REPORT

Meeting of National Focal Points of Western and Nordic-Baltic European Countries on the Preparation of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

Reykjavik, Iceland
18-21 October 2011

Report prepared by Nordic World Heritage Foundation

SUMMARY

The meeting gathered National Focal Points from the Western and Nordic-Baltic sub-regions, and was generously hosted by the Republic of Iceland and co-organised by the World Heritage Centre and Nordic World Heritage Foundation. The aim of the meeting was to prepare the key stakeholders for the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Europe and North-America; exchange experiences and practices between the two sub- regions; and develop a Road Map for the implementation of the exercise which ensures capacity building and involvement of stakeholders at national level.

The main outcomes from the meeting are:

1. Models and experiences from different State Parties are presented and discussed.
2. A Road Map, guiding the main steps in the exercise, is agreed.

Minutes of the meeting

Wednesday 19 October 2011
Chairperson: Petya Totcharova

- Welcome opening *by Ms Ásta Magnúsdóttir*, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

- *Mrs Petya Totcharova*, Chief of Europe and North America Unit, World Heritage Centre
    - This meeting is originally a meeting for Nordic-Baltic countries only, but by inviting the Western Europe sub-region experiences and practices can be exchanged in a useful manner.
    - The Nordic-Baltic and Western European sub-regions will be the first groups to submit their questionnaires according to the implementation plan agreed at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee. Hence, there is limited time to prepare. In addition, half of the Focal Points in this meeting have never participated in Periodic Reporting (PR). The PR exercise will be launched in 2012.

- *Mr Ole Søe Eriksen*, Nordic World Heritage Foundation
    - This is meant to be a participatory meeting, and not a lecture. The desired outcomes are a future Road Map and/or models to build on in the exercise to come.

Introduction to the 2nd Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise: principles, objectives, timetable and status on follow-up/preparations for the 2nd Cycle of Periodic Reporting
Mrs Petya Totcharova, Chief of Europe and North America Unit, World Heritage Centre

- In the First Cycle of PR for Europe (2006), 244 properties in 48 States Parties took part in the exercise. The First Cycle was followed by two years of reflection, from July 2006 to July 2008.
- Conclusions from the reflection period:
    - All databases should be integrated in order to have complete documentation on individual properties accessible online. The data should furthermore be consolidated;
    - The questionnaires should be simplified and harmonised;
    - The OUVs must be reaffirmed;
    - PR can be linked to other WH processes.
- The Second Cycle PR in Europe involves five sub-regions and 49 State Parties. All sites inscribed before 2012 in Europe are to be reported on. Currently there are 417 sites in Europe (453 in Europe and North America together).
- The PR exercise is implemented through an online tool with pre-filled forms, to be filled in at two levels: by National Focal Points (Section I) and by Site Managers (Section II). The exercise is for the States Parties, developed and supported by the WH Centre, ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN.
- The final report from North America shall be presented to the WH Committee at its 37th Session, and the final report from Europe will be examined by the WH Committee at its 38th Session in 2015.
- The questionnaires must be submitted within twelve months from the date of their launch in 2012, at latest by 31 July 2013.

Discussion/Q&A

- It is discussed whether the questionnaires should be translated into local languages. It was concluded that this may be useful for certain countries, but that the final text must be submitted in either English or French. Furthermore, ICCROM encourages translation of the management plans into local languages.

Clarifying boundaries, proposals of minor boundary modifications and establishment of buffer zones

Ms Alessandra Borchi, Policy and Statutory Meetings Section, World Heritage Centre

- The Retrospective Inventory (1978-1998) is one of the three pillars of PR (Retrospective Statements of OUV and the questionnaires are the other pillars) and was launched by the WH Committee in 2004. The retrospective inventory process includes:
    - Elaboration of an inventory of the content of each nomination file, including maps;
    - Identification of issues concerning the delimitation of WH Properties:
      - Properties with clear delimitation but without a good map
      - Properties with unclear delimitation
      - Properties without delimitation
    - Transmission of a letter to the State Party, presenting the problems identified for each property;
    - Submission of relevant information to the WH Centre (by States Parties);
    - Review of information submitted, to see if it corresponds to the situation of the property at the time of the inscription;
    - Presentation of all "clarifications" to the WH Committee.
- Following this exercise, the number of WH properties having clear boundaries on good quality maps has increased from 43% to 64%. The outcomes have been:
    - Favouring a common understanding of the extent of a property by the WH Centre and the State Party;
    - Allowing more efficient site management;
    - Updating and improving the quality of the information available at the WH Centre and on the WH properties.
- Any change to the delimitation of the WH property at the national level needs to be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre.

Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value: format, process, sources

Mr Junaid Sorosh-Wali, Europe and North America Unit, World Heritage Centre

- A retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) must be prepared for properties inscribed on the World Heritage List before the requirement for a SOUV was introduced in the Operational Guidelines in 2005.
- The SOUV should include a brief synthesis of the Committee's determination that the property has Outstanding Universal Value, identifying the criteria under which the property was inscribed, including the assessments of the conditions of integrity/authenticity, and of the requirements for protection and management in force. The SOUV shall be the basis for future protection and management of the property.
- Further, the following was specified for the different sections of the SOUV:
    - Brief synthesis: summary of factual information, summary of qualities (values, attributes).
    - Justification for criteria: check whether a text on the justification for criteria was adopted by the Committee at the moment of inscription. If it exists, the wording must not be changed. If the adopted text is not enough, new text may

be added to clarify the justification of the criteria. If no justification for the criteria was agreed by the Committee, a justification should be proposed related to the evaluation of the property at the time of inscription.
    - Integrity: include as much as possible at the moment of inscription AND at the date of the drafting, if significant changes have occurred since inscription.
    - Authenticity: applies to properties inscribed under criteria (i) to (vi). Include as much as possible at the moment of inscription AND at the date of the drafting, if significant changes have occurred since inscription.
    - Protection and Management requirements: summarise in one or two phrases the overall legal protection mechanism and management system covering the property. Present the long term expectations for the effective conservation of the property and propose solutions to potential weaknesses as identified in the paragraphs on integrity/authenticity.
- Retrospective SOUV for a serial property: Serial properties should have a single SOUV covering all component parts of the serial property as a whole.
- There are three sources of information towards preparing the retrospective SOUV (hierarchical order):
    - The Committee Decision at the time of inscription
    - The Advisory Body Evaluation Text
    - The Nomination file

Recent examples of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value
Ms Alessandra Borchi, Policy and Statutory Meetings Section, World Heritage Centre

- 112 SOUVs adopted retrospectively, 28 in Europe**.** 360 in review process at the time of this meeting**,** with a further 381 expected by February 2012 (substantial workload)**.**
- WHC wants a very brief text that states key points on OUV and Management: avoid long historical synthesis; overall length between 1-2 pages (depends on number of criteria of inscription). It should never exceed three pages.
- Criteria: refer to the wordings of the criteria *at the time of the inscription*.
- Justification of criteria: do not hesitate to add information on attributes that was not included at inscription time, but be precise and specific. When referring - add explanation, which should be clear and understandable for all recipients.
- Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the property (assessing whether the property: includes all elements necessary to express OUV; is of adequate size to convey its significance; suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect), whereas Authenticity relates to whether the values of the property are truthfully and credibly expressed through its attributes.
- Protection and management requirements: avoid too concrete time references and features that are not statements (but reporting). The statements fixes your objectives for management
- Avoid phrases such as "the integrity of the site is intact", “the authenticity of the *nominated* property", etc. Furthermore, non-concrete time references or too concrete references to statistics should be avoided. Do not refer to something that has not (yet) been presented to the WH Committee (eg. buffer zones).
- Retrospective Statements of OUV shall be submitted officially by States Parties (not by Site Managers) to the WHC. The submission needs to be done electronically, in word version (not pdf).

Introduction to the Periodic Reporting tool – what is expected of States Parties, Focal Points and Site Managers?
Ms Alessandra Borchi, Policy and Statutory Meetings Section, World Heritage Centre

- The questionnaires for the Second Cycle PR are now partly pre-filled; shorter; has

links to already available information at the WH Centre; and the introduction of multiple choice questions are new features since the First Cycle. The same electronic questionnaires are now used globally for all regions.

- Exemptions from the Suzhou-Cairns quota: significant modifications to boundaries and changes to criteria (re-nominations) requested by States Parties will not fall within the limit of two nominations per State Party per year imposed by Paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines, while they will still fall within the overall limit of forty-five complete Nominations per year. This decision shall apply for the **1st February 2012** and **1st February 2013** deadlines for the Africa Region, after which time the normal limit established in Paragraph 61 will be resumed.

