

Distribution Limited

WHC-09/33.COM/7.2  
Paris, 14 May 2009  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF  
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-third session

Seville, Spain  
22 – 30 June 2009

**Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: Examination of the state of conservation  
of World Heritage properties**

**7.2 Report on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism**

**SUMMARY**

This document describes the activities undertaken under the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) by Decision **31 COM 5.2** and provides a report on the implementation of this mechanism with a view to assessing the lessons learned during this period, prior to institutionalizing the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in the *Operational Guidelines*.

**Draft Decision: 33 COM 7.2** see point III

## I. Introduction

1. Following the decision adopted by the Executive Board at its 176th session (176 EX/Special Plenary Meeting/Decision), which “requests the Director-General within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*, to propose to the World Heritage Committee at its forthcoming session a mechanism to ensure the proper implementation of the World Heritage Committee decisions”, the reinforced monitoring mechanism was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Decision **31 COM 5.2**) to allow the sending of one or a series of reports to the World Heritage Committee in the interval between two sessions. In 2007, it was applied to three cases (including seven properties) at the request of the World Heritage Committee: Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany, Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls and the five natural heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. At the meetings of the World Heritage Centre with the Advisory Bodies since September 2007, the mechanism was reviewed and the issues of coordination among the activities discussed. Various operational aspects have been raised, including the lack of resources, lack of clarity about the specific purpose of the mechanism in some cases, calendar and workload implications, and the relationship between Reinforced Monitoring and other established monitoring mechanisms.
2. The Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM) was conceived following the discussions held at the Executive Board of UNESCO as an additional tool for monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties to the existing and long established processes of the World Heritage Committee, i.e. Reactive Monitoring (including in relation to the List of World Heritage in Danger) and Periodic Reporting. It was specifically considered as a tool in relation to the particular circumstances that pertain to the case of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. While the latter two established mechanisms noted above are rooted in the text of the *Convention* (respectively Article 4 and 29 of the *Convention*) this new mechanism does not specifically refer to the *Convention*, nor is its implementation set out in the *Operational Guidelines*. There was no prior discussion in advance of the World Heritage Committee session, and thus the new mechanism was not fully considered in relation to the *Operational Guidelines* or the established processes of the World Heritage Committee. Thus the concept has had far less consideration than the other operational mechanisms of the World Heritage Committee, and was introduced after a short debate over one World Heritage Committee session, without the level of consultation or consideration of all the operational aspects. This situation has inevitably resulted in a new mechanism that suffers from several operational deficiencies.
3. The World Heritage Committee decided to apply the RMM to the following World Heritage properties at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). All these properties were included at that time on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and Committee members highlighted the risk of overlap with the other existing tools.
  - Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany)
  - Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls
  - Five natural heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: Virunga National Park, Kahuzi-Biega National Park, Garamba National Park, Salonga National Park, and Okapi Wildlife Reserve.
4. The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) enlarged the application of the RMM to 4 additional properties reaching a total of 11 cases. It continues to be applied for the seven properties requested in 2007 noting that they are all on the List of World Heritage in Danger although the four additional properties are not:

- Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)
  - Timbuktu (Mali)
  - Bordeaux, Port of the moon (France)
  - Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan)
5. The application of the RMM to properties not included on the List of World Heritage in Danger has been noted as a key concern regarding the operation of the RMM, as it was adopted in each of the four cases as an alternative to the consideration of inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger . This, in the view of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, resulted in the RMM cutting directly across one of the longest established processes of the *Convention*, and a requirement of the *Convention* itself. The suggestion that a mechanism that is not specified in the *Operational Guidelines* and does not yet have its operational aspects properly defined would be regarded as a meaningful alternative to the List of World Heritage in Danger clearly exposes the *Convention* to the charge of lacking credibility and directly undermines the establishment of the List of World Heritage in Danger as required in Article 11.4 of the *Convention*. The “exceptional” nature anticipated for the RMM has not been defined to date and the lack of a definition is a single most significant concern, about the RMM, as at the 32nd session, the mechanism was not adopted in exceptional cases but in all four cases where the property met the requirements for inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger. If this continues in the future, given the present rate of growth of the RMM, the number of properties to which it is applied will rapidly exceed the number of properties included in the World Heritage List in Danger. Thus, there is an urgent need to restrict the mechanism to exceptional cases as originally conceived.
6. The Committee decision requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to refine the operational aspects of the RMM. This needs to be done in the light of the experience of the RMM and the positive results and concerns that have been raised during this first period of operation (2 years).

