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- **5** Sub-regions
- **48** States Parties (10 in Western Europe)
- **248** reports for **244** sites (inscribed up to 1998)
- use of electronic online tool
- Cooperation: World Heritage Centre, States Parties, ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN
1st cycle Periodic Reporting for Western Europe

- Section I: 10 States Parties
  (available on WHC web site for each country)
- Section II: 8 States Parties
  (available on WHC website for each site inscribed up to 1998)

72 Sites under Section II from:

- Austria: 3 reports
- France: 23 reports (incl. 1 transboundary site with Spain)
- Germany: 19 reports
- Ireland: 2 reports
- Luxembourg: 1 report
- The Netherlands: 4 reports
- Switzerland: 3 reports
- United Kingdom: 17 reports
### First Cycle of Periodic Reporting – by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>States Parties</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia &amp; the Pacific</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL: 496 properties from 146 States Parties**
## World Heritage in Western Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Party</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>P.R.</th>
<th>Tentative List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 PR</td>
<td>11 (28/01/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (04/04/2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23 PR</td>
<td>35 (29/06/2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19 PR</td>
<td>14 (06/10/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 PR</td>
<td>8 (28/09/1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 PR</td>
<td>2 (01/10/1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 PR</td>
<td>12 (13/02/2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 PR</td>
<td>2 (29/11/2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17 PR</td>
<td>15 (19/01/2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To reaffirm OUV as the basis of all World Heritage processes

Outstanding Universal Value

Nomination  Inscription  Periodic Reporting (6 year cycle)

Reactive Monitoring (Missions)
## Next cycle of Periodic Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Retrospective Inventory</th>
<th>Launch of second Cycle of PR</th>
<th>Sessions of the World Heritage Committee</th>
<th>Year of Examination by Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>2006/2008</td>
<td>2008/2010</td>
<td>34th session</td>
<td>June-July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>20010/2011</td>
<td>2011/2013</td>
<td>37th session</td>
<td>June-July 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistics on the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

World Heritage properties having neither a **Statement of Significance**
or a **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

- Arab States: 45 / 65 (70%) [31 Jul 2009]
- Africa: 43 / 76 (57%) [1 Feb 2010]
- Asia & Pacific: 109 / 182 (60%) [1 Feb 2011]
- Latin America: 76 / 120 (63%) [1 Feb 2011]
- Europe & N. America: 222 / 436 (51%) [1 Feb 2012]

Preparation is a crucial aspect of this process (⇒ workshops in the regions and specifically in the Arab and African States)
Periodic Reporting Meeting for Western Europe, Dublin, Ireland, 14-16 December 2009

Statistical analysis (through electronic evaluation tool)
Qualitative Analysis (detailed data sheets)

Netherlands
Schokland and surroundings

1. Introduction
Year of recognition: 1999
Agency responsible for site management:
- Dutch Government Department for Conservation
- Netherlands Committee for Monuments (Weerestichting Monumenten) (WeMO)

2. Statement of Significance

Irland
Skeigh Michael

1. Introduction
Year of recognition: 1990
Agency responsible for site management:
- Ministry of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government
- Heritage Council
- e-mail: heritage@heritage.ie

2. Statement of Significance

Germany
Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town of Quedlinburg

1. Introduction
Year of recognition: 1996
Agency responsible for site management:
- Quedlinburg District Administration
- Quedlinburg Castle Administration

2. Statement of Significance

Statutory provided by the State Party

Ireland
Skeigh Michael

1. Introduction
Year of recognition: 1990
Agency responsible for site management:
- Ministry of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government
- Heritage Council
- e-mail: heritage@heritage.ie

2. Statement of Significance

Statutory provided by the State Party

Statement of Significance

The presentation is based on the assumption that the site is of exceptional importance as it is the only known example of a medieval town with a castle in the same location. It has been designated as a World Heritage site by UNESCO, and its conservation and management are the responsibility of the State Party. The site includes important archaeological and historical features, including the castle and the old town, which are of significant cultural and historical value. The site is also recognized for its exceptional architectural and historical significance, and its cultural heritage.

The site has been the subject of extensive research and analysis, and its conservation and management are ongoing. The site is managed by the State Party, and its conservation and management are subject to regular review and monitoring. The site is also included in the UNESCO World Heritage List, and its conservation and management are subject to regular review and monitoring.

