Helsinki Action Plan Monitoring Survey

Presentation of Results for the reporting period from July 2015 to October 2016
Survey Objectives

• to allow States Parties to carry out a self-assessment of progress in the implementation of the Helsinki Action Plan for Europe;

• to track progress on the regional level in the implementation of the Action Plan through its quantifiable regional targets;

• to reassess the regional priorities and targets in relation to the results;

• to ensure the engagement of the States Parties in the priorities endorsed by the Committee.
Provisional Timeline

3rd Cycle of Periodic Reporting (All Regions)

- **2016**: MS1
  - 40 COM Side event (Information Session)
  - 41 COM Update on Survey 1

- **2017**: MS2
  - 42 COM Side event (Information Session)
  - 43 COM Update on Survey 2

- **2018**: MS3
  - 44 COM Side event (Information Session)
  - 45 COM Update on Survey 3
  - Launch of 3rd PR Cycle for Europe and North America

- **2020**: MS4
  - Submission of 3rd Cycle PR Questionnaire by State Parties
  - 47 COM Presentation of 3rd Cycle Periodic Reporting and summary of all four Monitoring Surveys

*MS* Monitoring Survey undertaken between October and November every two years.

*////* Possible dates for the 3rd cycle of Periodic Reporting for Europe and North America.
Overview of Participation

Reporting period: July 2015 to October 2016

States Parties responses

Properties represented

*only States Parties with sites inscribed are included in the data

The States Parties that responded represent 83% of the World Heritage properties in Europe.
Results at a Glance

Total number of actions/questions: 44

12 targets reached or surpassed
13 actions for which progress was made
20 baselines established
Analysis of the relevance of actions

* Based on the responses of 33 States Parties
Top rated actions

**Action 15** (32/33 respondents): Identify monitoring indicators and establish a regular monitoring system (in particular using the Periodic Reporting outcomes, the State of Conservation database, as well as the existing tools on Risk Management and Sustainable Tourism, and the resource manuals on the management of cultural and natural properties)

**Action 18** (31/33): Before the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting, review and update Management Plans to integrate World Heritage mechanisms, or prepare them if they do not exist

**Action 9** (30/33): Clearly identify attributes of OUV and include them as a key component of site management plan/system

**Action 13** (30/33): Clarify and agree upon roles and responsibilities regarding the protection and conservation of the properties between national, regional and local authorities, involving the local communities
Structure of results presentation

Priority Area

Objective

Action

Relevance results

Target(s)      Result(s)
Part A: Identification & Protection of Outstanding Universal Value
Credible and Effective Tentative Lists and Nominations

Objective: Effective Updated Tentative Lists

Action 1: Provide the World Heritage Centre with good practice examples for the establishment and review of Tentative Lists, to be made available on the website

Target:
At least 10 good practice examples submitted

Result:
2 good practice examples were submitted

7 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant
Credible and Effective Tentative Lists and Nominations

Objective: Effective Updated Tentative Lists

Action 2: Establish or update national review processes for Tentative Lists to check potential OUV of sites

21 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
All States Parties (48) have established or updated their national review process
Credible and Effective Tentative Lists and Nominations

Objective: Effective Updated Tentative Lists

Action 4: Ensure funding for the update of Gap Analyses by one or more States Parties

**Target:**

75,000 USD contributed by the States Parties for the update of two Gap Analyses

**Result:**

115,500 USD was contributed by three (3) States Parties

Target reached
Credible and Effective Tentative Lists and Nominations

Objective: Fewer failed nominations

Action 5: Use existing training modules on the preparation of nominations for natural and cultural heritage and ensure funding for these training sessions by one State Party or more

9 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least <strong>four (4)</strong> States Parties have organized training sessions</td>
<td><strong>Eight (8)</strong> States Parties have organized a total of 29 training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on nominations for cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td>sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least <strong>fifty (50)</strong> persons have been trained on nominations for</td>
<td><strong>554</strong> persons were trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural and natural heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least <strong>four (4)</strong> nominations have been prepared following the</td>
<td><strong>Twenty (20)</strong> nominations by <strong>five (5)</strong> States Parties were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aforementioned training sessions, presented to the Committee and have</td>
<td>prepared, presented to Committee and given a positive evaluation by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received a positive evaluation by the Advisory Bodies</td>
<td>the Advisory Bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets reached
# Credible and Effective Tentative Lists and Nominations

