The effectiveness of Algeria's advisory council for cultural heritage in protecting immovable cultural heritage

Legal Design, Institutional Constraints and Prospects for Reform

Terbeche Rahma

Senior lecturer B ,University of Ain Temouchent, Laboratory of Real Estate Activity (Algeria)

rahma.terbeche@univ-temouchent.edu.dz

Orcid https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5359-4440

Received: 31/07/2026;

Accepted: 13/09/2026; Published: 29/10/2026

Abstract

This article examines whether Algeria's Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage, established by Executive Decree No. 21-124 of 29 March 2021, is legally and institutionally equipped to contribute effectively to the protection of immovable cultural heritage. The article's contribution is evaluative rather than descriptive: it moves beyond an account of the Council's composition and statutory remit to assess four dimensions of effectiveness—access to the decision-making agenda; legal status and follow-up of opinions; coordination with existing heritage institutions; and transparency and verifiable performance. The research uses doctrinal analysis of Law No. 98-04 of 15 June 1998 and Executive Decree No. 21-124, supplemented by analysis of Algeria's obligations under the 1972 World Heritage Convention and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The legal framework gives the Council a broad advisory mandate, but its work is dependent on matters being referred by the Minister, while the decree does not create a general public mechanism for tracking opinions and responses. Its relationship with the National Commission for Cultural Property also requires careful institutional differentiation, particularly in classification procedures. The publicly accessible sources reviewed for this study do not establish a complete record of meetings, quarterly reports, opinions or implementation since 2021. The article therefore distinguishes institutional capacity under the law from demonstrated operational results. It concludes that the Council may provide valuable expertise and participation, but legal establishment alone cannot prove effectiveness. Transparent reporting, documented follow-up, clear coordination protocols and measurable indicators would make its contribution more assessable.

Keywords: immovable cultural heritage; Algeria; Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage; Law No. 98-04; Executive Decree No. 21-124; UNESCO conventions; institutional effectiveness.

La eficacia del Consejo Consultivo del Patrimonio Cultural de Argelia en la protección del patrimonio cultural inmueble

Diseño jurídico, limitaciones institucionales y perspectivas de reforma

Terbeche Rahma

Profesora titular de categoría B, Universidad de Ain Temouchent, Laboratorio de Actividad Inmobiliaria (Argelia)

rahma.terbeche@univ-temouchent.edu.dz

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5359-4440

Resumen

Este artículo examina si el Consejo Consultivo del Patrimonio Cultural de Argelia, creado mediante el Decreto Ejecutivo n.º 21-124, de 29 de marzo de 2021, dispone de los instrumentos jurídicos e institucionales necesarios para contribuir eficazmente a la protección del patrimonio cultural inmueble. Su aportación es de carácter evaluativo, más que descriptivo: trasciende la exposición de la composición y las competencias legalmente atribuidas al Consejo para evaluar cuatro dimensiones de su eficacia: el acceso a la agenda de toma de decisiones; el estatus jurídico y el seguimiento de sus dictámenes; la coordinación con las instituciones patrimoniales existentes; y la transparencia y el desempeño verificable. La investigación emplea el análisis doctrinal de la Ley n.º 98-04, de 15 de junio de 1998, y del Decreto Ejecutivo n.º 21-124, complementado con el examen de las obligaciones de Argelia derivadas de la Convención sobre la Protección del Patrimonio Mundial, Cultural y Natural de 1972 y de la Convención para la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial de 2003. El marco jurídico atribuye al Consejo amplias funciones consultivas, pero su actividad depende de los asuntos que le remita el ministro, mientras que el decreto no establece un mecanismo público general de seguimiento de los dictámenes y de las respuestas correspondientes. Su relación con la Comisión Nacional de Bienes Culturales también exige una delimitación institucional precisa, especialmente en los procedimientos de clasificación. Las fuentes de acceso público examinadas en este estudio no permiten establecer un registro completo de las reuniones, los informes trimestrales, los dictámenes o su ejecución desde 2021. Por ello, el artículo distingue entre la capacidad institucional reconocida por el ordenamiento jurídico y los resultados operativos demostrados. Se concluye que el Consejo puede aportar conocimientos especializados y favorecer la participación, pero su mera creación jurídica no demuestra su eficacia. La publicación transparente de informes, el seguimiento documentado, unos protocolos claros de coordinación y la adopción de indicadores medibles permitirían evaluar mejor su contribución.