Section I of the Questionnaire
Mrs Patricia Alberth, Europe and North America Unit, World Heritage Centre

- Section I concerns the implementation of the WH Convention at national level and should be filled in by the national Focal Points.
- Tentative lists: indicate the potential timetable for future nominations to the WH List within the next 6 years*.*
- Nominations: rate the level of involvement of the different stakeholders in the preparation of the most recent nomination dossiers. Please rate the perceived benefits in your country of inscribing properties on the World Heritage List
- General Policy Development: is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulations) adequate for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage?
- Financial Status and Human Resources: please assess the relative importance of the following sources of funding for the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage in your country.
- Training: please assess the training needs in the following fields identified in your country for conservation, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage.
- Deadline: *31st July 2013.*

Section II of the Questionnaire
Ms Alessandra Borchi, Policy and Statutory Meetings Section, World Heritage Centre

- Section II concerns each WH Property. It is to be filled in by the Site Managers and then validated by the national Focal Point who submits it to the WH Centre.
- The following paragraphs are pre-filled (if data are available): property data, Statement of OUV, protection and management, international assistance.
- New features in section II: online tool; pre-filling; qualitative focus; the assessment of the factors affecting the property; the assessment of management needs
- Deadline: *31st July 2013.*

What will be the outcome of Periodic Reporting? How is the data analysed and utilised? Experiences of the Africa Periodic Reporting
Mr. Ole Søe Eriksen, Nordic World Heritage Foundation

- PR is a tool for sustainable management and monitoring, strengthening capacities of States Parties at both Focal Point and Site Manager levels, in addition to other relevant national levels and promoting international cooperation. Furthermore, it is an opportunity to perform necessary modifications to the World Heritage properties' boundaries, buffer zones, name changes and revision of criteria.
- For analytical purposes, the *reliability* and *validity* of the data and conlusions drawn

from them must be considered, especially because the data collection is based on self-evaluation through an online tool.

- The questionnaires provide both quantitative and qualitative data, which are cross-checked with other available sources and knowledge (cf. Decision **29 COM 7B**). The qualitative data are used to support arguments and conclusions based on findings from the statistical analysis and to provide additional, in-depth information.
- The data allows for analyses at global, regional, sub-regional, country and WH property levels.
- The qualitative data are very valuable, but is very demanding on the analysis team – input in all comments fields should be very specific and kept as short as possible.
- PR should be perceived as a preventive monitoring tool; an alarm mechanism; a tool for identification of needs for assistance and capacity building; an opportunity to gather Site Managers and national Focal Points; an opportunity to strengthen regional networks between professional actors within the field; a self-reporting tool for the States Parties; and as an instrument for "peer-review" in the region.
- The final report, with conclusions and recommendations based on the input from States Parties and Site Managers is only part of the end result of this exercise, the main outcomes are Action Plans for the six-year periods between the PR cycles, which will address the challenges and needs raised by Focal Points and Site Managers through the PR exercise.

Working groups:

Collecting ideas for the development of a joint approach to the Periodic Reporting Exercise – Organisation, cooperation, knowledge sharing and information exchange

- *2 questions:*
  1. What would the Road Map from start to finish of the second PR Cycle exercise look like?
  2. How to ensure knowledge sharing, especially at the national level (e.g. training the trainers)?
- *Sub-question:*
  - How do you see the role of the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre in this process?

Discussion

- The role of Nordic World Heritage Foundation as potential first line manager/consultant/coordinator is discussed. The conclusion is that NWHF can be requested by the States Parties and WHC, but that its Board of Directors have to make decisions regarding NWHF's activities and functions.
- The possibility of providing a web page with FAQs and an online platform is furthermore discussed. WHC's budget is limited, but costs and possibilities will be looked into. It is suggested that NWHF may provide this service, something its Board of Directors will discuss.
- The Second Cycle PR will include properties which will be inscribed in 2012, and the States Parties are strongly encouraged to give priority to training/capacity building initiatives and include these properties in the PR process as early as possible.
- How to deal with retrospective SOUV for properties with imprecise justification for criteria or even wrong criteria? ICCROM replied that consulting the Advisory Bodies on the issue would be the first and best thing to do, but in case of time constraints, submission of the SOUV with gaps and notes, indicating that Advisory Bodies must be consulted, is recommended.
- It is asked about the difference between nomination file and management plan; the first is static and a document for the WH Committee and WHC, while the latter is for management, conservation and protection for Site Managers and should be revised on a regular basis, for example in line with the PR cycles. PR is important for both the

WH Committee and State Party/Site Managers to perform self-assessments and improve on management issues. Management plans are not obligatory; but you need to prove that you have a management system which sustains the OUV of the property.