**Objective:** Fewer failed nominations

**Action 6:** States Parties request upstream assistance from Advisory Bodies for Tentative Lists and Nominations

12 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

### Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least <strong>20%</strong> of nominations were recommended for inscription by the Advisory Bodies after benefiting from upstream assistance</td>
<td><strong>Four (4)</strong> recommendations for inscription by the ABs after benefitting from upstream assistance at 39COM and 40COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least <strong>ten (10)</strong> requests submitted</td>
<td><strong>Seven (7)</strong> requests for upstream assistance were submitted by <strong>seven (7)</strong> States Parties <em>(baseline: 2)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credible and Effective Tentative Lists and Nominations

Objective: Fewer failed nominations

Action 7: Advisory Bodies to provide upstream assistance

Target:

100% of the upstream assistance requests funded by the States Parties are fulfilled by the Advisory Bodies

Result:

3 requests for upstream assistance requests were made by States Parties

2 requests were fulfilled by the Advisory Bodies

(66% of requests fulfilled)

6 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant
Objective: Fewer failed nominations

Action 8: Ensure that the management of sites on Tentative Lists is fully operational before nomination

24 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:

100% of sites on the Tentative Lists have fully operational management systems before submission of the nomination

Based on total number of 561 Tentative List sites in Europe (as of 6 January 2016)
Clear definition of OUV and its attributes

Objective: Clear definition of the OUV and its attributes as a basis for informed management decisions to ensure the effective protection of World Heritage properties.

Action 9: Clearly identify attributes of OUV and include them as a key component of site management plan/system.

Target:

100% of properties have clearly defined attributes of OUV as basis of the management system.

30 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant.

Baseline established:

29% of properties reported to have defined attributes of OUV.
Action 9: Clearly identify attributes of OUV and include them as a key component of site management plan / system

Target: 100% of properties have clearly defined attributes of OUV as basis of the management system

Subregional analysis
Part B: Effective Management of World Heritage Properties
Objective: Improved collaboration between the various levels of authorities

Action 13: Clarify and agree upon roles and responsibilities regarding the protection and conservation of the properties between national, regional and local authorities, involving the local communities

30 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:

100% of properties have roles and responsibilities clearly set out in the management plans/systems

Q14. How many properties in your country have roles and responsibilities clearly set out in the Management Plans/Systems?

- Clearly defined: 362
- Not clearly defined: 44
- Unknown: 92
Effective Management Systems

Objective: Improved collaboration between the various levels of authorities

Action 13: Clarify and agree upon roles and responsibilities regarding the protection and conservation of the properties between national, regional and local authorities, involving the local communities

30 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Q15. How many properties in your country have effective cooperation mechanisms established between stakeholders?

Target:

100% of properties have established effective cooperation mechanisms between stakeholders (baseline 35%)

Effective cooperation mechanisms: 307; No cooperation mechanisms: 99; Unknown: 92
Effective Management Systems

Objective: Improved collaboration between the various levels of authorities

Action 14: Improve coordination between the authorities responsible for cultural and natural heritage

Target:

100% of States Parties have established effective cooperation mechanisms between the authorities responsible for cultural and natural heritage

Q16. Does your State Party have effective cooperation mechanisms in place between the authorities responsible?

Yes: 19; No: 10; Unknown: 19 States Parties
Effective Management Systems

Objective: Effective Monitoring

Action 15: Identify monitoring indicators and establish a regular monitoring system (in particular using the Periodic Reporting outcomes, the State of Conservation database, the existing tools on Risk Management and Sustainable Tourism, and resource manuals on cultural and natural properties)

32 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Targets:

100% of properties have identified monitoring indicators (baseline 38%)

100% of properties have a regular monitoring process (baseline 47%)

47% of properties have indicators identified
51% of properties have a regular monitoring process in place
Effective Management Systems

Objective: Prioritize management responses to highest threats identified in Periodic Report(s)

Action 16: Present and interpret Periodic Reporting results and take appropriate management actions at national and site levels

Target:

100% of properties have used the results of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting to take appropriate management actions

Q19. How many properties in your country have used the results of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting to take appropriate management actions?