Palabras clave: patrimonio cultural inmueble; Argelia; Consejo Consultivo del Patrimonio Cultural; Ley n.º 98-04, Decreto Ejecutivo n.º 21-124; convenciones de la UNESCO; eficacia institucional.

1. Introduction

Immovable cultural heritage—including historic monuments, archaeological sites and protected urban or rural ensembles—embodies collective memory and provides material evidence of the historical development of communities. Its protection requires more than formal legal designation. It also depends on reliable

inventories, technical expertise, conservation planning, administrative coordination, resources, public participation and the capacity to respond to risks before damage becomes irreversible. In Algeria, Law No. 98-04 of 15 June 1998 on the protection of cultural heritage provides the central statutory framework for identifying and protecting cultural property.

Executive Decree No. 21-124 of 29 March 2021 established the Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage and set out its organisation and functions. The Council's remit extends to legal and institutional arrangements, priorities, restoration and preservation projects, inventory and classification, archaeological research, publication and the valorisation of heritage. The establishment of a specialist advisory body may improve the quality of policy by bringing together academics, experts and representatives of heritage associations. Yet the creation of an institution does not, by itself, establish that it has influenced decisions or improved protection outcomes.

The originality of this article must be stated in relation to prior work. Benaicha's 2022 article, "Cultural Heritage Advisory Council in Executive Decree 21-124," directly examines the decree and the Council's legal establishment. The present article does not claim to be the first study of the Council. Its intended contribution is to evaluate the institutional design of the Council through questions that a descriptive account of the decree does not, by itself, resolve: who controls the agenda; what legal and practical effect attaches to the Council's advice; how its remit relates to the National Commission for Cultural Property; and whether available public information permits an assessment of activity and follow-up. Before submission, the author should check the full text of Benaicha's study to ensure that this distinction accurately reflects its scope and findings.

The research question is therefore: To what extent does the legal and institutional framework governing Algeria's Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage enable it to contribute effectively to the protection of immovable cultural heritage, and what legal and institutional constraints limit its role?

The article advances a qualified proposition. The Council's multidisciplinary composition and broad advisory remit create the potential for useful expert input and civil-society participation. However, that potential is constrained by dependence on ministerial referral, the general non-binding character of its advice, the absence of a clearly defined public follow-up mechanism in the founding decree, and the need to coordinate its work with bodies exercising specific statutory powers. Whether these constraints have affected actual decisions since 2021 is an empirical question that cannot be answered from the decree alone.

The article is organised as follows. Section 2 explains the methodology and the limits of the available evidence. Section 3 outlines only those elements of the Algerian heritage-protection framework necessary to understand the Council's institutional position. Section 4 assesses the Council against four criteria and examines its relationship with the National Commission. Section 5 considers the relevance of international conventions and comparative principles of advisory governance. The conclusion answers the research question and identifies legal and administrative reforms.

2. Methodology and scope

2.1. Doctrinal legal analysis

The primary method is doctrinal analysis of Law No. 98-04 of 15 June 1998 and Executive Decree No. 21-124 of 29 March 2021. The analysis focuses on the legal mandate, composition, procedures, reporting requirements and relationship between institutions.

2.2. Four criteria for evaluating effectiveness

For this article, "effectiveness" is not treated as a synonym for the Council's formal existence or the breadth of its mandate. It is an analytical concept assessed through four criteria:

First, agenda access and institutional autonomy: whether the Council can identify emerging issues, receive proposals and bring matters to the attention of decision-makers, or whether its work depends on ministerial referral.

Second, legal status and follow-up: whether its opinions are transmitted, considered, answered and capable of being traced to subsequent decisions.

Third, institutional coordination: whether its remit complements rather than duplicates the powers of the Ministry and the National Commission for Cultural Property.

Fourth, transparency and demonstrable activity: whether meeting records, quarterly reports, opinions and administrative responses are available in a form that allows its work to be assessed.

These criteria are proposed by the author as a framework for legal-institutional evaluation; they are not presented as an existing statutory test. They also distinguish inputs (membership and resources), activities (meetings and consultations), outputs (opinions and recommendations), responses (acceptance, partial acceptance or rejection) and outcomes (documented changes in conservation or protection practice). The distinction is important because the existence of a meeting or report is not, without further evidence, proof of improved heritage protection.