- Issues concerning compilation, implementation, monitoring and follow-up of the PR Action Plan are discussed. It is mentioned that review of previous Action Plans and their implementation is important.
- Management Plans for transnational/serial properties/nominations are brought up as an issue at several occasions. There is a recommendation in the Operational Guidelines on having a common management plan for transnational properties. The *Viking Age Monuments and Sites* nomination project was used as an example. A common OUV and common management system will be set up, but each separate component part has a management plan on its own, detailing the different national legislations and management issues.

Wrap up and conclusions/Road Map for the Periodic Reporting Exercise
Ms Carol Westrik, International expert

Discussion:

- How to best ensure involvement of States Parties in the analysis is discussed. Creating regional/sub-regional meetings as early as possible to keep momentum and further to use the already existing international meeting points were suggested, such as the Committee meetings and the General Assembly in 2013.
- The future Action Plan is discussed. It was suggested to use the 5Cs as methodology for structuring the Action Plan. The Focal Points/States Parties will have to agree on a framework for the Action Plan at regional and possibly sub-regional levels and go back to their countries to ensure implementation at national and site levels. Linking the action plan with other WH initiatives in Europe is crucial. Further, utilising the Action Plan for fundraising purposes was suggested. It is proposed to have the Action Plan ready for presentation together with the final report for Europe in 2015.

Main Conclusions

- The Periodic Reporting exercise should be a capacity building tool for all stakeholders involved, at both State Party/Focal Point and local levels. Hence involvement of *all* must be ensured through the implementation strategy for the exercise.
- States Parties have the lead in the exercise. The World Heritage Centre (WHC) has a consultative role during this process and will have a more leading role in the analysis process.
- The First Cycle of PR was followed by a reflection period (July 2006 – July 2008) to evaluate and analyse the tools and mechanisms used in PR. Several modifications to the PR tools have been made: the questionnaires are simplified, shortened and partly pre-filled; standardised and used by all regions; and allows for a more qualitative approach in data analysis.
- A main goal for the Second Cycle PR is to resolve all outstanding issues, both formal requirements and ”volunteer” issues (i.e. boundary issues, proposals for Buffer Zones, name changes, management plans etc.) in relation to the World Heritage properties.
- Proper follow-up by all stakeholders must be ensured. The Second Cycle will include properties that will be inscribed next year, so integrating these into the process as early as possible will be imperative.
- Implementation of the agreed Road Map must be ensured. Use the opportunity to meet during statutory meetings, and at least once a year, evaluate and discuss the process and its progress.
- Issues that needs further exploration:
  - Funding issues
  - Management Plans
  - §172 of the *Operational Guidelines:*

    “The World Heritage Committee invites the States Parties to the *Convention to inform the Committee, through the* Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the *Convention major restorations or* new constructions which may affect the outstanding universal value of the property. Notice should be given as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the outstanding universal value of the property is fully preserved.”

Road Map

Steps	Date	Details
1	1 November 2011	Inform all stakeholders about upcoming task / share information. Budget and resource planning.
2	15 November 2011	Letter sent by the WH Centre on identification of Site Managers.
3	1 December 2011	**Deadline for submission of Retrospective Inventory.**
4	1 February 2012	**Deadline for submission of Retrospective OUV.**
5	Spring 2012	Information sharing with Site Managers continued.
6	June/July 2012	Formal launch of Second Cycle PR in the Europe Region.
7	September 2012	Training workshop by the WH Centre for national Focal Points.
8	Oct/Nov 2012	Training workshop by Focal Points on national level.
9	Winter 2012/13	Deadline for site managers for filling in Section II.
10	**31 July 2013**	**Submissions Sections I and II ”Group I”.**
11	November 2013	General Assembly: ”Debriefing meeting”, pre-analysis Group I.
13	**31 July 2014**	**Submissions Sections I and II ”Group II”.**
14	June/July 2014	Final Report to WH Committee, USA & Canada.
15	November 2014	”Debriefing meeting”, pre-analysis Group II
16	January 2015	Final Europe Meeting?
17	February 2015	Compilation of regional report for the European region.
18	**June/July 2015**	**Final Report to WH Committee, Europe.**
19	June / July 2015	Action Plan(s) presented to the WH Committee
20	November 2015	General Assembly: Final harmonization meeting on Action Plan(s) for the WH Centre and Focal Points.