The site is also recognized for its exceptional architectural and historical significance, and its cultural heritage. The site has been the subject of extensive research and analysis, and its conservation and management are ongoing. The site is managed by the State Party, and its conservation and management are subject to regular review and monitoring. The site is also included in the UNESCO World Heritage List, and its conservation and management are subject to regular review and monitoring.
Follow-up to Periodic Reporting

Publication of the European synthesis: World Heritage papers

- English: 

- Français: 

- Datasheets for State Parties and sites (until 1998) included in the publication (CD ROM)

- Numerous follow-up workshops
Requests to the World Heritage Committee

Streamline the Committee’s decisions
Revision of Statement of Significance / New Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
Clarifications / changes of boundaries
Creation / changes of buffer zones
Changes of names
Changes of criteria / re-nomination

Decision 30 COM 11 G
Do not enter into the limit imposed by the Suzhou-Cairns Decision: significant changes if requested;
Requests submitted were reviewed in 2008/09
Specific Expected Results for Western Europe

- PREPARATION of Statements of Significance / Statements of Outstanding Universal Value
- CLARIFICATION and (RE)DEFINITION of boundaries of the properties
- IMPROVEMENT / PREPARATION of management plans / management systems
- HARMONIZATION of Tentative Lists

Others issues:
- enhancing regional cooperation programmes
- ensuring new partnerships and funding (incl. EC)
Statement of Significance / Statement of OUV

- **Operational Guidelines:** Annex 7, § II.2 (PR General)
- **Process:** drafted by State Party collaboration with the Word Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies (IUCN / ICOMOS)
- **Training:** by ICCROM (January 2008)
- **Attention:** Working Document WHC-09/33 COM/13 with **DRAFT format** has not been adopted by the Committee (see Decision 33 COM 13)

**Examples of SoS:** provided by North America in 30 COM/11B
Statement of Significance
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Statement of Significance (OG 2002)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OG 2005, §154-155)

Statement (description)
Justification (criteria)
Authenticity
Integrity

Statement of Significance of OUV
Boundaries and buffer zones

• Many sites inscribed before 1998 do not have clearly defined boundaries
• 20 sites (27%) consider that their boundaries are inadequate
• 52 inscribed sites before 1998 do not have a buffer zone (28 of these sites wish to create a buffer zone)
• Need for new boundaries and creation or redefinition of a buffer zone
• Elaboration of new maps of the boundaries using new technologies (example of French Atlas)
Boundaries and buffer zones
Boundaries and buffer zones

A) **Clarification** of the existing boundaries through the Retrospective Inventory
   - Operational Guidelines: not specified
   - Deadline for procedures: 6 months before Committee (for noting), 1st February

B) **Minor** modifications of the boundaries
   - Operational Guidelines: § 163-164
   - Deadline for procedures: 6 months before Committee (for approval), 1st February

C) **Extensions / Major** modifications of the boundaries
   - Operational Guidelines: § 165
   - Deadline for procedures: 18 months before Committee (for approval), 1st February
### Clarification for Boundaries – Retrospective Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Party</th>
<th>WHC letter</th>
<th>Information requested</th>
<th>Satisfactory answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>24/01/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>4 sites</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>25/01/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>2 sites</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>24/01/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>24 sites</td>
<td>10/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13/04/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>20 sites</td>
<td>8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>09/03/07</td>
<td>1 site</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>28/07/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>1 site</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>24/06/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>3 sites</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>15/09/05</td>
<td>3 sites</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>24/05/05; 03/09/07</td>
<td>11 sites</td>
<td>9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total answer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>69 sites</strong></td>
<td><strong>41/69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management plan / system

- 60% of sites in Europe (until 1998) do not have planning legislation developed specifically to protect World Heritage
- Need for an adequate and sustainable management plan (many sites do not have a management plan or consider that their management plan should be improved)
- Less than 50% of sites have a follow-up programme
- Lack of specific tourism management plans, as more than 75% of the sites are tourist destinations
Management plans
Management plan / system

- Lack of understanding or interpretation of the management plan concept and implementation
- Differences between countries for management systems (private or public institutions)
- Need for better funding (no international assistance from UNESCO / World Heritage Fund)
- Need to share best practice
### Tentative List

Harmonization of the Tentative Lists to improve the representativity (over-representation of cultural properties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of sites</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tentative List

- Operational Guidelines: Chapter II.C
- Deadline for procedures: preferably 1 year prior to the submission of the any nomination (§65)
- Tentative List should be re-examined/re-submitted every 10 years
- Take into account the Global Strategy (OG II B), the Gap Analysis (IUCN 2004; ICOMOS 2004 – 28 COM) and specific thematic studies
- Cooperate with other countries on specific themes (e.g. Le Corbusier, Primeval Forests)
- Review results of the Vilm meeting on Tentative Lists for natural heritage (May 2007)
Other changes

Name changes

- Operational Guidelines: § 167
- Deadline for procedures: 3 months prior to the World Heritage Committee