Yes: 124; No: 186; Unknown: 188
Effective Management Systems

Objective: Management Planning

Action 17: Tailor to national and/or local needs the existing World Heritage Centre technical guidance documents and manuals on managing cultural and natural heritage

19 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least 35 guidance documents on the management of World Heritage properties produced by the national and/or local authorities

Result:
48 guidance documents were produced

Target reached
Effective Management Systems

Objective: Management Planning

Action 18: Before the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting, review and update Management Plans to integrate World Heritage mechanisms, or prepare them if they do not exist

31 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Targets:

All World Heritage properties in Europe have a Management Plan (baseline: 94% with management system/plan)

The Management Plans for at least 440 properties have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre (baseline 136)

19 management plans were reported to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre during the reporting period
Effective Management Systems

Objective: More effective impact assessments

Action 19: Training Site Managers on Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) and/or Environmental Impact Assessments

17 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least 49 training activities carried out at national level

Result:
31 training activities were carried out in 10 States Parties
Effective Management Systems

Objective: More effective impact assessments

Action 20: Promote the integration of HIA into the European EIA practice via EU institutions (e.g. through production of guidance materials with technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies)

13 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
HIA and EIA practices are integrated on an EU and national level

Results:
5 out of the 33 States Parties that responded to the survey have taken steps towards the integration of HIA and EIA practices at the EU level (Bosnia and Herzegovina, FYR Macedonia, Germany, Georgia, Latvia)
Reinforcement of interdisciplinary skill sets for Site Managers

Objective: Reinforcement of Site Managers’ technical, managerial and advocacy skills

Action 21: Establish capacity-building systems for Site Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 40 capacity-building activities carried out</td>
<td>79 capacity-building activities were carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 800 participants trained during those capacity-building activities</td>
<td>1,935 participants were trained during the capacity-building activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Targets reached
Reinforcement of interdisciplinary skill sets for Site Managers

Objective: Reinforcement of Site Managers’ technical, managerial and advocacy skills

Action 22: Reinforce and/or create networks of Site Managers (national or thematic)

22 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 24 active networks of Site Managers (baseline: 6)</td>
<td>57 active networks of Site Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 30% of Site Managers actively participate in a national and/or thematic network</td>
<td>75% of Site Managers actively participate in a national and/or thematic network (327 of total 435 site managers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reinforcement of interdisciplinary skill sets for Site Managers

Objective: Reinforcement of Site Managers’ technical, managerial and advocacy skills

Action 23: Twinning/mentoring at sub-regional, regional and/or inter-regional levels

Target:
At least 50% of properties engage in twinning/mentoring cooperation activities

23 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Engagement in twinning/mentoring cooperation activities

104 properties (20.9%) were reported to engage in twinning/mentoring cooperation activities
Reinforcement of interdisciplinary skill sets for Site Managers

Objective: Reinforcement of Site Managers’ technical, managerial and advocacy skills

Action 24: Research and knowledge exchange at sub-regional and/or regional level on common threats to the OUV of properties (i.e. by type of property)

24 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least 25% of properties engage in sub-regional and/or regional research activities

107 properties (21.5%) were reported to engage in relevant research activities
Reinforcement of interdisciplinary skill sets for Site Managers

Objective: Adaptation of the role of the Site Manager to a fast-changing environment

Action 25: States Parties to review and update the roles and responsibilities of Site Managers (‘Terms of Reference’/’Job description’) on the basis of general guidelines proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies

12 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least 25% of the properties have carried out a review of the roles and responsibilities of the Site Manager(s)

58 properties (11.6%) reported making revisions to the roles and responsibilities of Site Managers
Part C:
Increased Awareness of the World Heritage Convention
Decision makers, especially outside the heritage sector, fully aware of WH and its benefits to society

Objective: Harnessing benefits of heritage for society through informed decision-making

Action 26: Heritage practitioners and communities advocate to increase understanding of key concepts and processes of the World Heritage Convention by the decision makers at national and regional level

