

**Periodic Reporting Follow-up Meeting for Eastern and Central Europe
14 -15 September 2007
Wroclaw, Poland**

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The participants of the Follow-up Meeting to Periodic Reporting for Eastern and Central Europe, which took place 14 -15 September 2007 appreciated the efforts by the Polish authorities, in particular the Ministry for Culture, the National Heritage Board and the National Commission for UNESCO as well as the Municipality of Wroclaw for organizing and hosting this important event for the region.

The meeting was attended by 37 participants from 13 countries (Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, United Kingdom, Ukraine), NGOs (Heritage Alive), and researchers, as well as by Representatives of IUCN, ICOMOS and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Rapporteur and Chairperson of the European Periodic Reporting exercise. The list of participants and agenda of the meeting are enclosed as Annex I and II.

CONCLUSIONS

The participants recalled the success of the Periodic Reporting for the European Region presented to the World Heritage Committee in 2006 for 5 sub-regions covering 48 countries and a total of 244 sites (including transboundary properties).

The participants noted that a momentum was created in raising awareness about World Heritage, creating a European network of Focal Points, strengthening cooperation within the region and subregions and enhancing the credibility of the World Heritage Convention.

The participants appreciated the training exercises during the meeting, for example in preparing statements of significance, reviewing boundary changes and the harmonization of Tentative Lists and wish to share the lessons learnt among the European subregions and beyond.

In view of follow-up actions, the Reflection Year and the future Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting a number of recommendations from the meeting should be taken into account. These are addressed to States Parties to the Convention, the Advisory Bodies ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN as well as the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Statements of significance/statement of outstanding universal value

1. The participants note that the difference between the concepts of the statement of significance (Operational Guidelines 2002) / statement of outstanding universal value (Operational Guidelines 2005) is not fully understood and that guidance for the preparation of these statements is urgently needed and should be transmitted to States Parties and focal points as a priority;
2. The participants welcome the ICCROM training envisaged on the preparation of Statements of significance/statements of outstanding universal value and wish to share the results of their exercise for a historic city centre, serial monuments, large scale cultural landscape and transboundary natural property (see Annex III). They further note that training in January 2008 would be too late for the submission of statements by 1 February 2008 and that for some cases (e.g. for some properties inscribed from 1978 to 1990) and States Parties more time was required;

Boundaries and buffer zones

3. The participants note the provisions in the Operational Guidelines concerning minor and significant boundary changes, buffer zones and extensions and welcome the International Expert Meeting to be hosted by Switzerland and Israel in March 2008 on buffer zones;
4. The participants, recalling Decision 31 COM 11A.2 concerning clarifications of existing boundaries and buffer zones, encourage all States Parties and focal points to comply with the deadline of 1 December 2007 for submission of missing information and documentation (e.g. map of property as inscribed, surface in hectares);
5. The participants note that a number of boundary changes were requested in the Periodic Reports and encourage States Parties to submit them formally by the deadline of 1 February 2008 to the World Heritage Centre;
6. The participants welcome the guidance on the presentation of minor boundary changes provided to the meeting (Annex IV) and request that this be made available to all focal points and should be considered for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines when they are next revised;
7. The participants also discussed the impact of the rapid economic development in the sub-region of Central and Eastern Europe, and investment pressures in and around World Heritage sites and that national legislation may not be adapted to ensure proper protection of World Heritage; they considered that further guidance on the protection of the wider setting may be needed;

Management plans and management systems

8. The participants note the provisions in the Operational Guidelines concerning management plans. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the management systems, encourage national authorities and site managers to prepare, in a timely fashion using a pro-active approach, management plans (including tourism and risk management) for those sites which still do not have this important conservation tool, or to up-date existing plans when appropriate;
9. The participants further note that a coordinated approach between the different institutions involved at site, national/transnational and regional level was needed to ensure integrated management and effective implementation

- as well as coordination with other programmes and Conventions relevant for the properties (e.g. MAB, Ramsar, Council of Europe Conventions);
10. The participants request to further share the experience of national frameworks and guidance for World Heritage site management plans such as from Romania including indicators for management effectiveness;
 11. The participants underline that the statement of significance/outstanding universal value is the basis for the effective and successful management of a World Heritage property;

Tentative Lists

12. The participants appreciate the results of the different workshops held for Central and Eastern Europe as well as South Eastern Europe on harmonizing Tentative Lists for natural heritage and cultural landscapes and their extrabudgetary financing (German Agency for Nature Conservation - BfN, Bellagio Forum and the German Foundation for the Environment DBU). The participants encourage further workshops and funding to continue this important exercise;
13. The participants emphasise that Tentative Lists are planning tools in World Heritage processes and require regular updating, review in line with the Global Strategy and the IUCN/ICOMOS gap analysis, quality control, transnational and regional harmonization. They encourage States Parties to take this into account in their national revision.

Other issues

14. Concerning the reliable **database** of European site managers (Decision 31 COM 11A.1), the participants urge the States Parties concerned to provide and to update as necessary the details (name, function, address, telephone, fax, e-mail, web-page) to the World Heritage Centre;