## **II. Application of the RMM to the World Heritage properties**

A preliminary analysis of the operation of the RMM was carried out by the World Heritage Centre via input from the relevant desks and in discussion with the Advisory Bodies.

### **A. RMM requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session**

7. Application of the RMM to the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls: The RMM adopted by Decision **31 COM 7A.18** requested a report every two months from the World Heritage Centre, until its 32nd session in 2008, focussing on the issue of the Mughrabi Ascent in the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. Decision **32 COM 7A.18** requested a report every three months. Since 2007, three missions were undertaken (see Annex 2) and six reports were sent to the Committee (6 October 2007, 5 February 2008, 6 March 2008, 5 June 2008, 2 October 2008, 12 March 2009) informing the members of the World Heritage Committee regularly on the situation. These missions were funded through the World Heritage Fund resources allocated to List of World Heritage in Danger. In this case, the RMM provided a regular up-date to the World Heritage Committee on the situation between two sessions.
8. Application of the RMM to the “Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany)”: The RMM was adopted by Decision **31 COM 7A. 21** as a response to the issues arising from the

Waldschloesschen bridge project, the construction of which the Committee considered that it might “irreversibly damage the values and integrity of the property”. The judicial process had been exhausted before the RMM started, and the World Heritage Committee decided to apply RMM in order to enhance the efforts to find appropriate alternative solutions to protect the outstanding universal value and integrity of the World Heritage property. No mission was requested by the World Heritage Committee, but one was invited later on by the State Party authorities (e.g. the mission to Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) in February 2008 to assess the possible adverse impact of a proposed bridge on the river Elbe).

9. RMM was further applied with the objective to frequently inform the World Heritage Committee on all steps taken by the State Party and the consultations held with World Heritage Centre. While the World Heritage Committee had decided to “delete the property from the World Heritage List in the event that the construction of the bridge has an irreversible impact on the outstanding universal value of the property” (Decision **31 COM 7A.27**), it decided at its 32nd session to continue applying the RMM to the property and requested the State Party to provide progress reports as relevant and to submit a report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 (Decision **32 COM 7A.26**). Although requested, no progress reports were submitted by the State Party during 2008, and the update report submitted by the Permanent Delegation of Germany on 28 January 2009 pointed out that all legal procedures at Courts concerning the halting or changing the current bridge crossing project had been completed with the result that the bridge is being built as planned. Given that the judicial process was considered exhausted before the RMM was applied, RMM could not significantly contribute to change the situation. Political commitment as well as media attention had already been obtained earlier through the World Heritage Committee’s decision to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in July 2006. It could be concluded in this case that the only benefit of the use of the RMM was to provide additional information. It is however considered essential to use RMM as a more frequent reporting mechanism for properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
10. Application of the RMM to the 5 properties of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the Committee decided to apply the RMM to monitor the 5 properties in DRC inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (**31COM7A.32**). Following the killing of several mountain gorillas in Virunga National Park and at the request of the DRC authorities, a Reinforced Monitoring mission was sent to Virunga in August 2007. The mission was able to conduct an investigation about the killings and was able to demonstrate how an illegal charcoal producing network, with alleged involvement of certain ICCN staff, was responsible for the killings. The report was sent to the Chairperson and the members of the Committee as well as to the State Party. The Chairperson decided not to make the report public or disseminate to other involved stakeholders. This limited the impact of the report.
11. No immediate specific actions were taken by the Committee following the report. A reactive monitoring mission was undertaken to the Okapi Wildlife Reserve from 24 February to 2 March 2009. Through the World Heritage Biodiversity Programme for DRC, funded by Belgium, United Nations Foundation and Italy, the World Heritage Centre is able to follow up on the situation in the DRC sites on an almost daily basis in close cooperation with the protected area authority and other stakeholders. This enables a swift reaction to new developments and identifying appropriate responses. As reported in State of Conservation reports to the Committee, the World Heritage Centre has been able to provide adequate support on several occasions in response to urgent crisis situations. It needs to be noted that this follow up is only possible as a full time staff person is employed by the project for this purpose. Follow up could also be more efficient if it could be decentralized. The advent of the RMM did not change the way the World

