



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



World
Heritage
Convention

FINAL MEETING ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING IN EUROPE

FORTRESS OF SUOMENLINNA
HELSINKI, FINLAND
1-3 DECEMBER, 2014



Ministry of
Education
and Culture



Ympäristöministeriö
Miljöministeriet
Ministry of the Environment

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Overview of the Trends of the Second Cycle	3
Achievements since the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting	5
Draft Regional Action Plan	8
5C Working Groups.....	9
Sub-Regional Consultations	10
Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe	10
Mediterranean Europe	11
Nordic & Baltic Europe	12
Western Europe	13
General Discussion	13
Focus Group on Natural World Heritage Properties	15
Reflection towards the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting	16
Projects linked to Periodic Reporting: Publication and Video Interviews	19
Conclusions	21
Follow-Up.....	22
Annex I: Draft Regional Action Plan (Status at the End of the Meeting, 2 December 2014)	23
Annex II: Final Meeting Agenda	29
Annex III: List of Participants	33
National Focal Points	33
Resource Persons.....	36



View from the Porlom II point, "Struve Geodetic Arc".

INTRODUCTION

Wiktoriina Hurskainen, Organiser of the Periodic Reporting Meeting for the National Board of Antiquities, welcomed all the participants and introduced the opening speeches.

Juhani Kostet, Director of the National Board of Antiquities, welcomed the participants of the meeting and recalled Finland's role as a member of the World Heritage Committee, and also the country's international activities in the field of heritage. Mr Kostet briefly presented the seven World Heritage properties located in Finland, and emphasized that the Final Periodic Reporting meeting was organized by the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, the Finnish Ministry of the Environment, and the Finnish National Board of Antiquities, in co-operation with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

Heikki Lahdenmäki, Acting Director of the Fortress of Suomenlinna, wished a warm welcome to the participants. He briefly explained the history of the Fortress of Suomenlinna, up to its current use as a banquet and conference center. He also exposed the philosophy of minimal intervention implemented at the property.

Petya Totcharova (World Heritage Centre) thanked the Finnish authorities for their warm welcome and the excellent organization of the event, and welcomed all participants to the Final Meeting of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in Europe. She reminded the participants of the key aims of the meeting:

- reviewing the results of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting,
- drafting a Regional Action Plan to be adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2014),
- discussing sub-regional priorities in terms of Capacity-Building needs;
- and launching a reflection from the European perspective on the future of the PR exercise and its Third Cycle..

Ms Isabelle Longuet (ICOMOS), evoked her experience with Periodic Reporting with regard to her three functions: Site Manager, Member of ICOMOS France, and representative of ICOMOS International. She reminded the participants that the First Cycle was an extraordinary opportunity that allowed the Europe region to work together. She expressed her opinion that the Second Cycle saw a better organisation and an improved coordination between the States Parties, and emphasized that even though the First Cycle did not end on a concrete set of time-bound actions and indicators, it was the starting point of a very positive evolution. Finally, she expressed her hope that the Second Cycle can lead to a very concrete set Action Plan.

Mr Tim Badman (IUCN), also presented his experience from a double perspective, as a former site manager and current representative of IUCN. He highlighted the uniqueness and possible complementarity of the Periodic Reporting as a self-assessment exercise, and IUCN's World Heritage Outlook as an independent assessment. He suggested that during the next 7-8 years, a reflection could be carried out, based on the differences in results obtained through these two schemes.

Ms Jane Thompson (ICCROM) expressed that Periodic Reporting is especially useful in reaching towards and developing the capacities of various audiences and stakeholders in terms of management for heritage. She highlighted the richness of the results obtained during the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, and expressed her hope that those results may reach a large number of stakeholders on the ground, beyond the usual World Heritage practitioners.

Ms Alexandra Fiebig (World Heritage Centre) presented the Agenda for the meeting (See Annex II).

OVERVIEW OF THE TRENDS OF THE SECOND CYCLE

Background documents:

- [Document 1: Summary of Outcomes of Section I and II](#)
- [Documents 2 and 3: Quantitative summaries of PR Sections I and II](#)

Presentation by Ole S e Eriksen (Nordic World Heritage Foundation)

Mr Eriksen explained the methodology used for the quantitative analysis of the PR results. For the quantitative analysis, 66 358 rows of data were collected, totaling over 1,913,000 individual data input cells to take into account. The questionnaire provides both qualitative data (notably comments boxes) and quantitative data (although the latter has both quantitative and qualitative aspects), and those different sets of data require very different analyses.

The fact that the PR questionnaire is a self-evaluation implies some level of subjectivity, and can occasionally lead to questioning the reliability and validity of the data. In this context, reliability can be seen as the level of precision of the data, whereas validity is a sort of grid for the accuracy of the results. Additionally, some Focal Points and Site Managers have indicated that they considered the questionnaire imprecise or difficult to understand.

The data analysis does show clear trends, but those need to be considered critically: for instance, the data indicates that local indigenous people are adequately involved in the management of mixed sites, as opposed to cultural sites – however, there are far fewer mixed sites than cultural sites, which limits the validity of this comparison.

Overall, it is clear that the Periodic Reporting exercise led to many learning experiences, and a new feature of the Europe report is that both positive and negative factors have been taken into account in the quantitative analysis. This is particularly useful to show the balance that exists between factors: for instance, the data shows how tourism sometimes has a negative impact, but often bears tremendous positive potential for World Heritage properties.

Discussion

USE OF DATASETS

Several Focal Points noted that there is no overview of what the States Parties actually do with the datasets, which have been prepared and sent by the World Heritage Centre, on the basis of the PR questionnaires, per country and per property. A list of good practices may therefore be interesting, in order to showcase what the ultimate use of this States Parties-driven exercise can be. The possibility of organising training on the use of datasets was discussed, and the **World Heritage Centre** indicated that this could be further discussed during the Reflection towards the Third Cycle.

It was also noted that the data collected has huge potential, due to its unique nature and scale, and could be extremely useful for discussions and strategic planning at national and sub-regional level. Several States Parties shared their existing practices with the datasets: Israel has hired students to analyse the data for use at national level, Spain has forwarded the data to their national statistics board for further analysis, and Finland is currently evaluating different options to make the best use of the data in view of the National Strategy for World Heritage currently in the drafting.

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that they would be grateful if Focal Points could share good practices in using the datasets with the Centre, in order to make this information available on the online PR platform.

Presentation by Christopher Young (PR Expert) on Section I

Mr Young presented Document 1, in particular the *Summary of Outcomes of Section I*. Mr Young indicated that PR started as a reporting tool to the World Heritage Committee, and has since become increasingly valuable as a tool for the States Parties themselves.

Overall, the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting appears to have been very useful, both at national level and at site level, as it gave States Parties an opportunity to look at the individual properties and the implementation of the Convention as a whole. Although the questionnaire itself needs improvement in many ways, Mr Young indicated that PR has enormous potential as a tool for the future.

He indicated that, as discussed before, self-reporting exercises have weaknesses and strengths, but that ownership of the data remains a very important element in the success of such an exercise.

For Section I, the analysis was carried out at regional level, since the differences between sub-regions were negligible. Mr Young emphasized the importance of Article 5 of the Convention, and noted that in the questionnaire, many Focal Points considered that the enforcement of the legal framework in place for heritage could be strengthened. Regarding the cooperation between individual bodies of government at national level, the questionnaire highlights that there is room for progress integrating World Heritage in the community and its functions.

Mr Young highlighted that the questionnaire shows clearly that the European Union is an important source of funds throughout the region, and that many Focal Points have been able to streamline World Heritage into the priorities of the EU, cultural or otherwise.

On the basis of Section I, he noted that except in specific circles, the general understanding of World Heritage is poor, a situation which leaves a lot of room for improvement.

Finally, he noted that the occasional differences between the answers provided by the Focal Points and the Site Managers must be addressed.

Presentation by Pierre Galland and Katri Lisitzin (PR Experts) on Section II

Mr Galland noted that considerable progress has been made since the First Cycle, notably with regard to collaboration between Focal Points, Site Managers, national and local authorities, but also between the States Parties themselves.

Overall, he noted that the data now appears more reliable, diverse and genuine. However, he noted that it is difficult to make comparisons between the two cycles, notably due to the increase in number of sites and the changes to the questions and their formulation. Nonetheless, it is clear that huge progress has been made with regard to SOUVs, maps, clarifications of boundaries and other statutory aspects.

Ms Lisitzin emphasized that in using the data from the questionnaire, point 3.16 (“Assessment of current negative factors”) has not been looked at enough at this stage, but could provide valuable information. She noted that the comments boxes have been used extensively, and provided a rich basis for her analysis.

Regarding questions of Outstanding Universal Value, she noted that Attributes are rarely discussed, nor shown as the basis of monitoring and management of the property, which will need to be addressed. She also noted that there appears to be some level of misunderstanding regarding what exactly attributes and indicators are. Integrity and Authenticity appear to follow the trends of OUV, as very few questionnaires highlight any issues in this regard.