Changes to existing criteria

- Operational Guidelines: § 166
- Deadline for procedures: 1st February for all re-nominations (at best 18 months procedure before Committee approval)
Weaknesses Western Europe

• High number of World Heritage properties: workload;
• Awareness for heritage, but not always a good understanding of the Convention or of World Heritage;
• Lack of systematic approach to Tentative Lists / nominations;
• Need to harmonize Tentative Lists;
• Lack of integration between natural and cultural heritage;
• Need for information management plans and buffer zones;
• Difficulties to implement management plans;
• Lack of coordination, dilution of responsibilities;
• Reorganization of functions and loss of expertise, and division of responsibility between central and local governments;
• Lack of local resources, and/or irregular resources.
Salzkammergut Cultural Landscape, Austria
Strengths Western Europe

- Strong governmental, public awareness and interest in heritage;
- Enhanced World Heritage dynamics: integrated development schemes;
- Sound legal basis/regulatory tools for protection of heritage;
- General support from governments for Tentative Lists and nominations;
- Good network of professionals in heritage conservation;
- Good national data survey systems;
- Considerable involvement of the private sector;
- Strong international solidarity through international cooperation (national, regional, and local levels), and active solidarity;
- Active involvement of NGO’s and civil society;
- Measures and incentives to promote information/education on heritage.
Recommandations for Western Europe
Specific recommendations

- Follow up of WHC letter (changes to names, boundaries, criteria or Statements of Significance/OUV) and Retrospective Inventory
- Re-establish the balance between different categories of sites/Revision of Tentative Lists
- Need for a better cooperation between the 5 sub-regions to improve the representativity
- Encourage the nomination of transnational/serial sites to enhance international cooperation
- Training/information programmes for all relevant groups for improved management of World Heritage
Specific recommendations

- Dissemination of best practice models adapted to sites in the region;
- Programme to strengthen national legislations for the protection of World Heritage (co-operation between the different levels of responsible authorities);
- Integration of the World Heritage sites in overall planning processes;
- Organisation of sub-regional seminars and workshops with specific themes and ensure funding (extrabudgetary resources);
Skellig Michael, Ireland
Cooperation with other Conventions

- The European Cultural Convention (1954)
- The Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1985)
- The European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (1992)
- The European Landscape Convention (2000)
Meetings for the sub-region: follow-up to 30 COM 11 A.1

• Western Europe (Paris, France 23-24 October 2006)
• Western Europe (Vienna, Austria, 2-3 May 2007)
• Western Europe (Dublin, Ireland, 14-16 December 2009)
• and NEXT??

additional informal meetings during the World Heritage Committee sessions in 2006 and 2009
Follow-up to Decision 31 COM 11 A.1 (July 2007)

Submit **all changes** in a timely fashion (name changes, criteria, boundaries, and statements of significance);

Prepare a **reliable database** of all site managers in Europe;

**Progress report** presented in July 2008 (32nd session of the World Heritage Committee, Quebec City, Canada)

**Information on follow-up to the World Heritage Committee 2010**
Follow-up to Decision 31 COM 11 A.2 (July 2007)

Adoption of clarifications of boundaries submitted by European States Parties: 23 from Western Europe

Request to provide all missing clarifications

Flemish Béguinages, Belgium
Periodic Reporting: Year of Reflection

1. Streamline the Committee’s consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting (revision of Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, changes of boundaries, changes of names…)

2. Ensure effective links between State of Conservation and Periodic Reporting as well as other processes (Nominations, Retrospective Inventory)

3. Identify training and capacity development priorities from all Periodic Reports

4. Identify international cooperation priorities
Total amount of 496 properties in 146 States Parties:

- **Arab States** (44 properties in 12 SP 2000)
- **Africa** (40 properties in 18 SP 2001/02)
- **Asia Pacific** (88 properties in 39 SP 2003)
- **Latin America / Caribbean** (62 properties in 62 SP 2004)
- **North America** (31 properties in 2 SP 2005)
- **Europe** (244 properties in 48 SP 2006)
### Next cycle for Periodic Reporting

- **Arab States:** launch: 2008  report: 2010
- **Africa:** launch: 2009  report: 2011
- **Asia-Pacific:** launch: 2010  report: 2012
- **Latin America/Caribbean:** launch: 2011  report: 2013
- **Europe-North America:** launch: 2012  report: 2014
Hands-on exercise

• **Statements of significance**: go back to your authorities with hands-on experience on how to do it and with examples to take back;

• **Boundary changes/extensions**: get first hand information on your situation from WHC and assess what needs to be done for your properties;

• **Management**: review progress, assess the current situation and identify further gaps, needs and training requirements;

• **Tentative Lists**: review progress from previous meetings and implement at national level;
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