditions of integrity if it includes adjacent catchment and downstream areas that are integrally linked to the maintenance of the aesthetic qualities of the property.

93. Properties proposed under criterion (viii) should contain all or most of the key interrelated and interdependent elements in their natural relationships. For example, an "ice age" area would meet the conditions of integrity if it includes the

snow field, the glacier itself and samples of cutting patterns, deposition and colonization (e.g. striations, moraines, pioneer stages of plant succession, etc.); in the case of volcanoes, the magmatic series should be complete and all or most of the varieties of effusive rocks and types of eruptions be represented.

94. Properties proposed under criterion (ix) should have sufficient size and contain the necessary elements to demonstrate the key aspects of processes that are essential for the long term conservation of the ecosystems and the biological diversity they contain. For example, an area of tropical rain forest would meet the conditions of integrity if it includes a certain amount of variation in elevation above sea level, changes in topography and soil types, patch systems and naturally regenerating patches; similarly a coral reef should include, for example, seagrass, mangrove or other adjacent ecosystems that regulate nutrient and sediment inputs into the reef.

95. Properties proposed under criterion (x) should be the most important properties for the conservation of biological diversity. Only those properties which are the most biologically diverse and/or representative are likely to meet this criterion. The properties should contain habitats for maintaining the most diverse fauna and flora characteristic of the bio-geographic province and ecosystems under consideration. For example, a tropical savannah would meet the conditions of integrity if it includes a complete assemblage of co-evolved herbivores and plants; an island ecosystem should include habitats for maintaining endemic biota; a property containing wide ranging species should be large enough to include the most critical habitats essential to ensure the survival of viable populations of those species; for an area containing migratory species, seasonal breeding and nesting sites, and migratory routes, wherever they are located, should be adequately protected. (Unesco - WHC, 2005: Paragraphs 92 – 95)

These tangible illustrations have been very useful in assisting States Parties to present integrity within their own nominations. This recognition presents a challenge to those interested in improving use of qualifying conditions for cultural heritage nominations – why not see if parallel explanations could be developed, involving for example, definitions of authenticity and integrity in relation to each of the cultural heritage criteria?

The importance of trying this approach had been recognized in earlier efforts to revise the Operational Guidelines, particularly following the Amsterdam World Heritage expert meeting of 1998 intended to unify treatment of cultural heritage and natural heritage. ICOMOS and ICCROM were challenged by the World Heritage Centre (Sarah Titchen) in 1999 to develop statements on authenticity for the six cultural heritage criteria equivalent to those developed for integrity and natural heritage. These efforts failed⁵ to find appropriate form at the time, and the current Operational Guidelines remind readers that it is expected that the Advisory Bodies will develop these soon for integrity. (Unesco - WHC, 2005: Paragraph 89)

Two realizations help shape the renewed response to this challenge presented below:

- The sense that it may be useful to deconstruct the two broad concepts of “conveying significance” and “securing and / or sustaining significance” further into a range of distinct supporting sub-concepts.
- The sense that it may be more useful to suggest interpretations of these cultural heritage “qualifying conditions” in relation to heritage typologies than to criteria.

⁵ During the second international symposium on integrated approaches to integrated urban conservation in Recife, Brazil in October 1999, Jukka Jokilehto and the author spent the better part of two days attempting to draft the missing explanations of authenticity for each of the cultural heritage criteria. A text was provided Sarah Titchen of the World Heritage Centre, but this text failed to provide a satisfactory counterpart to the integrity paragraphs on the Operational Guidelines.

Examination of the use of the integrity examples for various natural heritage criteria confirms that while they may work well, given that natural heritage properties may be inscribed under several criteria, then it can be understood that the examples used are illustrating only one facet of the nominated sites, and that the illustrations are not providing a full picture of integrity for the nominated property.

What follows below is an effort to suggest how the existing authenticity / integrity system could be replaced conceptually (and in the Operational Guidelines) for cultural heritage by a system which looks at six sub-aspects of authenticity/ integrity (wholeness, intactness, material genuineness, organization of space and form, continuity of function, continuity of setting) in relation to four cultural heritage typologies (archaeological sites, historic towns, architectural monuments and complexes, cultural landscapes). This is by no means meant to constitute a definitive framework for revising integrity/ authenticity analysis, but rather a framework meant to stimulate discussion and debate about the nature and scope of possible alternative approaches to the existing system.

2.4 New framework for integrity/ authenticity analysis

2.4.1 *Archaeological sites*

Wholeness: An archaeological site should include all the underground cultural resources (excavated and unexcavated) which are associated with the reasons advanced for its Outstanding Universal Value. Nominations should not be confined simply to exposed areas, but include all these areas that could contribute to the story being told even if those areas have been built over in modern times.

Intactness: An archaeological site should be well maintained, its constituent fabric and materials protected from risk of decay.