She noted that thanks to the Retrospective Inventory, many boundaries seem to have been clarified. However, buffer zones remain an issue that is gradually being addressed, mostly by including the setting of

properties into the buffer zone. At this stage, neither boundaries nor buffer zones are very well communicated by the authorities to the communities, and then within the communities themselves, which is a serious issue.

Mr Galland added that even within the World Heritage community, the awareness about the boundaries can be an issue. Regarding the factors affecting the properties, natural and mixed properties have not been analysed by sub-region, but together, due to their low number, geographic repartition, and the fact that early analyses have not shown any major sub-region-specific trends.

For positive factors, no major differences were found between natural and cultural properties. For negative factors for culture, the experts noted that illegal activities are listed as an important negative factor, although the exact nature of this illegal activity is unclear. A lot of negative factors are linked to climate (e.g. Climate change and severe weather events, Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species, Pollution, Biological resource use/modification, Physical resource extraction, but also Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure, Non-renewable energy facilities, etc.), and the effects of climate change will foreseeably lead to a greater number of such negative factors affecting World Heritage properties.

Ms Lisitzin underlined that tourism ranks both as the top positive factor, but also as the top negative one. Comments made in the questionnaires show that tourism does not directly benefit site management.

The questionnaires concur largely that more financial and human resources are needed and that the implementation of Management Plans remains difficult due to low resources. However, there has been an important improvement with regard to the number of Management Plans in the region, but there are no indicators to gauge their quality.

Priority management issues are difficult to define, and many sites report that issues are located outside of the property, and therefore beyond the authority of site management.

Finally, she noted that the low volume of monitoring indicators reported in the questionnaires may stem from a lack of training provided to the Site Managers, who may not be used to the type of terminology used within the questionnaire, as it is known that monitoring does take place for a number of sites.

ACHIEVEMENTS SINCE THE FIRST CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

(See the detailed PowerPoint presentation for further information.)

Christopher Young noted that overall, there has been a clear increase in awareness of the implications of World Heritage inscriptions, both at national and site level. However, the focus on prestige rather than responsibilities, though diminished, has not entirely vanished.

Transboundary and serial transnational properties come with a lot of specific needs and issues, which will need to be addressed differently in the future.

Petya Totcharova underlined that the First Cycle played the role of a people-gatherer and generated a lot of networking, the creation of associations, groups, as well as increased cooperation between States Parties. Numerous issues regarding statutory issues (retrospective SOUVs, Boundary Clarifications, etc.) have been solved or cleared, and some of this work is still in progress today. The same is true of Tentative Lists, where a lot of work is still needed to update, clean and revise lists in the region.

She noted that many sites now have Management Plans, many of which have been communicated to World Heritage Centre. For further guidance, Manuals have been prepared by the Advisory Bodies on the Management of cultural and natural properties which can be considered a major achievement since the First Cycle.

At this occasion, Ms Totcharova acknowledged with thanks the generous contribution of Switzerland, which allowed for the printing of the Manual on “Managing Cultural World Heritage” in both working languages of the Convention.

Discussion

During this discussion, the Focal Points from the following States Parties took the floor: **Georgia, Germany, Israel, The Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, and Turkey.**

MANAGEMENT PLANS

The participants agreed that a **large number of Management Plans** have already been submitted to the Centre, and **Petya Totcharova** stated that although there is always space for improvement in terms of quality, each Management Plan remains specific, and the very existence of so many Management Plans already constitutes a significant improvement since the First Cycle. Ms Totcharova and **Tim Badman** reminded the Focal Points that Management Plans are a basic necessity for World Heritage properties, and effectively have been part of the requirements for new inscriptions since 2005.

The variable **quality** of Management Plans was acknowledged by several Focal Points, and the question of a systematic approach to Management Plans was raised, notably regarding the possibility to establish standards for such documents. Several Focal Points also agreed that the mere existence of a Management Plan does not guarantee its quality, nor that the appropriate resources are being invested towards its implementation. Beyond the written document itself, participants noted that it is the entire management system that should be evaluated, and that the production of such a plan, with its cycles of internal review, can be a very beneficial exercise.

It was also noted that such a plan can become an important tool for communication between the State(s) Party(ies), the World Heritage Committee, and the Centre, bearing in mind that Management Plans communicated at international level can be helpful in solving issues arising at national and local levels.

The participants agreed that Management Plans should be working documents, to be revised on a regular basis (e.g. every 5 years). Furthermore, Focal Points emphasized that Management Plans can be written in the national language, and a summary forwarded to the World Heritage Centre in one of the working languages of the World Heritage Committee.

Concerning the **responsible authorities**, several Focal Points reminded the participants that Management Plans are the responsibility of the States Parties and the site managers, who must coordinate with all national and local authorities involved. **Christopher Young** mentioned that sites should not be seen as fenced off from the world, but as being part of an environment and a context. Focal Points also recalled that indigenous management systems are sometimes recognised as good practices, and function well without a written or legal document.

With regard to the **review process**, Ms Totcharova and Mr Badman indicated that Management Plans are being reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for nominations and when they are part of the SOC process or otherwise requested by the World Heritage Committee. Outside of these processes, the resources available at the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are currently insufficient to evaluate each Management Plan in detail. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies do however stand ready with guidance documents (such as the recently published Manuals and IUCN’s [Guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas](#), and *Best Practice Guidelines for Protected Areas*) and can provide advice. Additionally, they noted that States Parties have used Advisory Missions to review the management system and/or plan for a given property.

Focal Points noted that reviewing a Management Plan from the ‘outside’ can be a difficult task, as it often requires in-depth knowledge of the specifics of national legislation and its implementation. Mr Badman

suggested that the Focal Points may wish to create peer-to-peer review systems for Management Plans, which may prove helpful and allow for the sharing of lessons learnt and good practices.

BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS (MAJOR AND MINOR)

Ole Sør Eriksen highlighted that for 60% of properties, boundaries are reported as not adequate, and many properties require an update of their boundaries. He explained that a further analysis of existing data would be necessary, to see whether the suggested updates relate to technical or factual errors, or if they lead to a request for a major boundary modification by the national authorities.

Petya Totcharova confirmed that, as was done for other regions, the limitations regarding the number of nominations per year ("Cairns-Suzhou Decision") would be lifted during the two years following the adoption of the Periodic Report by the Committee, to allow States Parties to undertake major boundary modifications as a follow-up of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting. A relevant draft Decision will be proposed to the Committee along with the adoption of the Periodic Report for Europe.

OTHER TOPICS

Tim Badman compared the Periodic Reporting exercise with the IUCN Outlook Assessment and emphasized that whereas Periodic Reporting studies what has happened, the Outlook Assessment system also includes a projection into the future. He highlighted that Periodic Reporting is a self-assessment system, and that only 60 % of properties reported having an adequate management system / plan. He further noted that it should be a priority for the Europe region to use Environment Impact Assessments (EIA) and Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) when it comes to development projects.

Katri Lisitzin mentioned the importance of HIA indicators. She explained that if these are not defined, the management does not work. She also mentioned that site managers work in a context which is broader than conservation only.

Pierre Galland mentioned that the process of retrospective SOUVs showed that the current situation at the sites is not always the same as at the time of inscription. Stakeholders would appreciate having simplified procedures to correct criteria, without going through a new nomination process, which is currently compulsory for such modification. [This topic was further addressed during the Reflection session.]

Christopher Young highlighted the important degree of turnover in personnel at national and site level, which implies that Periodic Reporting needs to be done with future colleagues and successors in mind.

DRAFT REGIONAL ACTION PLAN

Background documents:

- *Document 4: Action Plan for the First Cycle of PR in Europe*
- *Document 5: Draft Action Plan for the Second Cycle of PR in Europe*

Presentation by Christopher Young of Document 5: Draft Action Plan for the Second Cycle of PR in Europe.

Following the presentation of the document and of a possible format for the working groups, the floor was opened for **discussion**, during which the Focal Points of the following States Parties took the floor: **Armenia, Belgium, Georgia, Germany, and Switzerland.**

The **World Heritage Centre** emphasized that the actions proposed in the Action Plan should be essentially State Party-led. The existing overlaps between the 5C may bring some repetition between the 5C group work, which can be addressed at a later stage.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PRIORITIES

Some Focal Points mentioned that it may be worthwhile to first consider national priorities and then move to a sub-regional level, and to differentiate between actions that can take place at international or national level.

SIZE AND USER-FRIENDLINESS

Tim Badman stressed that the Action Plan should include only a few priority points and indicate what the States Parties would like to see changed over the next eight years.

Some Focal Points agreed with earlier interventions, stating that the Action Plan should remain a simple document to which one could easily refer.

Christopher Young expressed the opinion that, ideally, the Action Plan should be no more than a 2-page document, focused on measurable key actions.