Heritage Centre was following up the DRC sites, but provided an additional mandate for the World Heritage Centre to do so. The experience in DRC suggests that a mechanism for the Committee to make decisions in between sessions in reaction to urgent developments and crisis can be useful. A possible alternative to do this might be for the Committee to give a specific mandate for this to the Chairperson to take decisions (perhaps also in consultation with the vice-chairpersons) in between sessions. The RMM was supported by the national authorities as an additional tool to be able to voice their concerns on critical issues to the Committee. The Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism Report of this property was sent to the members of the World Heritage Committee on 12 March 2009.

## **B. RMM requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session**

12. Application of the RMM to the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru): The Committee decided to apply the RMM for two years (2008-2010) but without justifying it specifically (Decision **32 COM 7B.44**). The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the international community to work closely with the State Party to provide additional technical and financial support to enhance both local and national capacities to urgently and effectively implement corrective measures, and requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS/ IUCN mission to start an Action Plan for the property, as part of the revised Management Plan. There was a formal request from the Committee to be kept informed of the results of the Reactive Monitoring mission and on any information relevant for the conservation of the outstanding universal value of the property. The State Party was also urged to consider requesting inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in Danger. A reactive monitoring mission to the site was carried out from 19 to 23 January 2009 and the report on the results of this mission within the framework of the RMM was sent to the members of the World Heritage Committee on 12 March 2009. With the exception of the report to the Committee on the mission, the other activities were undertaken in line with the normal processes for a Reactive Monitoring mission.
13. Application of the RMM to Samarkand, Crossroad of Cultures (Uzbekistan): When deciding to apply the RMM to the case of Samarkand (Decision **32 COM 7B.79**), the World Heritage Committee did not specify the nature or the periodicity of the required reporting. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, in consultation with the State Party, decided to organise a mission, from 10 to 15 March 2009, to the property and prepare a report to be submitted to the Committee as soon as available, i.e. before its 33rd Session. The report was sent to the members of the World Heritage Committee on 14 May 2009. The report was able to provide updated information on the new Master plan to assess its impacts on the conservation of the historic fabric. With the exception of the report to the Committee on the mission, the other activities were undertaken in line with the normal processes for a Reactive Monitoring mission. The use of the RMM in this case, suggests that, in the future, it would be desirable if all decisions by the Committee to apply the RMM were always accompanied by an indication of the nature and periodicity of the required reporting.
14. Application of the RMM to Timbuktu (Mali): The RMM was applied to this property by Decision **32 COM 7B.49**, requesting the State Party to implement a series of corrective measures in order to mitigate the threats which the property has been facing. Subsequently, a state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party to the Centre by the deadline of 1 February 2009. A joint WHC/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited Timbuktu on 26 March to 02 April 2009 in order to review the progress reported by the State Party. The mission was used to encourage strongly the national authorities to implement the corrective measures before the inauguration of the Ahmed

Baba Centre and to report as soon as possible to the Committee. With the exception of the report to the Committee on the mission, the other activities were undertaken in line with the normal processes for a Reactive Monitoring mission. The RMM was requested by the Committee without any detail on its nature or timeframe. It was only requested within the framework of the RMM in order to report on the results of this mission and on any other relevant decision with a view to establishing prioritization and a timetable. Because of this mixture between two monitoring processes, the RMM was not well understood by the national authorities nor appreciated as it was not accompanied by technical or financial support. A RMM report was sent to the members of the Committee on 14 May 2009.

15. Application of the RMM to Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France): The World Heritage Committee by its Decision **32 COM 7B.89**, asked to be informed, within the framework of the RMM, of the results of the Reactive Monitoring mission and of any information relevant for the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, threatened by the destruction of the Pertuis Bridge by the State Party, and the project of a drawbridge over the Garonne. However, the Committee did not specify any indication of the periodicity of the required reporting or on its duration. Furthermore, the Committee strongly urged the State Party to consider requesting inscription of the property on the List of the World Heritage in Danger and a report on the state of conservation of the property, including the results of the different impact studies, was requested for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, with a view to considering the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List. Subsequently, a state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party to the Centre by the deadline of 1 February 2009 and a joint WHC/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 20 to 22 January 2009 to the site. A RMM report was sent to the members of the Committee on 14 May 2009.
16. It should be noted that since the last Committee session, collaboration and exchanges of information between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have been further enhanced. However, it is difficult to confirm whether this is a result of the application of the RMM to this property, or the possible future consideration by the Committee of In-Danger Listing or of deletion from the List. According to the joint mission, the RMM concept and related expectations are perceived as an additional process alongside the already established state of conservation process. With the exception of the report to the Committee on the mission, the other activities were undertaken in line with the normal processes for a Reactive Monitoring mission. In the future, decisions by the Committee with a view to applying the RMM should give a clear indication of the nature and periodicity of the required reporting, its duration and the process for taking related decisions.