2.3. International and comparative analysis

The international dimension considers the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The former is directly relevant to the State's duties concerning cultural and natural heritage; the latter is relevant because the Council's statutory remit includes intangible heritage as well as tangible heritage. These instruments provide normative context, not evidence that the Council itself has performed effectively.

The comparative element is deliberately functional. In the absence of a verified, fully developed country-by-country comparison, the article uses general governance principles—clear allocation of responsibilities, transparent advice, reasoned follow-up, stakeholder participation and periodic evaluation—rather than claiming that a named foreign council is more effective. A later empirical study could test these principles against selected national systems using primary legislation and activity records.

2.4. Evidence limitations

The publicly accessible sources reviewed for this study establish the Council's legal framework and its initial establishment. They do not provide a sufficiently complete and independently verified record of the Council's sessions since 2021, quarterly reports, opinions, or the implementation of recommendations. This is an evidence limitation, not proof that the Council has been inactive. The study consequently assesses the Council's legal and institutional capacity and specifies the evidence needed for an operational evaluation. It does not invent activity figures, case studies or causal claims.

3. The Algerian legal and institutional framework

3.1. Law No. 98-04 and the protection of immovable cultural property

Law No. 98-04 is the principal legislative framework governing cultural heritage protection in Algeria. Article 2 defines national cultural heritage broadly, including immovable cultural property, property by allocation and movable cultural property, while also recognising intangible cultural property. Article 8 identifies categories of immovable cultural property that include historical monuments, archaeological sites and protected sectors. These categories show that heritage protection extends from individual structures to wider sites and coherent urban or rural ensembles.

The Law provides mechanisms such as inventory, classification and protected-sector arrangements. Their significance for this article is institutional: they create processes in which expert assessment, administrative decision-making and coordination may be required. The Council's contribution should be assessed in relation to these existing processes. A long descriptive account of each category of cultural property would not answer the research question unless it demonstrated how the Council's advice changes the application of a particular protection mechanism.

The existence of a statutory framework is necessary but not sufficient for protection. Legal designation may need to be supported by technical conservation, planning controls, maintenance, enforcement and cooperation between central and local authorities. These implementation issues form the background against which an advisory institution's added value should be evaluated.

3.2. Establishment and composition of the Council

Executive Decree No. 21-124 of 29 March 2021 establishes the Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage and regulates its organisation and functioning. The Council consists of eleven members: seven academics or recognised competent figures who have contributed to the preservation or promotion of tangible or intangible heritage; one representative of the Minister responsible for culture; and three representatives selected from

accredited associations concerned with heritage. The decree also allows the Council to seek assistance from persons whose expertise may contribute to its work.

The Council includes standing committees for tangible cultural heritage and archaeological research, and for intangible cultural heritage, and may establish special committees when necessary. The decree provides for ordinary meetings every three months and allows extraordinary meetings in the circumstances specified in its provisions. It also provides for a report on the Council's activities every three months to be sent to the Minister responsible for culture. These provisions create a formal structure for specialist deliberation, but they do not establish how often the Council has actually met or what practical effect its work has had.

The Council's composition can be understood as a potential strength because it combines academic expertise with participation by heritage associations. Its limitations, however, cannot be evaluated from membership alone. Relevant questions include how members are selected in practice, whether the Council has adequate administrative and technical support, how conflicts of interest are handled, and whether outside submissions can reach its agenda. These questions require internal rules, appointment decisions or activity records beyond the basic founding decree.

4. Critical assessment of the Council's effectiveness

4.1. Agenda-setting and dependence on ministerial referral

The Council's functions under Executive Decree No. 21-124 are exercised in relation to matters submitted to it by the Minister responsible for culture. This arrangement gives the Minister a gatekeeping role over the issues formally considered by the Council. The decree does not clearly establish a general power for the Council to initiate consideration of any heritage matter independently of ministerial referral.

There is a plausible institutional rationale for ministerial referral: the Council is advisory, and referral may ensure that its work relates to policy questions for which the Ministry is responsible. However, this arrangement also creates a structural risk. Local authorities, researchers, professional bodies or heritage associations may identify urgent threats that do not reach the Council unless a referral mechanism exists. The legal design may therefore limit the Council's responsiveness, although the available evidence does not establish that any particular issue was actually excluded.