The participants then split into several groups, according to the 5C, as defined by the [Budapest Declaration on World Heritage](#) (28 June 2002) and the World Heritage Committee Decision [31 COM 13B](#) (Christchurch, 2007). (See next page.)

OUTCOMES

At the end of the working session, each group presented the outcomes of their reflection on the draft Regional Action Plan on the basis of one of the 5C:

- **Petya Totcharova** presented the outcomes of the working group on Credibility;
- **Nevra Ertürk** (Turkey) presented the outcomes of the working group on Conservation;
- **Henry Owen-John** (UK) presented the outcomes of the working group on Capacity-Building;
- **Mirna Boric** (Croatia) presented the outcomes of the working group on Communication;
- **Maidar Marana** presented the outcomes of the working group on Communities.

The results of those working groups can be found in **Annex I: Draft Regional Action Plan**, as they have been presented at the end of the meeting, with minor adjustments done by the Periodic Reporting Experts team and the World Heritage Centre between this working session and the Sub-Regional Consultations.

5C WORKING GROUPS

CREDIBILITY

Facilitators: Christopher Young
Rapporteur: Petya Totcharova
Aim: Strengthening the credibility of the World Heritage List.

Name	Country
Birgitta Ringbeck	Germany
Piet Geleyns	Belgium
Anna Marconi-Betka	Poland
Rene Wokke	Netherlands
Rusudan Mirzikashvili	Georgia
Oliver Martin	Switzerland
Maire Mattinon	Finland
Béatrice Boisson-Saint-Martin	France

CONSERVATION

Facilitators: Isabelle Longuet
 Tim Badman
Rapporteurs: Nevra Ertürk
 Anna Sidorenko
Aim: Ensuring effective conservation of World Heritage properties.

Name	Country
Liina Jänes	Estonia
Nevra Ertürk	Turkey
Alex Langini	Luxembourg
Ilija Lalosevic	Montenegro
Isabelle Leroy	Belgium
Luiz António Branco de Pinho Lopes	Portugal
Adele Cesi	Italy
Mariia Buiukli	Ukraine
Sigurdur Thrainsson	Iceland
Guy Kav Venaki	Israel
Maria Serlupi Crescenzi	Holy See
Jérôme Etifier	France
Tarana Gambarova	Azerbaijan
Mustafa Shabanov	Azerbaijan
Rugile Balkaite	Lithuania

The results of those Working Groups can be found in [Annex I: Draft Regional Action Plan](#).

CAPACITY-BUILDING

Facilitators: Jane Thompson
 Pierre Galland
Rapporteurs: Henry Owen-John
 Alexandra Fiebig
Aim: Promoting effective capacity-building.

Name	Country
Arta Dollani	Albania
Stefan Wessman	Finland
Marina Solomidou-Ieronymidou	Cyprus
Gabor Soos	Hungary
Photini Panayi	Cyprus
Evrin Uluhan	Turkey
Henry Owen-John	UK
Dré van Marrewijk	Netherlands
Gislaine Devillers	Belgium
Kerstin Manz	Germany
Katarzyna Piotrowska	Poland

COMMUNICATION

Facilitator: Ole Søre Eriksen
Rapporteurs: Mirna Boric
 Lise Sellem
Aim: Increase awareness and support through communication.

Name	Country
Ieva Svarca	Latvia
Mirna Bojic	Croatia
Arakelyan Artashes	Armenia
Michaela Mrazova	Slovakia
Susanna Lindeman	Finland
Gaute Sønstebo	Norway

COMMUNITIES

Facilitator: Katri Lisitzin
Rapporteurs: Maider Marañón
Aim: Strengthening the role of communities.

Name	Country
Judit Szabadhegyi	Hungary
Brana Stojkovic Pavelka	Serbia
Zoran Pavlov	FYR of Macedonia
Špela Spanžel	Slovenia
Margrét Hallgrímsdóttir	Iceland
Daniela Mihai	Romania
Bolette Lehn Petersen	Denmark
Maria Wikman	Sweden
Petter Koren	Norway
Laura de Miguel	Spain
Bruno Diklic	Croatia
Lubica Pincikova	Slovakia

SUB-REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Background documents:

- [Document 6: Sub-Regional Consultations : Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe](#)
- [Document 7: Sub-Regional Consultations : Mediterranean Europe](#)
- [Document 8: Sub-Regional Consultations : Nordic & Baltic Europe](#)
- [Document 9: Sub-Regional Consultations : Western Europe](#)

CENTRAL, EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

Facilitators: Rusudan Mirzikashvili (Georgia) / Gabor Soos (Hungary)

Rapporteurs: Špela Spanžel (Slovenia) / Arta Dollani (Albania)

Resulting from the study prepared by **Katarzyna Piotrowska** of this vast and very diverse region, covering 20 countries and containing 116 World Heritage properties (96 cultural, 19 natural and 1 mixed), the CESEE group considered that there are several groups of priorities that the Action Plan should take into account:

- organisation of World Heritage sites and its management systems: States Parties are quite competent and successful in conservation issues, skills connected to sustainable management are needed;
- protection of World Heritage sites as a common task: collective efforts of various stakeholders on all levels are needed;
- difficult situation related to spatial planning is evident: World Heritage encompasses much wider context, this is where potential conflicts arise.

However, the State of Conservation reports as well as the World Heritage Committee often focus on particular problems, whereby the community dimension does not come out.

With regard to the draft Action Plan, and focusing on capacity-building, the CESEE group proposed to:

- draft Terms of Reference for site managers (as already suggested in the table), since it is a relatively quick and inexpensive action that could be quite useful on several levels;
- address the gap between the ministries and site managers and ensure that the support extended to site managers at a national level is strong and consistent (e.g. through a central institution, national level working group);
- improve the coordination between culture and nature, particularly with regard to the planning authorities, as intersectoral communication and cooperation proves to be of great importance (intersectoral working groups or steering committees on national level with different representatives);
- ensure that there is an adequate legal basis or regulated frameworks, and that those are appropriately implemented;
- emphasize the role of civil society, NGOs or communities in general: a good practice database, networks of site managers (thematic, not limited to one or two countries) which are often a stronger discussion partners with authorities and exchange knowledge and best practice examples, engage in projects etc.;
- decide upon a form of assistance from the ABs to the States Parties: based on a pool of experts to be mobilized on a particular question and when needed, a system of mentoring could be introduced, offering short, tailored training courses to site managers and other stakeholders;

- pay special attention to the understanding of concepts related to the World Heritage management and other related issues, e.g. not every local development process is management issue: through awareness-raising activities, lectures etc.;
- address the lack of experience, knowledge and good practice on how to turn heritage benefits into sustainable development – so called heritage economics, the emphasis being on assuring the sustainability of the process (in contrary to the nomination process as a project-driven exercise, it is much more difficult to ensure the running costs, through ordinary budgets).

The CESEE group felt that this last point is perhaps the only feature that unites the sub-region and stands out in comparison to the other sub-regions.

In conclusion, the group emphasised the interconnectivity of the issues (especially the 5 C's) and felt that this could be achieved through improved capacities.

MEDITERRANEAN EUROPE

Facilitators: Adele Cesi (Italy) / Laura de Miguel (Spain)

Rapporteurs: Evrim Uluhan (Turkey) / Maria Serlupi Crescenzi (Holy See)

On the basis of the study by **Maider Maraña**, the Mediterranean Europe group agreed upon the following points:

1. MANAGEMENT PLANS

- a. Participatory approaches (how to communicate with different stakeholders at different levels; political decision makers, academic staff, site managers, communities and media)
- b. Integrating World Heritage mechanisms into the existing mechanism of SPs rather than creating new ones
- c. Adapting existing UNESCO's technical guidelines / manuals on management to national / local needs of SP's (can be defined as actions)
- d. Increasing coordination among authorities responsible for conservation, managing and monitoring of the sites
- e. Training (can be defined as actions)
 - training of trainers (attributes, management plans, value / attribute based approaches in managing changes)
 - training of site managers (soft skills, technical conservation skills, communication skills and World Heritage context etc)
 - sharing achievements and best practices of SP's in the implementation of management planning processes
 - building new approaches in training
- f. Taking into account frequent changes in political managers, keep raising awareness amongst decision makers (can be defined as actions)
- g. Efforts should be made to produce short, realistic and effective management plans
- h. Instead of creating new plans, harmonizing them with the existing plans

2. RISK PREPAREDNESS

- a. Increase awareness and capacities about risk preparedness and integrate relevant chapters into management plans

NORDIC & BALTIC EUROPE

Facilitators: Bolette Petersen (Denmark) / Rugile Balkaite (Lithuania)

Rapporteurs: Maria Wikman (Sweden) / Liina Jänes (Estonia)

Ms Bolette Petersen (Denmark) presented the results of the Sub-Regional discussions for the Nordic & Baltic Sub-Region.