### **C. Specific cases of application of the RMM to World Heritage properties**

- Application of the RMM to the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia)
17. The application of the RMM to the property of the Temple of Preah Vihear was decided by the Director-General in response to a request for a mission by the State Party, following the shooting incident of 15 October 2008, which resulted in casualties and some damage to the property. The mission's objectives are to assess the damage caused to the property by the incidents as well as the progress made by the State Party in implementing the recommendations by the Committee (Decision **32 COM 8B.102**). This is the first case where the RMM has been applied outside a Committee session. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the Director-General has always the prerogative to request for a reactive monitoring mission outside of the Committee sessions in case of emergency, and so in this case the activity could happen without the RMM.

- Application of the RMM to the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo, **(Serbia)**
18. The authorities of Serbia, by letter of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, dated 29 October 2008, requested the Director General of UNESCO to apply the RMM to the property in order “to ensure timely implementation of the World Heritage Committee’s decisions relating to the protection of these monuments in danger”. Subsequently, a state of conservation report was submitted to the World Heritage Centre for the deadline of 1 February 2009. Furthermore, a mission to the site was carried out from 19 to 22 January 2009 by the UNESCO BRESCE Office which recommended applying RMM. After having carefully considered the situation, the Director-General decided to apply the RMM to this property on 1 April 2009. Further information is provided in working Document *WHC-09/33 COM/7A.Add*.

### **III. Refinement of the Operational Aspects**

19. This section outlines the operational aspects for the RMM that have been identified by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies as requested in Decision **31 COM 5.2**. These reflect the experience of the first two years of operation and also ensure the possible use of the RMM is undertaken in ways that support and do not contradict the *Operational Guidelines* to the *World Heritage Convention*, and the decision introducing the RMM. These operational aspects will be followed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in relation to the recommended use of the RMM, until such time as the RMM may be agreed to be institutionalised in the *Operational Guidelines*.

#### **Principles for operation**

20. It was understood during the 31st session of the Committee that the RMM would apply to properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger (Dresden, Jerusalem and the five DRC properties). However, there was a change during its 32nd session, when the World Heritage Committee took decisions that to apply the RMM to four other properties which are not inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger.
21. The use of the RMM in relation to properties not inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger creates considerable potential for ambiguity and confusion between the RMM and the existing system of reactive monitoring, especially given that the above analysis suggests that the RMM does not add value to the decision-making process of the Committee. A further concern is to ensure that there can be no suggestion that the RMM is somehow being used as a tool to avoid the In Danger Listing because this would represent an undermining of the established mechanisms of the *Convention* and create a significant risk to the credibility of the *Convention* and to a process that is established in the *Convention* itself.
22. Based on the analysis of the applications of the RMM to date, the mechanism should be used in exceptional situations, where action is required between sessions to properties where there is a critical danger of the property losing its Outstanding Universal Value between sessions. RMM is not useful for properties where the existing reactive monitoring mechanism can be used. In most cases, the existing experience also suggests that there is potential for confusion about the operation of RMM and its relationship with other monitoring and reporting processes for national authorities and other stakeholders.
23. It should be noted that unforeseen additional reports and missions create an additional workload for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies which is not always manageable and the necessary funds may not be available.

24. The operational aspects of RMM therefore require consideration of the following factors, as discussed below: process of activation of RMM, exceptional nature of the situations considered for RMM, activities, reporting, time frames, and budget. Recommendations arising from the preliminary analysis are suggested for each of these aspects.

### **Activation of RMM**

25. As per the document creating the RMM (*WHC-07/31.COM/5.2*), the World Heritage Committee can activate this mechanism during its sessions.