A proportionate reform would allow the Council to propose items for its agenda, receive documented submissions from local authorities, experts and accredited associations, and publish an annual summary of topics considered. The Minister could retain control over formal administrative decisions while being required to record a response when the Council raises a matter of significant public interest. This would strengthen responsiveness without converting the Council into an executive authority.

4.2. Advisory opinions: legal effect and practical follow-up

The Council provides opinions, recommendations and proposals. Its advisory role does not, in itself, transfer to it the decision-making powers assigned by law to the Minister or other competent authorities. Nor should the Council's opinions be described as binding unless a specific legal provision expressly gives them that effect. Advisory status is not automatically a weakness: expert bodies may influence public policy through the quality of their analysis, their access to decision-makers and the transparency of the decision process.

The key weakness is the limited visibility of what happens after an opinion is issued. The decree provides for quarterly activity reports to the Minister, but the material reviewed does not establish a general obligation to publish individual opinions, publish reasoned responses from the competent authority, or maintain a public record of implementation. Without such a record, an external researcher cannot reliably determine whether recommendations were adopted, rejected for stated reasons, delayed or left without a documented response.

A suitable effectiveness measure is therefore not the percentage of recommendations accepted in isolation. It is whether opinions are evidence-based, formally transmitted, considered by the competent authority, answered within a reasonable period and followed by a reasoned decision. Rejection may be legally and practically justified; what matters for accountability is that the process is traceable. Publication should be subject to legitimate restrictions, including protection of confidential information and any legally protected security or privacy interests.

4.3. Relationship with the National Commission for Cultural Property

The relationship between the Council and the National Commission for Cultural Property is a central institutional issue. Article 79 of Law No. 98-04 provides for the National Commission. Article 18 assigns the Commission a specific role in the classification procedure, including the requirement for its conforming opinion as set out in that provision. This specific statutory function must be distinguished from the Council's broader advisory remit under Executive Decree No. 21-124.

The two bodies should not be treated as interchangeable. The Council may advise on general legal and institutional policy, priorities, restoration, research and heritage valorisation. The National Commission's role in the statutory classification process has a distinct legal basis and legal effect. Where the two bodies' subject matters overlap, the Council's recommendations cannot replace the procedure or opinion required by Law No. 98-04.

The distinction between the respective functions of the Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage and the National Commission for Cultural Property is essential to ensuring effective institutional coordination in the protection of immovable cultural heritage. The existence of multiple institutions does not, in itself, guarantee stronger protection. In the absence of clear coordination mechanisms, overlapping responsibilities may result in duplication of efforts, inconsistent recommendations, and uncertainty regarding institutional accountability. An effective coordination framework would therefore enable the Advisory Council to contribute its broader policy expertise in support of the National Commission for Cultural Property, while respecting the latter's statutory powers and legally defined responsibilities.

A coordination protocol should specify: which body handles which category of question; how technical information and inventories are shared; whether and when the Council may provide general policy advice relevant to a classification proposal; how the legally required Commission procedure is preserved; and how urgent risks are communicated to the competent authority. Any protocol must remain consistent with the hierarchy of norms and cannot amend the legal effect assigned to the Commission by the Law.

4.4. Transparency, quarterly reports and evidence of actual activity

The decree's provision for quarterly meetings and quarterly reports creates a basis for periodic accountability. However, a statutory reporting requirement does not establish that each report was produced or that its contents were acted upon. The publicly accessible materials reviewed for this study did not provide a complete, independently verifiable series of reports, minutes or opinions since the Council's establishment. The proper conclusion is that performance cannot be established from the accessible evidence reviewed, not that the Council has necessarily failed to perform its duties.

An empirical assessment should obtain and analyse at least the following information:

(1) dates and attendance of ordinary and extraordinary sessions;

(2) matters referred by the Minister;

(3) subjects and number of opinions or recommendations adopted;

(4) quarterly reports submitted under the decree;

(5) documented responses by the Ministry or other competent bodies;

(6) examples of recommendations incorporated into inventories, restoration projects, research programmes or protection decisions;

(7) any available assessment of implementation. Interviews with Council members, ministry officials, heritage associations and independent specialists could help interpret documentary evidence, but interview claims should be corroborated where possible.

