

[Online Consultation - Strengthening the effectiveness of the World Heritage Reactive Monitoring process](#)

Submission Deadline - 14 September 2018

**Email address \***

**Background**

The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention define Reactive Monitoring as being "the reporting by the World Heritage Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat" (Paragraph 169). The Reactive Monitoring process is one of the most extensive systems of monitoring ever developed under an international legal instrument and has evolved over the years from purely ad-hoc and empirical reporting to the current process defined in Chapter IV of the Operational Guidelines, with a set of clear procedures and formats. However, some of the key actors involved in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention often don't fully understand well the procedures and benefits of the Reactive Monitoring process. This lack of understanding (or misunderstanding) can at times hamper the proper implementation of decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee regarding the state of conservation (SOC) of natural and cultural properties. Decision 40 COM 7 was adopted by the 2017 Committee, as follows: "27. Takes note of its discussions under agenda items 7A and 7B, and requests the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and States Parties, to promote better understanding of the implications and benefits of properties being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to develop appropriate information material in this regard with a view to overcome the negative perceptions of the List of World Heritage in Danger. The information material should highlight the importance of the protection of the OUV; 28. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies to evaluate the effectiveness of the Reactive Monitoring including procedures and case studies and to present a preliminary report for the consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018, if funds are available." A project has been elaborated by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to implement this decision. The objective of the project is to: "reinforce the implementation of the World Heritage Convention by strengthening the effectiveness and improving the understanding of its Reactive Monitoring process." This project is being undertaken by a Team comprising Mr Gamini Wijesuriya, formerly from ICCROM, addressing cultural aspects of the project, and Mr David Sheppard, formerly from IUCN, addressing natural aspects of the project. A internet based questionnaire has been developed to provide an important information input to this project. This questionnaire will be widely circulated to World Heritage stakeholders, including State Parties, Advisory Bodies, and Site Managers, NGOs, civil society, etc. Thank you very much for your kind assistance, which will make a major contribution to the more effective implementation of Reactive Monitoring under the World Heritage Convention.

**Section A - Information about yourself**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Title \***

- ( ) Mr.
- ( ) Mrs.

**First Name \***

**Last Name \***

**Job Title \***

**Institution / Organization \***

**Country \***

[Afghanistan V]

**(A1) Please indicate whether you are a representative of a: \***

- ( ) State Party
- ( ) Advisory Body
- ( ) World Heritage Site Manager
- ( ) World Heritage Centre staff member
- ( ) NGO/Civil Society
- ( ) Academic
- ( ) Other:

**(A2) Please indicate whether your expertise is mainly in: \***

- ( ) Cultural Heritage
- ( ) Natural Heritage
- ( ) Mixed Heritage
- ( ) Legal matters
- ( ) Other:

**(A3) What is your level of awareness of Reactive Monitoring under the World Heritage Convention? \***

- ( ) I have never heard of it
- ( ) I am aware but have never be involved in it
- ( ) I have been involved in it sometimes
- ( ) I am involved in it on a regular basis

**(A4) What was/is your involvement in the Reactive Monitoring process under the World Heritage Convention? (Please tick more than one box if required) \***

- [ ] Preparing a SOC report to be sent to World Heritage Centre
- [ ] Drafting a SOC report to the Committee
- [ ] Making interventions related to SOC during the Committee session
- [ ] Organizing / participating in a Reactive Monitoring Mission
- [ ] Preparing a mission report
- [ ] Taking action on SOC decisions by the Committee

**(A5) What is the level of your involvement (for States Parties) in the Reactive Monitoring process under the World Heritage Convention? \***

- ( ) National Focal Point/Nodal agency/Ministry level
- ( ) UNESCO National Commission
- ( ) Permanent Delegation to UNESCO
- ( ) At site level
- ( ) Attending Committee sessions

**(A6) If you have a site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger /or involved with a site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, what is your involvement in the Reactive Monitoring process under the World Heritage Convention? \***

- ( ) Receiving missions/involvement in discussions with mission teams
- ( ) Preparing annual reports to the Committee
- ( ) Attending Committee meetings
- ( ) Developing/implementing corrective measures

**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (A1-A6) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**



**Section B - General views regarding Reactive Monitoring**

\*\*\*\*\*

**(B1) How do you rate the level of contribution of Reactive Monitoring to achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Convention? \***

- ( ) 5 - Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 - Unsatisfactory

**(B2) If your property has been subjected to Reactive Monitoring, how do you rate the level of its contribution to achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Convention? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(B3) If your property has been subjected to Reactive Monitoring, how do you rate the level of its contribution to management of the property? \***

- ( ) Very useful
- ( ) Moderately useful
- ( ) Not useful

**(B4) What have been the most positive aspects of Reactive Monitoring for the World Heritage Convention for your site/s? (limit of 250 words) \***

**(B5) What have been the least positive aspects of Reactive Monitoring for the World Heritage Convention for your site/s? (limit of 250 words) \***