Material genuineness: Nominations should identify surviving material resources strongly associated with the OUV of the property. Maintaining integrity/ authenticity of sites does not generally require reconstruction or restoration of surviving fragments, but rather a primary focus on protection of the legibility and substance of archaeological resources, exposed or otherwise.

Genuineness of organization of space and form: Where efforts to communicate OUV appear to demand restoration or reconstruction of existing elements, then such work should be based on existing evidence and should be the least necessary to effectively communicate a site's significant messages.

Continuity of function: Not normally applicable for archaeological sites.

Continuity of setting: Nominations should demonstrate the extent to which the current setting maintains the quality of the setting associated with the OUV of the property. Development controls in an associated buffer zone should be sufficient to protect the character of the setting defined to be important

2.4.2 *Historic Towns*

Wholeness: An historic town should include all those districts and neighborhoods which are directly associated with the OUV of the nominated property. The limits of the property nominated should be established to include all those constituent areas which contribute to the OUV of the property.

Intactness: An historic town should generally be in a good physical state of repair. Physical, social and economic conditions should support efforts to maintain OUV.

Material genuineness: Surviving historic fabric which contributes to the OUV of the site should be protected. In some cases this may mean efforts to protect original material or material from a particularly important phase of city development; in other cases, this may mean efforts to protect the material testimony of successive phases of use over time

Genuineness of organization of space and form: The particular patterns of spatial organization (urban layout of streets and spaces) which contribute to the OUV of the property should be present and legible. If a city's heritage value lies in its continuity of occupation for over 2000 years, then it should be possible to read the evolution and transformation of built form and patterns of spatial arrangement in the surviving city.

Continuity of function: If the primary historic function(s) of an historic city contribute to its OUV, then every effort should be made to ensure continuity of function over time. Where these functions may now be obsolete, efforts should be in place to encourage compatible functions or at minimum those functions which do not obliterate the evidence of significant earlier functions. Cities which have exchanged historic uses for dependency on touristic use are particularly vulnerable to loss of important attributes.

Continuity of setting: Nominations should demonstrate the extent to which the current setting of the settlement maintains the quality of the setting associated with the OUV of the property. Development controls in an associated buffer zone should be sufficient to protect the character of the existing setting in ways compatible with the OUV of the property.

2.4.3 Architectural monuments and complexes

Wholeness: A monument or complex should include all those elements, features and structures which are directly associated with the OUV of the nominated property. The limits of the property nominated should be established to include all of those constituent features which support the OUV of the property. A monastic complex for example should include all contributing buildings, not just the largest, oldest or more aesthetically significant – but for example, include also the chapter houses, library and archives, cooking and dining features, domestic work shops, gardens, etc. as well as the important churches and chapels.

Intactness: A monument nominated to the WH List should generally be in a good physical state of repair. The physical, social and economic conditions necessary to maintain the monument in good condition should also be present.

Material genuineness: Surviving historic fabric which contributes to the OUV of the monument should be protected. In some cases this may mean efforts to protect original material or material contributing to “unity of style” perceived as important; in other cases, this may mean efforts to protect evidence of successive phases of use over time, if property “evolution” is linked to OUV. Material fabric within a monument which is deemed not to contribute to OUV may be removed if this enhances appreciation of other aspects of the structure which do contribute to OUV. For example, mid 20th century additions which obscure the medieval characteristics of a temple valued for the excellence of its medieval artistic expression could be legitimately removed, if this action does not impair legitimate use or financial viability.

Genuineness of organization of space and form: The particular aspects of a monument's design, formal arrangement or patterns of spatial organization (layout of internal corridors and spaces for example) which contribute to the OUV of the property should be present and legible. If a property's heritage value lies in the classical organization of its Renaissance design for example, then the defining characteristics of that design approach

(for example, symmetry, use of classical orders arranged in defined hierarchies, etc.) should be legible and coherently expressed.

Continuity of function: If the primary historic function(s) of a monument contribute to its OUV, then every effort should be made to ensure continuity of function over time. Where these functions may now be obsolete, efforts should be in place to encourage compatible functions or at minimum those functions which do not obliterate the legibility of significant earlier functions.

Continuity of setting: Nominations should demonstrate the extent to which the current setting of the historic settlement reflects the quality of the setting associated with the OUV of the property. Development controls in an associated buffer zone should be sufficient to protect the character of the existing setting in ways compatible with the OUV of the property.

2.4.4 Cultural Landscapes

Wholeness: A cultural landscape should include all those features, patterns and dynamic use and management processes which are directly associated with the OUV of the nominated property. The limits of the property nominated should be established to include all those constituent areas which support the OUV of the property.

Intactness: As well, a cultural landscape should generally be in a good physical state of repair and functioning. All physical, social and economic conditions necessary to ensure maintaining the quality of the state of conservation of the landscape should be in place.