A public annual report could distinguish activities, outputs, responses and outcomes. Suggested indicators include the number of sessions held; number and type of referrals; time taken to issue advice; number of recommendations receiving a documented response; publication rate for non-confidential opinions; and selected examples of implementation. Outcome indicators—such as improved conservation or reduced risk to a particular site—require case-specific evidence and should not be attributed to the Council without a credible causal explanation.

5. International obligations and comparative governance principles

5.1. The 1972 World Heritage Convention

Algeria ratified the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on 24 June 1974. Articles 4 and 5 establish the State's responsibility to identify, protect, conserve, present and transmit cultural and natural heritage to future generations, and call for appropriate policies, services, scientific and technical studies, and legal, administrative and financial measures. The Convention does not require States to establish a council of this particular form, nor does it prescribe that such a council's advice must be binding.

The Convention nevertheless provides a relevant standard for assessing the Council's potential contribution. Its advice may support policy development, priority-setting, research, conservation planning and cooperation between institutions. But the State's international obligations remain obligations of the State; they cannot be treated as discharged merely because an advisory body exists. The relevant question is whether the Council's work is connected to the public authorities and procedures responsible for implementation.

5.2. The 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage

Algeria approved the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage on 15 March 2004, and it entered into force for Algeria on 20 April 2006. Although this article focuses on immovable heritage, the Convention is relevant because the Council's remit also covers intangible heritage. Articles 11–15 address safeguarding measures, inventories, education and awareness, capacity-building and participation by communities, groups and individuals.

The Convention's participatory emphasis provides a useful lens for assessing the Council's composition and working methods. The inclusion of heritage associations may support dialogue, but representation on a council is not a substitute for sustained participation by communities that maintain and transmit heritage. Nor should the legal and practical needs of tangible and intangible heritage be conflated: immovable property often requires conservation and planning controls, while intangible heritage requires attention to transmission, practice and community participation. The Council's structure should accommodate both approaches.

5.3. Comparative principles without unsupported claims

A rigorous comparative section should identify a defined comparator, examine its primary legal instruments and evaluate evidence of actual operation. The available materials reviewed for this study do not support a detailed country-by-country comparison. It would therefore be misleading to claim that a named foreign council is more effective without verified legislation, reporting rules and empirical evidence.

At a functional level, however, several governance principles are relevant. Advisory bodies are more assessable when their mandates and boundaries are clear; when they can receive information from affected stakeholders; when their opinions are recorded; when decision-makers provide a response; and when activity and implementation are reported periodically. These principles are compatible with the institutional and participatory orientation of the UNESCO conventions. They provide a reform framework for Algeria without assuming that any single foreign model can be transplanted unchanged.

Future comparative research should select one or two jurisdictions with a clearly identified heritage advisory institution and compare legal basis, appointment rules, agenda-setting powers, publication of opinions, relationship with statutory decision-makers and annual reporting. The comparison should rely on primary legislation, official reports and relevant scholarship, and should distinguish institutional design from demonstrated outcomes.

6. Discussion

The analysis answers the research question in a qualified way. The legal framework enables the Council to contribute through expertise, policy advice and participation, but does not itself establish that the Council has effectively protected immovable heritage in practice. Four limitations are particularly important.

First, dependence on ministerial referral may restrict the Council's ability to bring emerging or locally identified problems onto its agenda.

Second, the advisory nature of its opinions means that their influence depends on follow-up by competent authorities; without a transparent response mechanism, that influence is difficult to evaluate.

Third, the Council's broad remit must be coordinated with the National Commission for Cultural Property, whose role in classification derives from Law No. 98-04.

Fourth, publicly accessible evidence reviewed for this article is insufficient to establish the Council's actual meeting record, opinions or implementation outcomes since 2021.

These limitations do not establish that the Council is ineffective. Rather, they show that effectiveness remains insufficiently demonstrated on the evidence available. This distinction is central to the article's contribution: it avoids equating the enactment of a decree with institutional success, while also avoiding a negative conclusion based solely on missing public data.