**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (B1-B5) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**

### **Section C - Statutory framework for Reactive Monitoring**

\*\*\*\*\*

**(C1) How would you rate the adequateness of the provisions of the Operational Guidelines (Chapter IV) to ensure that the OUV of the World Heritage properties is fully preserved? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(C2) Do you consider that the provisions of the World Heritage Committee Rules of Procedures adequately frame the conduct of the discussions in relation to the examination of Reactive Monitoring reports (SOC reports) during Committee sessions? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2

- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(C3) Do you have any comments on the purpose of Reactive Monitoring process and how it has developed over time? (limit of 250 words)**

**(C4) How do you perceive the contents and clarity of the Committee decisions in general?**

\*

- [ ] Reflect the ground realities
- [ ] Unrealistic
- [ ] Clear
- [ ] Ambiguous / Difficult to understand
- [ ] Easy to implement
- [ ] Difficult to implement

**(C5) How do you perceive the contents and clarity of the Committee decisions in relation to your site if it has subjected to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- [ ] Reflect the ground realities
- [ ] Unrealistic
- [ ] Clear
- [ ] Ambiguous / Difficult to understand
- [ ] Easy to implement
- [ ] Difficult to implement

**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (C1-C5) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**

**Section D - Reactive Monitoring process: phases and actors**

\*\*\*\*\*

**(D1) How do you rate the effectiveness of the World Heritage Committee in relation to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent

- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(D2) How do you rate the effectiveness of the World Heritage States Parties in relation to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(D3) How do you rate the effectiveness of the World Heritage Centre in relation to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(D4) How do you rate the effectiveness of the World Heritage Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM) in relation to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(D5) How do you rate the effectiveness of third parties/civil society in relation to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(D6) How do you rate the dialogue among above-mentioned actors in relation to Reactive Monitoring? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4

- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (D1-D6) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**

**Section E - Reactive Monitoring procedures**

\*\*\*\*\*

**(E1) How do you rate the way properties to be reported on to the World Heritage Committee under Reactive Monitoring are selected? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E2) How do you rate the selection of properties to be discussed/opened by the Committee members during the session? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E3) How do you rate the quality of the State of Conservation reports submitted by States Parties (respect of format, deadlines, quality of content, etc) \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E4) How do you rate the review by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre of SOC reports submitted by States Parties? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E5) How do you rate the Reactive Monitoring mission reports? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E6) How do you rate the assessment of the various impacts on the OUV of properties, particularly regarding content and clarity? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E7) How do you rate the voluntary submission of information by States Parties? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(E8) Do you have sufficient information available to enable you to fully participate in the Reactive Monitoring process? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (E1-E8) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**





**Section F - Reactive Monitoring procedures relevant to the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and deletion of properties**

\*\*\*\*\*

**(F1) How do you rate the impact of the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger on the state of conservation of the property? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(F2) How do you rate the benefits of inscribing a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in general? \***

- ( ) Highly beneficial
- ( ) Beneficial
- ( ) Not beneficial at all

**(F3) If your property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, how do you rate the benefits? \***

- ( ) Highly beneficial
- ( ) Beneficial
- ( ) Not beneficial at all

**(F4) In many instances, there are conflicting views between States Parties, Advisory Bodies, and Committee members. How do you rate the final results achieved so far? \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(F5) How do you rate the requirements for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (threshold –“Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger”, implementation of corrective measures, respect of draft decisions on removal from Danger List, etc.) \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent

- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**(F6) Given the amount of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and considering the discussions around them, do you consider the current process for deleting sites is adequate? \***

- ( ) Adequate
- ( ) Not adequate
- ( ) Cannot comment

**(F7) How do you rate the effectiveness of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism so far: \***

- ( ) 5 – Excellent
- ( ) 4
- ( ) 3
- ( ) 2
- ( ) 1
- ( ) 0 – Unsatisfactory

**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (F1-F7) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**

**Section G - Outcomes of the Reactive Monitoring process**

\*\*\*\*\*

**(G1) Is the Reactive Monitoring process an effective tool in ensuring that the OUV of the World Heritage properties is fully preserved? \***

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) Yes with improvements
- ( ) No

**(G2) Has the Reactive Monitoring process had an influence in improving the state of conservation of your World Heritage property/ies? \***

- ( ) It drew attention of higher authorities
- ( ) It enabled to received more resources
- ( ) It changed legislation/monitoring to improve the state of conservation
- ( ) It provided an opportunity to have a closer dialogue with Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre and/or other stakeholders to the Convention

- ( ) It influenced the work of other World Heritage site managers

**(G3) Do you think the inscription of a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger assists in avoiding loss of OUV? \***

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) Cannot assess
- ( ) No

**(G4) What can be done, if relevant, to strengthen the effectiveness of the Reactive Monitoring process and ensure the delivery of better outcomes? (limit of 250 words)**



**Any other comments or suggestions for improvements related to questions above (G1-G4) would be greatly appreciated (limit of 250 words)**



**MANY THANKS FOR YOUR KIND COOPERATION**