Material genuineness: Surviving historic fabric which contributes to the OUV of the cultural landscape should be protected. In some cases this may mean efforts to protect original features or patterns perceived as important; in other cases, this may mean efforts to protect evidence of successive phases of use over time, if landscape “evolution” is linked to OUV.

Genuineness of organization of space and form: The particular patterns of spatial organization (landscape layout and organization – movement systems (rail, road, water), infrastructure systems etc.) which contribute to the OUV of the property should be present and legible. If a landscape’s heritage value lies in its continuity of occupation for several centuries, then it should be possible to read the evolution and transformation of built form and patterns of spatial arrangement in the surviving layers of the landscape.

Continuity of function: If the primary historic function(s) of a landscape contribute to its OUV, then every effort should be made to ensure continuity of these functions over time. Landscapes valued for their design qualities or their associative qualities are particularly vulnerable to changes of function; landscapes valued as evolving landscapes (for the most part, agricultural landscapes) are best managed where character defining functions are maintained.

Continuity of setting: Nominations should demonstrate the extent to which the current setting of the cultural landscape maintains the quality of the setting directly associated with the OUV of the property. Development controls in an associated buffer zone should be sufficient to protect the character of the existing setting in ways compatible with the OUV of the cultural landscape.

The above is simply a set of hypothetical suggestions which illustrate how this approach could possibly be developed and presented within future Operational Guidelines.

2.5 Building capacity

Finally, if a new approach is adopted, there is a need to build capacity at all levels in use of these revised concepts in preparing nominations and in managing inscribed properties. Efforts to fund capacity building programs for WH properties have always fallen far short of the need for such support in relation to dozens of important themes and areas of understanding in WH. Yet building comfort with use of these new concepts could dramatically strengthen ability to measure effectiveness of conservation treatments, and ultimately to improve conservation work – and to strengthen efforts to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that the qualifying conditions of integrity and authenticity are essential both to ensure the quality of analysis employed for cultural heritage properties during the nomination phase, and equally importantly, to ensure the quality of guidance provided to management and conservation treatment decisions made subsequent to inscription. This paper has argued further that the concepts which lie behind the two qualifying conditions of integrity and authenticity need to be deconstructed and re-assembled in ways which would allow them to be more easily understood and used in conservation analysis for WH properties. The paper has also illustrated how a new approach could be developed within use of the two guiding concepts, and which if adopted which could include all the former component ideas – but perhaps now more clearly understood – and spelled out in relation not to inscription criteria but to heritage typologies. Finally the paper has urged the WH Committee to strengthen efforts to build awareness of the importance of these concerns and to explore means to increase capacity for their practical use in preparing nominations and in post-inscription operations for cultural heritage properties.

References

- Andrus, P. W.; Shrimpton, R. H. 2002. How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property". U.S. Dept. of the Interior - National Parks Service, National Register, History and Education. (PDF version of "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation Bulletin).
- Cameron, C. 2006. Protecting Important Views? Recent Case Studies from the World Heritage Committee. Paper given at ICOMOS Canada Congress, November 2006, Ottawa, Canada.
- Dushkina, N. 1995. Authenticity: Towards the Ecology of Culture. In: Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention. Proceedings. UNESCO WH Centre – Agency for Cultural Affairs (Japan) – ICCROM – ICOMOS.
- Jokilehto, J. 2006. World Heritage: Defining the outstanding universal value. *City & Time* 2 (2): 1. [online] <http://www.ct.ceci-br.org>, Pages 2-3.
- Jokilehto, J.; Feilden, B. 1993. Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites. UNESCO-ICOMOS – ICCROM. (rev. 1998).
- National Park Service. 2006. Application for inclusion of a property in the U.S. World Heritage Tentative List. National Park Service Office of International Affairs, USA.

- Parks Canada. Guiding Principles and Operational Policies, Part II – Activity Policies: National Historic Sites.
http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pc/poli/princip/sec2/part2d3_E.asp
- Stovel, H. 2003. From commentaries included in Annex 4, The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO WH Centre, version prepared by the Advisory Bodies.
- Stovel, H. 2004. Authenticity in conservation decision-making: the World Heritage perspective. *Journal of Research in Architecture and Planning, Conservation and Cultural Heritage*, Volume 3. Karachi. Page 3.
- Stovel, Herb. 1995. Considerations in Framing the Authenticity Question for Conservation. In: *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO WH Centre – Agency for Cultural Affairs (Japan) – ICCROM – ICOMOS.
- UNESCO WH Centre. 2005. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- Von Droste, B.; Bertilsson, U. 1995. Authenticity and World Heritage. In: *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO WH Centre – Agency for Cultural Affairs (Japan) – ICCROM – ICOMOS.
- Yang, M. et al. 2000. *Seminar for the Integrity and Development of Historic Cities*. Report of an expert meeting organized by the World Heritage Centre in Nara, Japan, in 1999. UNESCO.