The following priority sub-regional capacity-building objectives and actions were identified:

OBJECTIVE	ACTION	REMARKS, GOOD EXAMPLES
Awareness raising and collaboration between all levels and sectors	Capacity-building on all levels up to ministries Community engagement in conservation and management, interpretation of sites.	Clear responsibilities between sectors and departments Cooperation on ministerial level National World Heritage strategies
Sustainable tourism	Pilot programme “World Heritage and sustainable tourism” with pilot sites UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism toolkit	All State Parties continue the work
Balance between development and World Heritage	Sub-regional training on HIA	HIA responsibility should be on higher level than site manager / municipality, on national level
Risk preparedness /development of efficient monitoring	Highly relevant training measure indicated by site managers	Site-specific actions, could be on sub-regional level if needed.
Clear role and skills of site managers	A common understanding / document /job description	Sub-regional cooperation between site managers

This led to the elaboration of the following Sub-Regional priorities for the Action Plan:

OBJECTIVE	ACTION
Effective Management Systems	Identify monitoring indicators and establish a regular monitoring system in particular using existing and new tools for risk management and sustainable tourism and resource manuals.
Institutional framework. Decision-takers especially outside heritage sector are fully aware of World Heritage value	Intersectorial bridge building
Heritage practitioners. <u>A concept</u> of site managers. Broader cross-discipline cross-sectorial shared knowledge	Establish capacity-building systems for site managers
Community awareness, engagement and ownership of World Heritage properties	World Heritage coordinators engage communities, awareness-raising.
	Creating, maintaining, sharing and enhancing knowledge in sustainable way.

WESTERN EUROPE

Facilitators: Dré van Marrewijk (The Netherlands) / Oliver Martin (Switzerland)

Rapporteurs: Béatrice Boisson-Saint-Martin (France) / Birgitta Ringbeck (Germany)

Ms Birgitta Ringbeck (Germany) presented the results of the sub-regional consultation in Western Europe, where the following core capacity-building priorities were identified:

- a. The explanation of the key concepts and processes of World Heritage, especially to decision-makers at the political level, is an important but difficult task.
States Parties should use the most appropriate tools to achieve this goal.
- b. Guidance and tools for the inclusion of HIA into the European context and regulations are necessary, as well as training modules for the application of the HIA approach for experts outside the World Heritage system and decision-makers.
- c. Further training is needed for Site Managers on management plans, including risk assessment and preparedness.
- d. Training is also needed on how to develop approaches to and how to organise community involvement within World Heritage properties.

For the Draft Action Plan, the Western Europe group highlighted the following as priorities for the sub-region:

- a. Credible Tentative Lists and nominations;
- b. Keep the high level of heritage legislation and ensure synergies among national laws;
- c. Effective management systems;

Proposed amendment for the 1st paragraph: "... while creating and regularly updating Management Plans prior to the 3rd cycle Periodic Reporting".

Include aspects of community involvement.

Proposed deletion of the last two points of the Communication section.

- d. Streamline all the proposals and priorities identified in the Global Capacity Strategy;
- e. Concentrate on awareness-raising for decision-makers and owners.

The Western Europe group further recommended that point D of the Action Plan ("World Heritage Information and Tools accessible, shared, promoted and understood") be streamlined into all communication actions.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In this discussion, the Focal Points of the following States Parties took the floor: **France, Germany, Italy, Poland, and Switzerland.**

SIZE AND NATURE OF THE ACTION PLAN

In the wrap-up of this group session, **Petya Totcharova** emphasized again that it is important to arrive at a short and efficient strategic document.

Some Focal Points supported aligning the sub-regional priorities for Capacity-Building with the 2011 Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage, whilst others asked whether it would be useful to merge the Capacity-Building priorities by sub-region with the Action Plan.

Petya Totcharova responded that it remains to be seen if and how the capacity-building strategies can be implemented in the individual sub-regions.

Christopher Young indicated that he gathered from the Focal Points' interventions that one consolidated Action Plan would be more welcomed. It should therefore be possible to combine the regional Action Plan and the sub-regional Capacity-Building Strategy and to indicate the various levels of priority and sub-regional repartition.

Mr Young further emphasized the need to make actions as SMART as possible, and noted that the PR Experts would need to sit down with the documents after the end of the meeting to clean up the Action Plan before sharing it with the Focal Points for their comments.

THE 5C FRAMEWORK

Several Focal Points evoked the difficulty of working within the framework of the 5C, and expressed the opinion that the frequent overlaps come from the fact that three of the Cs are objectives (Credibility, Conservation and Communities), whereas two are activities that enable the implementation of the others (Capacity-Building, Communication).

Petya Totcharova stated that the World Heritage Centre is aware of the overlap issues, and had therefore proposed, in the Action Plan template, that one action can fall into more than one 5C, as is the practice for Committee reports based on the 5C. She further indicated that only the World Heritage Committee can decide if, at some point in the future, a more operational approach to the 5C could be adopted.

BENEFICIARIES OF THE EXERCISE

Several Focal Points emphasized that the Site Managers should also be seen as core beneficiaries of this exercise.

Petya Totcharova indicated that the Centre was taking due note of this, and reminded the Focal Points that she asked those who are using the data from PR to share their experiences, which can be uploaded onto the WHC website. She also noted that there is room for further discussion on how to use the Periodic Report once it is published.

CROSSING THE PR RESULTS AND OTHER DATABASES

Christopher Young emphasized that the outcomes of the Periodic Reporting questionnaires should directly inform the Action Plan. He further reminded the participants that the overarching goal of creating such a plan is for it to respond to the needs of the States Parties and the individual properties.

Jane Thompson indicated that crossing-checking SOC data and PR data would be very interesting. Despite the limitations of SOC Reports, they do flag some gaps in PR (due notably to the subjective aspects and interpretation of the current situation, e.g. when management is rated as appropriate in the PR questionnaire, but as insufficient in the SOC framework).

REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Focal Points asked whether the 2015 revision of the *Operational Guidelines* would deal with Periodic Reporting and update the relevant chapters.

Petya Totcharova indicated that this could not be said for certain at this stage, but that there is a long list of proposals for revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. She noted that the sections on Periodic Reporting have not been updated since before the First Cycle of PR, and would therefore certainly benefit from further attention from the Committee. They also expressed the opinion that it may be better to proceed with revisions during or after the reflection period.

STATUTORY FOLLOW-UP OF THE SECOND CYCLE

Alexandra Fiebig indicated that, concerning the statutory follow-up on the basis of PR data, all relevant questions and comments (regarding maps, coordinates, names, comments on the SOUVs) are currently being analysed. The World Heritage Centre will ensure individual follow-up with Focal Points within the next year or so.

FOCUS GROUP ON NATURAL WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

During a side meeting, the Focal Points dealing with natural properties gathered and produced the following remarks and conclusions, which were presented by **Mirna Bojic** (Croatia):

1. Natural properties are not numerous in the Europe region (only 40), but nonetheless important.
2. The *IUCN World Heritage Outlook* was recently launched and well-received. The system of ratings proposed therein needs more explanation, and feedback is always welcome (e.g. feedback regarding Plitvice will be provided to IUCN). IUCN will be focusing on building the Outlook in the coming years, and the Europe region can also contribute to improving the situation in sites outside the region itself.
3. Clearer guidance materials for site managers are needed on what is required and expected when managing a World Heritage site, including on sustainable tourism. This could help limiting the use of separate advice for natural and cultural sites.
4. More work is needed on HIA and EIA guidance documents, including on threatened sites that are on Tentative Lists.
5. The overlap between the World Heritage List and Natura 2000 has not been studied, nor did it emerge strongly from the PR exercise. This is a good entry point to renew discussions with the EU on World Heritage, on which the World Heritage Centre and IUCN could cooperate. Another point would be how to handle cultural landscapes that have high natural values.
6. Not all World Heritage Focal Points in the region are members of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), but are invited to join.
7. There are a range of good examples of nature/culture institutions cooperating in the region, which ought to be taken into account for the current reflection on how to better link nature and culture. The approach needs to be made practical, and could for instance focus on recognising ecosystem services provided by cultural sites.
8. Work on nomination dossiers is a lower priority in Europe, but IUCN is willing to advise where asked, and is working on a number of issues including upstream projects (e.g. Dinaric Karst Serial Nomination). A new initiative with France on the Tentative List is being discussed and could be a regional example of good practice. Overseas territories are a particular area of potential for listings.
9. The World Heritage Centre is seeking to replace its reduced nature capacity.
10. A regional meeting to bring back the results of the recent IUCN World Parks Congress is being planned in Austria on 28th May 2015, and World Heritage will be included in the agenda. Andrej Sovinc and Pierre Galland can provide more information on this.
11. The small number of natural sites in Europe makes sub-regional strategies potentially less useful on the nature theme.

REFLECTION TOWARDS THE THIRD CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

Background documents:

- [Document 10: Reflection towards the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting](#)

Stefan Wessman (Finland) opened the reflection session by announcing that Europe is the last region having completed the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting and that it is time to look towards the future.