The most proportionate reforms would strengthen the traceability and influence of advice rather than automatically grant the Council binding powers. The Council should be able to propose agenda items and receive submissions through transparent channels; non-confidential opinions should be published; competent authorities should record reasoned responses; and a coordination protocol should clarify the relationship with the National Commission. An annual report should use indicators that distinguish activity from impact. These reforms would make the Council more accountable while preserving the statutory powers of other bodies.

7. Conclusion

This article asked to what extent the legal and institutional framework governing Algeria's Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage enables it to contribute effectively to the protection of immovable cultural heritage, and what constraints limit its role. The analysis of Law No. 98-04 and Executive Decree No. 21-124 shows that the Council has a broad advisory remit, a multidisciplinary composition and a formal structure for periodic work. These features create the potential for expert input and participation, but they do not, on their own, prove operational effectiveness.

Four conclusions follow. First, the Council's dependence on matters referred by the Minister creates a structural limitation on agenda-setting and responsiveness.

Second, the non-binding character of its advice is not necessarily a defect, but the lack of a clear public follow-up system makes it difficult to trace how opinions affect decisions.

Third, the Council's role must be coordinated with the National Commission for Cultural Property, while respecting the Commission's distinct statutory function in classification procedures under Law No. 98-04. Fourth, the available public evidence reviewed for this study does not establish a complete record of meetings, quarterly reports, opinions or implementation since 2021. This evidentiary limitation does not prove inactivity; it means that claims about actual performance require further verification.

The evidence also does not support the categorical assertion that vandalism or neglect caused the Council to be created, nor does the decree establish that the Council itself can take immediate enforcement measures. These claims should be omitted unless supported by official documentation or a clear legal basis.

The article recommends publication of annual activity reports; public access to non-confidential opinions; reasoned responses by the competent authorities; a formal coordination protocol with the National Commission; transparent procedures for receiving proposals from researchers, local authorities and heritage associations; and measurable indicators covering activities, outputs, responses and outcomes. Algeria's obligations under the 1972 and 2003 UNESCO conventions provide an important context for these reforms, particularly regarding institutional capacity, conservation planning, inventories, research and community participation.

The central conclusion is therefore neither that the Council has proven effective nor that it has failed. Rather, the legal framework creates a potentially valuable advisory mechanism whose practical contribution cannot be established without transparent administrative records and evidence linking its advice to decisions and protection outcomes. A subsequent empirical study should examine official reports, interview relevant actors and trace selected recommendations through to their administrative consequences.

References

Primary legal sources

Algeria. Ordinance No. 67-281 of 20 December 1967 concerning excavations and the protection of historical and natural sites and monuments (repealed), Official Journal, No. 7, 23 January 1968.

Algeria. Law No. 98-04 of 15 June 1998 on the protection of cultural heritage, Official Journal, No. 44, 17 June 1998.

Algeria. Executive Decree No. 21-124 of 29 March 2021 establishing the Advisory Council for Cultural Heritage and determining its organisation and functioning, Official Journal, No. 25, 4 April 2021.
UNESCO. Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Paris, 16 November 1972. https://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/
UNESCO. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Paris, 17 October 2003. https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention

Academic literature

Benaicha, Nabila. "Cultural Heritage Advisory Council in Executive Decree 21-124." Journal of Legal and Economic Research, vol. 5, no. 1 (2022), pp. 803–822. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/178570
Badi Boukemidja, Nadjiba. "Mechanisms for Protecting Immovable Cultural Property." Journal of Real Estate and Environmental Law, vol. 8, no. 14 (2020), p. 123 .
Dalimi, Abdullah, and Mohamed Boumediene. "The Role of Administrative Control Bodies in Protecting Cultural Heritage under Law No. 98-04." Journal of Intellectual Dialogue, no. 12 (2017), p. 155 .
Laribi, Medjahed. "The Role of Sovereign National Institutions in Securing and Protecting Archaeological Sites." Al-Ibar Journal for Historical and Archaeological Studies in North Africa, no. 2 (April 2022), p. 474 .
Stoutah, Ghania. "Concept and Composition of Immovable Cultural Property in Algerian Law." Journal of Legal Studies, University of Yahia Fares, Médéa, vol. 9, no. 1 (January 2023), p. 1283 .

Official online sources

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. "Algeria – States Parties to the World Heritage Convention." https://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/dz/
United Nations Treaty Collection. "Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage: Status of Treaties." https://treaties.un.org/pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=080000028006656f