26. Between two sessions of the World Heritage Committee, the Director-General of UNESCO can activate it if he receives information regarding critical issues in relation to the implementation of the Committee's decision and after having verified and received comments from the State Party concerned. Since the last session of the World Heritage Committee, this was the case for Preah Vihear (Cambodia) and the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo.

27. It is specified in Decision **31 COM 5.2**, that the RMM can be activated only "in exceptional and specific cases". In order to define the operational aspects of this request, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that to ensure that the use of the RMM is exceptional, it should only be recommended for activation:

- At a Committee session, the Committee considers that there is a significant likelihood that a property that is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be threatened in a way that might lead to the loss of its Outstanding Universal Value, and therefore deletion from the World Heritage List;
- At a Committee session where the level of political issue involved is of such an overriding nature that the involvement of the Chairperson of the Committee in missions may be required. In essence, these cases will be those where intervention at the most senior levels of political leadership in a State Party (ie Prime Ministerial/Royalty/Presidential) is required.
- Between Committee sessions where the Director-General, having consulted the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, considers that there is an overriding likelihood of a property losing its Outstanding Universal Value, such that urgent action is required that cannot wait for a decision by the Committee. Such situations would be extremely rare, and most likely may arise from conflict situations. It may be noted that the only property to be deleted from the World Heritage List (The Arabian Oryx Sanctuary, Oman) was not included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Nature of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism**

28. It is clearly stated in the document creating the RMM (*WHC-07/31.COM/5.2*) that the World Heritage Committee should decide on the nature of the RMM, i.e. the type of activities which should be implemented such as reports, consultation with specialists, missions of experts, etc. This variety gives flexibility and can fit each particular case.

29. As mentioned above, in the case of Samarkand (Uzbekistan), the Committee did not specify the nature and periodicity of the required reporting. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, in consultation with the State Party, decided to organise a mission to the property and prepare a report to be submitted to the Committee for the 33rd session.

30. The dispatch of missions under the RMM depends also on the situation of the property. In some cases, no mission was requested by the World Heritage Committee, but was invited later by the State Party authorities (e.g. the mission to Dresden Elbe Valley

(Germany) in February 2008). Whatever is the nature of the activities proposed, the RMM was always undertaken in full consultation with the State Party and with its consent.

31. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that given the exceptional nature foreseen for the RMM, and the additional workload that could result from it, that the RMM should also only be considered when the normal mechanisms of the *Convention* are not sufficient. Examples of activities that are not normally taken within the context of these processes but could be part of the application of the RMM include:
- High level missions to assess the State of Conservation of properties by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies that require the participation of the Chairperson;
  - Decisions of the Chairperson on action required between sessions of the World Heritage Committee, having consulted the five vice chairs;
  - Situations where intercession by the Director-General of UNESCO with the Director-General/Head of other international bodies;
  - Situations with a requirement for the highest level of intervention within a State Party;
32. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will seek to ensure as an operational aspect of the RMM, that there is a specific identification of the activities that will be required. The RMM should not be applied in cases where the existing mechanisms of State of Conservation reporting, reactive monitoring missions, In Danger Listing can address the required actions.

### **Reporting**

33. Reporting to the World Heritage Committee is carried out whatever is the nature of the RMM. However it should be noted that reporting to the Committee depends on the information available. In all cases, reports of missions were sent to the Committee members as soon as they were available. These reports were also made available as documents to the annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee.
34. Reporting to the World Heritage Committee between two sessions appears to be the central advantage of the RMM as it allows the Committee to be informed on a regular basis on serious threats to specific World Heritage properties.
35. It should be noted also that the translation of the RMM reports into two working languages was difficult as no budget was foreseen (see budget below).
36. A key operational aspect of RMM is that reports, to be meaningful should be completed quickly and distributed to the Committee as soon as they are completed. The reports should indicate decisions to be taken by the Director-General or Chairperson of the Committee without reference to the World Heritage Committee, and those matters where decisions will need to wait for the following Committee Session.

### **Timeframe of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism**

37. It is clearly stated in the document creating the RMM (*WHC-07/31.COM/5.2*) that the World Heritage Committee should decide also on the timeframe for the application of the RMM. The timeframe means the periodicity of the activities (missions and/or report) but also on the duration of the mechanism (the RMM will apply for one year; two years...).
38. The **periodicity** of an activity should match the needs identified. In the case of Jerusalem, a report is requested every three months.