Presentation of Document 10 by Petya Totcharova

Ms Totcharova gave an overview of Document 10 and highlighted the following issues:

- UNESCO has been facing unprecedented financial constraints, while on the other side trying to deliver the best possible service in response to very many relevant questions and suggestions sent by the Focal Points, who have been very active, as well as Site Managers and the Advisory Bodies. All these useful comments shall be taken into account in the reflection towards the third cycle.
- Document 10 encompasses the feedback collected throughout the process, including during the Mid-Cycle Information Meeting (2013), as well as further inputs from Focal Points, Periodic Reporting Experts, the Secretariat, and in some cases feedback from other regions.
- Finally, Ms Totcharova recalled that the Committee, at its 38th session (Doha, 2014), took a decision concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the evaluation contained in Document 38 COM 5F.2 “Follow-up to the Audit of the Working Methods of Cultural Conventions and to the Evaluation of UNESCO’s Standard-Setting work of the Culture Sector”. One of the recommendations concerned the development of detailed indicators for result-based reporting. In this regard, the Committee noted that some indicators are already included in the current Periodic Reporting. Therefore, the Committee decided that the issue would be addressed during the reflection period at the end of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting.

Presentation of the Dutch proposal for the Third Cycle by René Wokke (Netherlands)

(See Document 10, Annex I).

Mr Wokke presented the reasons behind the Dutch reflection on Periodic Reporting, namely feedback received throughout the process about its time-consuming nature and the lack of relevance of some questions, as well as concerns regarding what can be done with the data collected and how to do it.

Mr Wokke further addressed that:

- the most relevant questions are in relation to OUV and its attributes;
- there should be a link between the answers of chapter 3 and 4;
- a distinction is needed between direct causes and underlying causes.

He also illustrated the difficulties to identify the trends in an objective manner, and suggested to adopt an approach where the same person would be assessing the present and the past and making a projection in to the future, to avoid discrepancies in approaches when such assessments are done over time by different persons.

In conclusion, Mr Wokke presented the scheme (also contained in the Annex of Doc 10), which shows how all the various parts of reporting are connected. He suggested that the attention should be focused on negative factors that have an impact on the state of conservation of properties.

Discussion

During this discussion, the Focal Points of the following States Parties took the floor: **Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Switzerland.**

Several Focal Points expressed their agreement with the proposal put forward by the Netherlands.

Tim Badman congratulated the Secretariat for the quality of Document 10. He mentioned that Europe and North America is the first region to try and reflect on Periodic Reporting critically, and that since Periodic Reporting is a global exercise that concerns all regions, the Document produced by Europe and North America will help towards the global reflection. He suggested that the costs of the PR exercise should be better documented, and highlighted that the Europe and North America region represents half of the properties inscribed on the List, while it handled the Periodic Reporting in one third of time of the global Second Cycle.

REMARKS ON THE FIRST CYCLE VS. THE SECOND CYCLE

Some Focal Points highlighted that there was a clear purpose to the First Cycle and Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, namely gathering and updating basic statutory data. However, the question remains what further purposes the Periodic Reporting may serve. They further highlighted the need to focus on fewer issues in the future, considering the reduction in financial and human resources, and emphasized the need to clarify the formulation of some of the questions.

Jane Thompson and **Petya Totcharova** highlighted the accomplishments since the First Cycle, in particular the publication of several useful Manuals for World Heritage and agreed with Focal Points that a core outcome of the Periodic Reporting is an improved awareness on behalf of the Site Managers of the implications of the World Heritage status, since there is an important turnover in staff in-between cycles.

Some Focal Points highlighted that the main benefit of the First Cycle had been to make States Parties aware of the need to improve the overall organisation of World Heritage matters at State level, and to create networks, notably amongst Site Managers. Even though the First Cycle Action plan has not been entirely implemented, this represents nonetheless an important step forward.

USABILITY OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING DATA

The Focal Points emphasized again that behind Periodic Reporting, one ought to see the Site Managers, who have invested considerable amounts of time filling out the questionnaire and would like to see how it will be used, and with which results. They further suggested that for the Third Cycle, it may be useful to show trends from the following cycles as the Focal Points fill out the questionnaire.

The Focal Points expressed the opinion that the Third Cycle will be an important tool for conservation, and that the responsibility of the States Parties and Focal Points in analyzing the results and taking appropriate action should not be forgotten.

ADDRESSING THE SPECIFIC NEEDS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF PROPERTIES

Several Focal Points regretted that the questionnaire is not well-suited for serial and transboundary or transnational properties, and does not allow for an accurate representation of the situation. The case of the current reporting on serial properties was evoked several times: if some components are in very good condition, but one or several components are in bad condition, the reply to the questionnaire would have to average out the results, which does not allow for an accurate representation of the situation on site. They therefore asked that the future questionnaire specifically address the issues of individual components of serial and transboundary properties.

A similar issue was also raised by Focal Points regarding Section I, where several Ministries can be involved in reporting; the ministries must reach a consensus when filling out the questionnaire, but such a consensus may not be reflected in the day-to-day reality.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTIES

The Focal Points expressed their appreciation that the analysis of the results in Europe takes into account both positive and negative factors, and underlined that the questionnaire should also allow putting forward successes and positive aspects.

Tim Badman regretted the imbalance created by focusing mainly on negative sides in reactive monitoring, Periodic Reporting, reports to the Committee, Reinforced Monitoring, Danger Listing, etc, while similar attention is not paid to positive evolutions. He added that well-managed issues should also be mentioned in the PR and that World Heritage properties should have the ambition to be leaders in the field of conservation and management.

Several Focal Points also emphasized that the questionnaire should focus on the most important issues, and include less information on the risk factors and potential threats, which can be misleading as they are not easily quantifiable. They suggested elaborating a simpler, but more focused questionnaire, so that the Focal Points and Site Managers can devote more time to each question, once they have completed their training.

Some Focal Points also highlighted that it would be useful to reflect on how to cross-reference the Convention's two monitoring processes (SOC and PR).

COOPERATIVE ASPECTS

Some Focal Points stated that although the questions are not perfect, they force Focal Points and Site Managers to think about their implications, making capacity-building one of the biggest gains of the exercise. They indicated that many States Parties have invested money and human resources in order to carry out this exercise at the national level, including meetings of site managers and discussions, and that Periodic Reporting led to a rapprochement of all involved and fostered the creation of networks as well as collective reflection. They noted that even though these efforts cannot solve all problems, many Site Managers wish to keep meeting and exchanging after the end of the Second Cycle.

REVISION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Several Focal Points emphasized that large-scale changes to the questionnaire would hinder comparisons between past and future cycles, but that small changes would be useful. They also highlighted that States Parties and Site Managers need a permanent monitoring system.

Other Focal Points expressed the opinion that although changes in the questionnaire would pose difficulties in terms of comparison, it is not possible to keep the questionnaire in its current state, and that there is a need for continuous improvement.

Tim Badman expressed his agreement with point 24 of the Document (the proposal by a Focal Point to shorten the questionnaire, make it more focused on 'key indicators' in relation to the attributes of OUV, and create parallel, more regular periodic assessments specifically dedicated to those topics most relevant for a given type of properties and/or sub-region), as well as with the points made regarding the need to adapt the questionnaire to fit the various types of properties.

PROJECTS LINKED TO PERIODIC REPORTING: PUBLICATION AND VIDEO INTERVIEWS

PERIODIC REPORTING PUBLICATION

Presentation of the Periodic Reporting Publication project by Christopher Young and Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt (World Heritage Centre)

Recalling the presentations made at the Side-Event on Periodic Reporting held at the occasion of the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (Doha, 2014) and at the Mid-Cycle Review Meeting (November 2013), **Mr Oudaille-Diethardt** explained that the Publication should be a concise, user-friendly booklet focusing mainly on clear examples that illustrate the Periodic Reporting exercise, its usefulness and main outcomes.

The publication should be a short document (~ 60 pages) and aims to share the results of the Periodic Reporting exercise with a wider, less specialised audience than the Periodic Report, making the exercise more accessible to people who are not heritage professionals, such as various government officials and decision-makers, interested members of civil society, but also newly appointed Site Managers.

The Europe Unit's goal is to present this Publication at the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee, during a Side Event. Regarding the timeline for this project, the writing process will be subordinated to the writing of the Periodic Report, the first draft of which is expected by the end of January 2015; accordingly, the first draft of the Publication has been scheduled for the end of February 2015.

Mr Young indicated that the authors are still looking for a good title, and that suggestions continue to be welcome.

Mr Oudaille-Diethardt invited the Focal Points to share two illustrations for the core themes selected by the PR Experts (see below), in view of their possible inclusion into the publication. The PR Experts will contact the Focal Points directly if a case is selected for the short publication.

Mr Young also confirmed that the PR Experts welcome good practice cases concerning themes other than those proposed, but underlined the fact that the publication is meant to remain short, and that selections will need to be made.