26 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 25 workshops and/or sensitisation activities organised</td>
<td>179 workshops and/or sensitisation activities were organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 75 public hearings and/or consultations organised</td>
<td>186 public hearings and/or consultations were organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 25 guidelines on communication and participatory processes developed</td>
<td>86 guidelines on communication and participatory processes were developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets reached
Community engagement and ownership of WH properties

Objective: World Heritage properties that are well cared for by the community and where the community advocates for their heritage

Action 27: World Heritage professionals to: identify and engage communities (identity mapping); and empower those communities through the formalisation of continuous participatory processes in the management systems

Target: At least 50% of properties have a Management Plan comprising a formalised framework for community participation

145 properties (29%) reported to have a formalized framework for community participation in their management systems
Awareness-raising among general public, in particular communities

Objective: Reliable and clear information on World Heritage is easily and widely available

Action 28: Disseminate relevant and credible information on World Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 link to an updated website for each World Heritage property in Europe submitted to the World Heritage Centre (total 498)</td>
<td>127 links to updated websites for World Heritage properties in Europe submitted to the World Heritage Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of properties have a communication strategy and/or visibility guidelines</td>
<td>48% of properties have a communication strategy and/or visibility guidelines (238 properties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 75% of properties use digital technologies to enhance interpretation on site</td>
<td>38% of properties use digital technologies to enhance interpretation on site (189 properties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant
Action 28: Disseminate relevant and credible information on World Heritage

Detail of responses to questions 37 and 38

Q37. How many of your country’s properties have a dedicated communication strategy and/or visibility guidelines?

Q38. How many properties in your country use digital technologies to enhance interpretation on site?
Awareness-raising among general public, in particular communities

Objective: Management Plans communicated to the communities

Action 29: Prepare and distribute concise and understandable leaflets on management plans and/or systems

15 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least 50% of properties have distributed short summaries of the Management Systems to the communities

14 States Parties reported distributing summaries to 45 properties (9% of WH properties in Europe)
**Objective:** Sustainability of educational programmes on heritage ensured

**Action 30:** Educate and inform younger generations about heritage, notably through: using the World Heritage in Young Hands Kit; encouraging the organisation of World Heritage Youth Forums; enhancing the position of heritage in national education programmes; organising school projects and school days on World Heritage.

27 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Results (based on respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15% increase in the use of World Heritage in Young Hands Kit (baseline 40%)</td>
<td>13 States Parties reported using the World Heritage in Young Hands Kit (27% of SPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 4 Youth Forums organised in Europe (baseline 1)</td>
<td>25 Youth Forums were organised in Europe (Target reached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% increase in properties that undertake educational programmes or initiatives with young people (baseline unknown)</td>
<td>256 properties have undertaken educational programmes or initiatives with young people (baseline established)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q40. Do your national authorities use the World Heritage in Young Hands Kit?

Q42. How many properties in your country undertake educational programmes or initiatives with young people?
World Heritage information tools widely available and used

Objective: World Heritage Centre’s website maintained and updated with contributions from the States Parties

Action 32: Maintain the World Heritage Centre website according to the needs of users

26 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
World Heritage Centre’s website regularly maintained and improved

Q43. Does the information on the World Heritage Centre website match your expectations/needs?

- Yes: 24
- No: 6
- To some extent: 17
- Unknown: 0

Chart showing the results of the survey question.
World Heritage information tools widely available and used

Objective: World Heritage Centre’s website maintained and updated with contributions from the States Parties

Action 33: Fund the updates of information tools available on the World Heritage website (e.g. the State of Conservation database, Periodic Reporting platform, presentation of good practice examples, data exchange with other inter/national databases etc.)

4 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least four information tools are updated through extra-budgetary funding

Results:
1 information tool was updated

130,000 USD was contributed towards the update of information tools (by 1 State Party)
World Heritage information tools widely available and used

Objective: World Heritage Centre’s website maintained and updated with contributions from the States Parties

Action 34: Contribute content to the World Heritage Centre website (e.g. with good practice examples, illustrative material, updated weblinks regarding properties, State Party report on state of conservation, management plans etc)

19 out of 33 States Parties consider this action relevant

Target:
At least 200 content contributions are submitted and published on the World Heritage Centre’s website

Result:
99 content contributions were submitted by 15 States Parties

* based on sample.
Fifteen (15) States Parties reported contributions