39. Concerning the **duration** of the application of the RMM, it is generally not specified except in the case of Machu Picchu which was specifically requested for a two-year duration although without a clear rationale for this. It should be noted that a long duration (several years, for example) pre-empts the Committee's decision in case the state of conservation has tremendously improved and the RMM is not anymore needed.
40. As an operational aspect, the Committee should be advised to apply the RMM occur on an annual basis until the next session of the Committee, with the possibility of extension. In view of the exceptional nature of RMM and its significant costs, the RMM should not be applied on an ongoing basis, and a ceiling of 2 years should be sought for its application.

### **Budget of the RMM**

41. When the mechanism was discussed at the 32nd session, the issue of lack of resources was raised, notably in order to undertake the required missions and the translation of the final reports to be sent to the Committee, as no funds were allocated with Decision **31 COM 5.2**. For this reason, the Committee decided to allocate an amount of US\$ 50,000 for the implementation of the RMM from the World Heritage fund for 2008-2009 (**32 COM 7.3**). This amount was considered as a lump sum for all properties under RMM. It appeared to be insufficient, even without mentioning the cost of the additional staff time of the activities for the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Such a provision based on real costs should be foreseen in a systematic manner in future for each property being put under reinforced monitoring.
42. Given the well documented strain on the human and financial resources available to the World Heritage Committee, it is also important to query whether the outcomes from the application of RMM have occurred in a manner which is efficient.
43. The RMM could be linked to other World Heritage processes such as the international assistance and could mean that the properties under RMM could get priority for international assistance if requested by the State Party.
44. As an operational aspect it is essential that prior to adopting decisions to apply the RMM, the Committee clearly considers the costs and indicates the source of the budget. A priority could be given to properties under RMM within the framework of international assistance.

### **Results of and follow up to the RMM**

45. The main potential advantage of the RMM is to inform the Committee members during the year in between two sessions, as a tool to follow the implementation of the Committee's decisions. This result has been achieved to some extent so far, although a more detailed consideration of the costs and benefits of this achievement has not been carried out.
46. In terms of conservation of properties, the question to be asked is: does this mechanism help in improving the state of conservation of the concerned properties being considered for inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger, and are these improvements beyond the capacity of existing monitoring and reporting mechanisms?
47. It is considered that the Chairperson could be entrusted by the Committee to decide, after having consulted the Director General of UNESCO, World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, any action needed to remedy an urgent situation in the most exceptional circumstances where the RMM is applied.

48. More time is needed to reflect on the usefulness of the above-mentioned operational aspects. In addition, they may be applied on an experimental and transitory basis before being institutionalized within the *Operational Guidelines*. The RMM could be reviewed by the Committee in 2011 at its 35th session.

### **III. Draft Decision**

#### ***Draft Decision: 33 COM 7.2***

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7.2,
2. Recalling Decisions **31 COM 5.2** and **32 COM 7.3** adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), and 32nd sessions (Quebec City, 2008) respectively,
3. Notes the report on the implementation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM);
4. Takes note of the operational aspects that have been refined by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies as requested in Decision **31 COM 5.2**, in view of the requirements of this decision that the RMM be activated in exceptional and specific cases;
5. Requests the World Heritage Centre to provide to the members of the World Heritage Committee a report on each activity undertaken within the RMM, as soon as it is available;
6. Sets a ceiling on the budget for the operation of the RMM at US\$ 50,000 per year, to include the costs of World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in its operation, and agrees that each decision to apply the RMM will be accompanied by a costing to ensure that the activity foreseen is within the available budget for the RMM;
7. Considers that RMM activities beyond this ceiling will require extra budgetary funding;
8. Decides to review the RMM in 2011 at its 35th session.