Themes proposed for the Periodic Reporting Publication	
Impacts of tourism / visitors / recreation Interpretation and associated facilities	Management responses to new developments, transportation infrastructure
Climate change and environmental degradation	Society's valuing of heritage Community involvement
Management effectiveness and cooperation	New Partnerships in Funding
Others (input from Focal Points)	

Discussion

In this discussion, the Focal Points of the Following States Parties took the floor: **Belgium, Germany, and Slovenia.**

Several Focal Points raised questions regarding authorship, format, review process, and illustrative examples and themes.

Christopher Young indicated that many ideas had also been expressed during the two days of the Final Meeting, which will be integrated into the publication after further reflection.

Some Focal Points expressed the opinion that it is much more difficult to do a short, concise publication than a selection of good practice examples taken by all States Parties. They hoped that such an accessible and illustrative review of the achievements of the region, clearly displaying what is done, why, by whom and for whom, and how the States Parties intend to continue carrying on this important work, would be of value.

In response to questions raised by some Focal Points, **Petya Totcharova** and **Christopher Young** indicated that this would be an authored publication written by the PR Experts team (Mr Young, Ms Lisitzin, Mr Galland, Mr Eriksen) in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre, but that the question of signing independent chapters and sections has not yet been considered.

Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt confirmed that the Europe and North America Unit always welcomes short descriptions of good practice cases (~10-15 lines), and can share those on the online platform for Periodic Reporting, regardless of whether they are featured in the Publication.

Petya Totcharova reminded the Focal Points that nearly every audit encouraged the sharing of good practices between the States Parties, and that this should be taken into consideration. However, she emphasized that the creation of a database would represent a considerable workload, which will notably need to be coordinated with the newly created Common Conventions Services unit, headed by Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy.

Alexandra Fiebig assured the Focal Points that they will be able to review the relevant descriptions if a good practice case is selected. **Petya Totcharova** underlined that publications are handled by the Secretariat, and moreover, due to the large number of States Parties in the Europe region, it would be technically impossible to submit the publication for review by all States Parties.

PERIODIC REPORTING VIDEO INTERVIEWS

Presentation by Petya Totcharova

Ms Totcharova explained that the Europe Unit has decided to realise a series of short (~ 2-3 minutes) videos on specific aspects of the Periodic Reporting exercise (e.g. process, benefits, outcomes, and future, as well as international cooperation and other uses). Inspired by the work done by the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, the World Heritage Centre sees these videos as an opportunity to further explain the nature and importance of the exercise, and to present it to outsiders in an approachable way.

The goal for those videos is to upload them on the Periodic Reporting online platform, and possibly to present them on the occasion of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee, during a Side Event. The Centre also hopes that this project can help spark an interregional dialogue on the future of Periodic Reporting and its importance, particularly for those regions who have completed their Second Cycle several years ago.

CONCLUSIONS

A considerable amount of work was invested by all parties involved to produce quantitative and content analyses of the results of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in Europe, going over tens of thousands of data entries in less than four months.

The PR Experts presented the **quantitative analysis** of the results of PR, which represented a very substantial amount of work analysing tens of thousands of data entries, as well as the analysis of Sections I and II in terms of content, with particular attention paid to the comments sections.

At the onset of the meeting, the question of the **reliability and viability** of the data has been raised again, mainly stemming from the fact that the questionnaire remains a **self-evaluation**. **Discrepancies between PR questionnaires and SOC cases** brought to the Committee do certainly exist, and will need to be thought about further, particularly regarding the possibility of cross-cutting analyses of the both sets of data. Nonetheless, the PR exercise remains an essential tool to gather statutory information on the properties and their state of conservation, whilst asking questions that are not necessarily part of each country's monitoring or conservation mechanisms.

Whilst there is agreement that the questionnaire is long and sometimes difficult, and needs to be thought about seriously before the next cycle, there is a strong consensus that the data collected provides **invaluable insight** into the conservation and management individual properties, but also on regional and sub-regional trends. Indeed, the analysis of the data often **confirms tendencies** that have been noted by Focal Points, and certainly provides many learning experiences for all involved.

An essential question was raised repeatedly: **What is the best use of the datasets** at national level? A lot of data is available, and can be integrated into many important aspects of management and conservation of the property.

The **collaborative aspects of PR** have become even clearer during this meeting: there is a strong case to be made for PR as a tool of international cooperation, and to build or expand networks within and between the different States Parties.

The **follow-up actions** of the PR exercise are clearly still ahead of us, and very much in the hands of the States Parties.

Together, the participants have:

- worked on the draft **Regional Action Plan**, and
- discussed **sub-regional Capacity-Building priorities**, with the help of the background studies prepared on the basis of the State of conservation reports.

The meeting enjoyed the **very active participation of many Focal Points**, and their remarks will be taken into account in the further preparation of the draft Regional Action Plan. The PR Experts and World Heritage Centre will go back to the results of this meeting, and propose a cleaned-up version of the Action Plan for consultation with the Focal Points.

Regarding the **future of Periodic Reporting**, it appears clear that the focus needs to be placed even more on the benefits of the questionnaire for Site Managers. Many Focal Points expressed their wish for a shorter but more specific questionnaire, which could address the state of conservation of properties in more detail, as well as take into account the specificities of certain types of properties (notably transnational and transboundary sites, serial properties, mixed properties, etc. ...).

The World Heritage Centre will continue to follow up on the statutory information provided during the cycle (maps, property names, SOUVs, ...) and will ensure individual and personalised follow-up with the States Parties over the next years.

In view of the presentation of the Periodic Report at the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee, the PR Experts and the Centre will prepare the Final Report, and hopefully also finalise two ongoing projects of the Centre: the Periodic Reporting publication and the series of short interviews.

FOLLOW-UP

- The PR Experts and the World Heritage Centre will clean up and streamline the regional Action Plan by **22 December**. The Focal Points are invited to provide their feedback on the Draft Action Plan by **16 January 2015**.
- For the Periodic Reporting Publication, Focal Points are invited to submit ~2 good examples to illustrate the main themes (see PowerPoint presentation) to Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt (a.oudaille-diethardt@unesco.org) by **16 January 2015**. The PR Experts and authors of the publication will then get in touch with the Focal Points directly.
- The deadline for Boundary Clarifications was 1 December 2014, and the deadline for Boundary Modifications to be considered at 39COM is **30 January 2015**.
- The World Heritage Centre will share the Datasets for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe as well as Mediterranean Europe no later than **1 February 2015**.
- The deadline for rSOUVs to be agreed upon between the States Parties and the Advisory, in view of their presentation for adoption at 39COM, is **2 March 2015**.
- The PR Report will be presented at the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee, and made available publicly with the 1st dispatch of documents (**18 May 2015**).
- Focal Points are invited to share with the World Heritage Centre any good practices on the use of the data collected during the Periodic Reporting exercise, in view of their publication on the online PR Platform, ahead of the Committee session.

ANNEX I: DRAFT REGIONAL ACTION PLAN (STATUS AT THE END OF THE MEETING, 2 DECEMBER 2014)

Strategic Objectives 5Cs					Themes Expected Results Outcomes	Objectives Outputs (SMART)	Action (SMART)	Lead partner Resource	Comments
Credibility	Conservation	Capacity-Building	Communication	Communities					
X					Credible TL and Nominations	1. Best practice examples for establishment and review of TL, to be provided by SPs to WHC and made available on the website.	SPs WHC to make available on the website	Good conservation is an essential element for ensuring the credibility.	
						2. Establish national review processes for Tentative List, to check potential OUV of sites.	SPs		
						3. Update the Gap Analysis concerning cultural properties, depending on funding.	ICCROM, ICOMOS		
						4. Ensure funding for the update of Gap Analysis.	One or more SPs jointly.		
						5. States Parties to use existing training modules on the preparation of nominations for natural and cultural heritage and ensure funding for the implementation training modules on nominations.	One or more SPs jointly.	On the basis of Resource Manual and existing training modules.	
						6. States Parties to request Upstream advice from ABs for TLs and Nominations.	SPs		
						7. ABs to provide such advice, depending on funding.	Abs		
						8. Ensure that the management of sites on TLs are fully operational before nomination.	SPs		
	X				Improved Legal framework	Establish synergies among national laws within the country.	SPs	Add implementation here ref: PR questionnaire outcomes	

Strategic Objectives 5Cs					Themes Expected Results Outcomes	Objectives Outputs (SMART)	Action (SMART)	Lead partner Resource	Comments
Credibility	Conservation	Capacity-Building	Communication	Communities					
	X				Effective Management Systems		Clarify and agree upon roles and responsibilities regarding the conservation of the property between national, regional and local authorities		
							Identify monitoring indicators and establish a regular monitoring system in particular using the existing tools for Risk Management and Sustainable Tourism and resource manuals.		
							ensure integrated effective management of properties protected by more than one Convention and programmes		
	X				OUV and Attributes	Red Line for Developments projects / No go area?	Identify attributes of OUV		
					Heritage practitioners: New concept of 'site manager' Broader cross-discipline cross-sectorial shared knowledge	Proficiency in technical, soft and advocacy skills in a sustainable way. Intersectorial bridge building.	Review and update the tasks (Terms of Reference / Job description) in a changing environment / for a new generation of 'site manager'		
						New approaches to effective team working / co-management	Create New learning environments for practitioners and institutions / decisions takers to achieve this shift		
		X				Greater proficiency in a variety of new management knowledge areas	Establish capacity-buildings systems for site managers covering: - management systems (including legal frameworks), - sustainable use and managing change – through a better understanding of balancing cultural values vs. other human values, attributes, integrity etc. (EIA and HIA); - interpretation - risk management - community engagement and resilience		

Strategic Objectives 5Cs					Themes Expected Results Outcomes	Objectives Outputs (SMART)	Action (SMART)	Lead partner Resource	Comments
Credibility	Conservation	Capacity-Building	Communication	Communities					
							building		
		X			Institutional frameworks: Decision takers especially outside the heritage sector fully aware of World Heritage and other cultural values	Informed decisions that take into account heritage values as well as other human values (economic, social and environmental) to harness heritage benefits for heritage and society.	Advocacy by heritage practitioners and communities National-level task forces / ambassadors Intersectorial bridge building Capacity building 'retreats' for senior players (ministers of culture, also intersectorial) Where appropriate better exploit leverage of international attention/interest to increase national interest in heritage		
		X			Communities & networks: Community engagement and ownership of World Heritage properties and based on understanding of values	World Heritage properties that are well cared for by the community and the community advocates for their heritage.	World Heritage coordinators to use their skills to engage communities	We have new and old audiences. Both need new learning environments. What is our realistic professional capacity to deliver all this? It is absent... So the question is not how do we fund it but how to we find the human resources of existing heritage practitioners / heritage institutional frameworks to accompany this change?	

Strategic Objectives 5Cs					Themes Expected Results Outcomes	Objectives Outputs (SMART)	Action (SMART)	Lead partner Resource	Comments
Credibility	Conservation	Capacity-Building	Communication	Communities					
							New learning environments for audiences in all 3 areas where capacities reside.		
							Good use of existing skills and knowledge, also from other sectors (including 'soft' management skills).		
							Creating, maintaining, sharing and enhancing knowledge in a sustainable way.		
							Using new knowledge from PR and SOC reporting at a SP level to lever change.		
							More research and knowledge exchange at a sub-regional level on common management threads typology by typology		
							Inter-regional learning / mentoring / twinning - Europe can learn from approaches elsewhere.		
			X		A) Raised awareness among decision makers	Informed decision makers	Public consultation (hearing) Make information available through all channels, including new(er) technologies (information accessible and credible)	States Parties	
			X		B) Raised awareness among general public	Strengthened civil society	Develop guidance on achieving transparency Prepare and distribute concise/understandable leaflets of integrated mgt plans		
			X				Public consultation (hearing) Make information available through all channels, including new(er) technologies (Social networks, Virtual Tours, QR codes etc)	States Parties	

Strategic Objectives 5Cs					Themes Expected Results Outcomes	Objectives Outputs (SMART)	Action (SMART)	Lead partner Resource	Comments
Credibility	Conservation	Capacity-Building	Communication	Communities					
						Management Plans are communicated to the Public	Systematic consultation with and involvement of civil society		
			X		C) Raised awareness among Young People	Sustainability of Educational programmes ensured	Enhanced use of World Heritage YH tool integrate heritage into national education programmes Align academic research with site management needs	States Parties	
			X		D) World Heritage Information and Tools accessible, shared, promoted and understood	1) OUV as starting point for the mgmt; Operationalizing the OUV for better understanding and conservation. 2) Improved use, at the national and international level, of already existing tools 3) World Heritage website platform sustained and SPs invited to contribute 4) Present and interpret PR results at national level	Identify key examples of values and attributes Identify factors Prioritize highest threats Prioritize management responses to highest threats identified in Academic research: increased data credibility; help convince decision makers	World Heritage Centre in close cooperation with States Parties	
				X	Raised awareness among the communities concerning World Heritage and increased the understanding of its value	World Heritage-targeted Education and Promotion	School programs and school days Use of the World Heritage logo Media involvement Celebrations and open-days Open-platforms (social media)		
				X	Communities involved in management	Stakeholders and community identified Community empowered and its role defined Cooperation among stakeholders and authorities increased	Identity "mapping" Develop Tentative Lists in a participatory manner Establish sustainable tourism and communication plans		

Strategic Objectives 5Cs					Themes Expected Results Outcomes	Objectives Outputs (SMART)	Action (SMART)	Lead partner Resource	Comments
Credibility	Conservation	Capacity-Building	Communication	Communities					
						Continuous and effective participation of communities ensured	Identify decision-making processes		

ANNEX II: FINAL MEETING AGENDA

DAY ONE

9.00 – 9.15: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Speakers: Juhani Kostet, Director of the National Board of Antiquities
Heikki Lahdenmäki, Acting Director, Fortress of Suomenlinna
Petya Totcharova, WHC
Isabelle Longuet, ICOMOS
Tim Badman, IUCN
Jane Thompson, ICCROM
Alexandra Fiebig, WHC

Rapporteur: Lise Sellem

9.15 AM – 11 AM: OVERVIEW OF THE TRENDS AND GOOD PRACTICES

Moderator: Alexandra Fiebig

Speakers: Christopher Young, Katri Lisitzin and Pierre Galand
Ole Søre Erikson
Petya Totcharova

Rapporteur: Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt

Background documents:

- *Document 1: Summary of Outcomes of Section I and II*
- *Documents 2 and 3: Quantitative summaries of PR Sections I and II*

11.30 AM – 12.30 PM: DRAFT ACTION PLAN: WORKING SESSION 1 (PLENARY)

Moderator: Petya Totcharova

Speaker: Christopher Young

Rapporteurs: Anna Sidorenko, Alexandra Fiebig

Background documents:

- *Document 4: Action Plan for the First Cycle of PR in Europe*
- *Document 5: Draft Action Plan for the Second Cycle of PR in Europe*

2 PM – 3.30 PM: DRAFT ACTION PLAN: WORKING SESSION IN 5C GROUPS

- All participants to split into working groups according to the 5C's. (Preferences expressed during the Coffee Break in the morning.)

Background documents:

- *Document 4: Action Plan for the First Cycle of PR in Europe*
- *Document 5: Draft Action Plan for the Second Cycle of PR in Europe*

CREDIBILITY

Facilitator: Christopher Young

Rapporteur: Focal Point volunteer / Petya Totcharova

Aim: Strengthening the credibility of the World Heritage List.

CONSERVATION

Facilitators: Isabelle Longuet & Tim Badman

Rapporteur: Focal Point volunteer / Anna Sidorenko

Aim: Ensuring effective conservation of World Heritage properties.

CAPACITY-BUILDING

Facilitators: Jane Thompson & Pierre Galland

Rapporteur: Focal Point volunteer / Alexandra Fiebig

Aim: Promoting effective capacity-building.

COMMUNICATION

Facilitator: Ole Søre Eriksen

Rapporteur: Focal Point volunteer / Lise Sellem

Aim: Increase awareness and support through communication.

COMMUNITIES

Facilitator: Katri Lisitzin

Rapporteur: Focal Point volunteer / Maider Marana

Aim: Strengthening the role of communities.

4 PM – 5 PM: DRAFT ACTION PLAN: WRAP-UP (PLENARY)

Moderators: Petya Totcharova and Christopher Young

Speakers: Rapporteurs of the 5C Groups

Rapporteurs: Maider Maraña / Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt

On-Screen Typist: Lise Sellem

7.30 PM – 9 PM: RECEPTION AT THE FINNISH NATIONAL MUSEUM

DAY TWO

9 AM – 10.30 AM SUB-REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Session 1:

- Review the First Cycle PR Sub-Regional Recommended Actions.
- Discuss the Second Cycle PR Priority Actions for the sub-region.

Session 2:

- Presentation of the Outcomes of the Desk Studies for Capacity-Building per sub-region (by the authors of the studies).
- Discuss priority capacity-building activities for the sub-region in the overall framework of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy (2011).

Background documents:

- *Document 1 : Summary of Outcomes*
- *Documents 2 and 3: Quantitative summaries of PR Sections I and II*
- *Document 4: Action Plan for the First Cycle of PR in Europe*
- *Document 5: Draft Action Plan for the Second Cycle of PR in Europe*

CENTRAL, EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

Facilitators: Georgia / Hungary

Rapporteurs: Slovenia / Albania

C-B study author: Katarzyna Piotrowska

States Parties: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine.

Background documents:

- *Document 6: Sub-Regional Consultations : Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe*

MEDITERRANEAN EUROPE

Facilitators: Italy / Spain

Rapporteurs: Turkey / Holy See

C-B study author: Maider Marañá

States Parties: Andorra, Cyprus, Greece, Holy See, Israel, Italy, Malta, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Turkey.