**Decision: 31 COM 5.2**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-07/31.COM/5.2,
2. Recalling the decision adopted by the Executive Board at its 176th session (176 EX/Special Plenary Meeting/Decision), which “requests the Director-General within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*, to propose to the World Heritage Committee at its forthcoming session a mechanism to ensure the proper implementation of the World Heritage Committee decisions”,
3. Affirming that nothing in the present decision shall affect each State Party’s primary duty to ensure the identification, protection and conservation of World Heritage properties, as stipulated in Article 4 of the *World Heritage Convention*;
4. Adopts with immediate effect, the reinforced monitoring mechanism proposed by the Director-General to ensure the proper implementation of the World Heritage Committee’s decisions and requests the World Heritage Centre to refine the operational aspects of this mechanism in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies, and with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee;
5. Acknowledges that the verification process under the reinforced monitoring mechanism may be activated in exceptional and specific cases either by the World Heritage Committee or the Director-General and underlines that reinforced monitoring is a constant cooperative process with the State Party concerned, which will always be undertaken in full consultation and with its approval;
6. Calls on the States Parties to contribute to resource mobilization with a view to reinforcing the monitoring of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as foreseen in the *World Heritage Convention*;
7. Requests the World Heritage Centre to present to the World Heritage Committee, at its 33rd session in 2009, a report regarding the implementation of the reinforced monitoring mechanism with a view to assessing the lessons learned during this period, prior to institutionalizing the reinforced monitoring mechanism in the *Operational Guidelines*.

**World Heritage properties in the Republic Democratic of Congo  
(Decision 31 COM 7A.32)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
11-21 August 2007 (RMM mission to Virunga)	29 November 2007	Decision to be taken by Committee (32COM)	Missions to Virunga National Park requested by DRC authorities following the slaughter of five gorillas late July 2007. The joint mission UNESCO/IUCN/UNEP was undertaken with the logistical support of MONUC
24 February-2 March 2009	12 March 2009	Decision to be taken by Committee (33COM)	Principal Senior Adviser to the President for environment will participate to the next session of the Committee (Seville, 2009)

**Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (Monitoring report every two months) (Decision 31 COM 7A. 18)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
28-31 August 2007	6 October 2007 (1st report)	Organisation of Encounter	
12-15 January 2008	5 February 2008 (2nd report)	Organisation of the follow-up meeting	Encounter between Israeli, Jordanian and Waqf experts requested by the Committee
23-25 February 2008	6 March 2008 (3rd report)	Follow-up meeting	Follow-up meeting
————	End May 2008 (4th report)	Decision 32COM 7A.18	
	2 October 2008 (5th report)	Organisation of follow-up meeting	Follow-up meeting of 12 November 2008 postponed
	12 March 2009 (6th report)	<b>Decision to be taken by the Committee (33 COM)</b>	

**Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany)**  
**(Decision 31 COM 7A. 21)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
4-5 February 2008	10 April 2008	none	Mission requested by the City of Dresden and cover letter officially forwarded by the national authorities
-----	9 March 2009	<b>Decision to be taken by the Committee (33 COM)</b>	Update information will be presented orally at 33 COM

**Machu Picchu (Peru)**  
**(Decision 32 COM 7B. 44)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
19-23 January 2009	12 March 2009	Decision to be taken by the Committee (33COM)	RMM requested for two years

**Timbuktu (Mali)**  
**(Decision 32 COM 7B. 49)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
26 March-2 April 2009	14 May 2009	Decision to be taken by the <b>Committee (33 COM)</b>	RMM was used to encourage strongly the national authorities to implement the corrective measures before the inauguration of the Ahmed Baba Centre and to report as soon as possible to the Committee

**Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France)**  
**(Decision 32 COM 7B. 89)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
20-22 January 2009	14 May 2009	Decision to be taken by the <b>Committee (33 COM)</b>	

**Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan)  
(Decision 32 COM 7B. 79)**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
10 to 15 March 2009	14 May 2009	Decision to be taken by Committee (33COM)	Mission not requested and nature and periodicity of the required reporting not specified by the World Heritage Committee at its 32 <sup>nd</sup> Session (Quebec City, 2008)

**Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia)  
(Decision 32 COM 7B.102 )**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
26 March-1 April 2009 by UNESCO Phnom Penh Office		Decision to be taken by Committee (33COM)	Director-General decided to apply RMM on 30 December 2008

**Medieval Monuments in Kosovo [Serbia]  
(Decision 32 COM 7A.27 )**

<b>Dates of the missions</b>	<b>Date report sent to WH Committee</b>	<b>Follow up</b>	<b>Notes</b>
January 2009 by UNESCO BRESCE Office		Decision to be taken by Committee (33COM)	Director-General decided to apply RMM on 1 April 2009