Background documents:

- *Document 7: Sub-Regional Consultations : Mediterranean Europe*

NORDIC & BALTIC EUROPE

Facilitators: Denmark / Lithuania

Rapporteurs: Sweden / Estonia

C-B Study Author: Ole Søe Erikson

States Parties: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden.

Background documents:

- *Document 8: Sub-Regional Consultations : Nordic & Baltic Europe*

WESTERN EUROPE

Facilitators: Netherlands / Switzerland

Rapporteurs: France / Germany

C-B Study Author: Christopher Young

States Parties: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Switzerland, UK.

Background documents:

- *Document 9: Sub-Regional Consultations : Western Europe*

11 AM – 12 PM: SUB-REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS (CONTD.)

12 PM – 12.30 PM: SUB-REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS - WRAP-UP (PLENARY)

Moderator: Petya Totcharova

Speakers: Rapporteurs of the Regional Groups

Rapporteur: Alexandra Fiebig

On-Screen Typist: Lise Sellem

2 PM – 2.45 PM: FINALISATION OF THE ACTION PLAN

Moderator: Petya Totcharova

Rapporteurs: Anna Sidorenko / Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt

On-Screen Typist: Lise Sellem

2.45 PM – 3.30PM: REFLECTION TOWARDS THE THIRD CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

Moderator: Stephan Wessman

Speakers: Petya Totcharova and Alexandra Fiebig

Christopher Young

Dré van Marrewijk and René Wokke

Rapporteur: Wiktoriina Hurskainan

Background documents:

- *Document 10: Reflection towards the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting*

4 PM – 4.45 PM: REFLECTION TOWARDS THE THIRD CYCLE (CONTD.)

4.45 PM – 5.15 PM: SHORT PREVIEW OF THE **PERIODIC REPORTING PUBLICATION AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE MEETING**

Moderator: Petya Totcharova

Speaker: Christopher Young

Rapporteur: Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt

ANNEX III: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NATIONAL FOCAL POINTS

	COUNTRY	NAME	E-MAIL
1.	Albania	Ms. Arta Dollani	artadollani@yahoo.com arta.dollani@imk.gov.al
2.	Armenia	Mr. Arakelyan Artashes	arakelyanartashes@gmail.com
3.	Azerbaijan	Ms. Tarana Gambarova	tg_bay@hotmail.com
4.	Azerbaijan	Mr. Rufat Nuriyev	r.nuriyev@mct.gov.az
5.	Azerbaijan	Mr. Mustafa Shabanov	mustafa.shabanov@gmail.com
6.	Belgium	Ms. Gislaine Devillers	Gislaine.devillers@spw.wallonie.be
7.	Belgium	Mr. Piet Geleyns	Piet.geleyns@rwo.vlaanderen.be
8.	Belgium	Ms. Isabelle Leroy	ileroy@sprb.irisnet.be
9.	Croatia	Ms. Mirna Bojic	Mirna.bojic@mzoip.hr
10.	Croatia	Mr. Bruno Diklic	bruno.diklic@min-kulture.hr
11.	Cyprus	Ms. Photini Panayi	p.panayi.cy@unesco-delegations.org
12.	Cyprus	Ms. Marina Solomidou-Ieronymidou	marinasieronymidou@gmail.com
13.	Denmark	Ms. Bolette Lehn Petersen	blp@kulturstyrelsen.dk
14.	Estonia	Ms. Liina Jänes	Liina.janes@kul.ee
15.	Finland	Ms. Susanna Lindeman	susanna.lindeman@metsa.fi
16.	Finland	Mr. Stefan Wessman	stefan.wessman@nba.fi
17.	Finland	Ms. Anne Huhtamaki	sanomat.une@formin.fi

18.	France	Ms. Béatrice Boisson-Saint-Martin	beatrice.boisson-saint-martin@culture.gouv.fr
19.	France	Mr. Jérôme Etifier	jerome.etifier@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
20.	Georgia	Ms. Rusudan Mirzikashvili	r.mirzikashvili@gmail.com
21.	Germany	Dr. Birgitta Ringbeck	birgitta.ringbeck@diplo.de
22.	Germany	Ms. Kerstin Manz	manz@unesco.de
23.	Holy See	Ms. Maria Serlupi Crescenzi	didattica.musei@scv.va
24.	Hungary	Dr. Gabor Soos	gabor.soos@forsterkozpont.hu
25.	Hungary	Ms. Judit Szabadhegyi	judit.szabadhegyi@forsterkozpont.hu
26.	Iceland	Ms. Margrét Hallgrímsdóttir	margret.hallgrimsdottir@for.is
27.	Iceland	M. Sigurdur Thrainsson	sigurdur.thrainsson@uar.is
28.	Israel	Mr. Guy Kav Venaki	Kavenaki2@orange.net.il
29.	Italy	Ms. Adele Cesi	Adele.cesi@gmail.com
30.	Latvia	Ms. Ieva Svarca	office@unesco.lv , i.svarca@unesco.lv
31.	Lithuania	Ms. Rugile Balkaite	rugile.balkaite@unesco.lt rugile.balkaite@gmail.com
32.	Luxemburg	Mr. Alex Langini	alex.langini@mc.etat.lu
33.	FYR of Macedonia	Mr. Zoran Pavlov	z.pavlov@uzkn.gov.mk
34.	Moldova	Mr. Sergius Ciocanu	sercigni@yahoo.com
35.	Montenegro	Mr. Ilija Lalosevic	ilalos@t-com.me
36.	Netherlands	Mr. Dré van Marrewijk	d.van.marrewijk@cultureelerfgoed.nl
37.	Netherlands	Mr. René Wokke	r.wokke@cultureelerfgoed.nl
38.	Norway	Mr. Petter Koren	prk@ra.no

39.	Norway	Mr. Gaute Sønstebo	gaute.sonstebo@miljodir.no
40.	Poland	Ms. Anna Marconi-Betka	amarconi@nid.pl
41.	Poland	Ms. Katarzyna Piotrowska	kpiotrowska@nid.pl
42.	Portugal	Mr. Luiz António Branco de Pinho Lopes	lplopes@dgpc.pt
43.	Romania	Ms. Daniela Mihai	Dana.mihai@inmi.ro
44.	Serbia	Ms. Brana Stojkovic Pavelka	brana.stojkovic@heritage.gov.rs
45.	Slovakia	Ms. Michaela Mrazova	michaela.mrazova@soprs.sk
46.	Slovakia	Ms. Lubica Pincikova	lubica.pincikova@pamiatky.gov.sk
47.	Slovenia	Ms. Špela Spanžel	spela.spanzel@gov.si
48.	Spain	Ms. Laura de Miguel	laura.demiguel@mecd.es
49.	Sweden	Ms. Maria Wikman	maria.wikman@raa.se
50.	Switzerland	Mr. Oliver Martin	Oliver.martin@bak.admin.ch
51.	Turkey	Prof. Nevra Ertürk	nevra.erturk@gmail.com
52.	Turkey	Ms. Evrim Ulsan	ulusan.evrim@gmail.com evrim.ulsan@kultur.gov.tr
53.	Ukraine	Ms. Mariia Buiukli	sophiacathedral@ukr.net
54.	UK	Mr. Henry Owen-John	henry.owen-john@english-heritage.org.uk

RESOURCE PERSONS

	NAME	TITLE/ORGANISATION	E-MAIL
1.	Mr. Tim Badman	IUCN	tim.badman@iucn.org
2.	Mr. Ole S�e Eriksen	Nordic World Heritage Foundation	ose@nwhf.no
3.	Mr. Valentino Etowar	WHC	v.etowar@unesco.org
4.	Ms. Alexandra Fiebig	WHC	a.fiebig@unesco.org
5.	Mr. Pierre Galland	PR Expert	pierre.galland@bluewin.ch
6.	Ms. Wiktoriina Hurskainen	National Board of Antiquities	wiktoriina.hurskainen@nba.fi
7.	Ms. Sari J�askel�inen	Parks & Wildlife Finland	sari.jaaskelainen@metsa.fi
8.	Ms. Katri Lisitzin	PR Expert	katri.lisitzin@gmail.com
9.	Ms. Isabelle Longuet	ICOMOS	longuet@mission-valdeleire.fr
10.	Ms. Maider Maraf�a	Capacity-Building Expert	maider.montevideando@gmail.com
11.	Ms. Marie Mattinen		maire.mattinen@saunalahti.fi
12.	Mr. Anatole Oudaille-Diethardt	WHC	a.oudaille-diethardt@unesco.org
13.	Ms. Lise Sellem	WHC	l.sellem@unesco.org
14.	Ms. Anna Sidorenko	WHC	a.sidorenko@unesco.org
15.	Ms. Jane Thompson	ICCROM	j.thompson@tiscali.it
16.	Ms. Petya Totcharova	WHC	p.totcharova@unesco.org
17.	Mr. Christopher Young	PR Expert	youngoakthorpe@btinternet.com