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Origins of the Retrospective Inventory

• No clearly defined limits to many World Heritage properties;
• No understanding of the number and significance of serial properties;
• Portions of nomination dossiers in two different archives;
• National authorities and site managers often no longer possessed either the original nomination files or the institutional memory concerning the original inscriptions.

Periodic Reporting and the Retrospective Inventory in Europe

• Focal points of State Parties would have the best possible baseline data on which to base their own Section II reports;
• WHC would have valid baseline data against which to review completed section II reports; and
• Missing geographic information could be identified and requested from States Parties as part of the process.

Elements of the Inventory

• Statement of Significance
• Geographic Data
• Statistical Indicators, where present
• Inventory of the nomination dossier
• Digital reference snapshots of relevant map(s)
Significance Statements

- Justification of the State Party
- Recommendation of the Advisory Body(ies)
- Statements of the Bureau and Committee
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Statistical Indicators

**Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape**
(CZ-763) (inscribed 1996)
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Inventory

**Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe**
(FR-230)

Inventory

**Old Town of Avila**
with its Extra-Muros Churches
(ES-348 Rev)

Inventory

**Pilgrimage Church of St John of Nepomuk at Zelená Hora**
(CZ-690)
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- Statement of Significance
- Geographic Data
- Statistical Indicators, where present
- Inventory of the nomination dossier
- Digital reference snapshots of relevant map(s)

Digital Reference Maps

Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (ES-348 Rev)

Digital Reference Maps

Ancient City of Aleppo (SY-21)
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Agricultural Landscape of Southern Öland (SE-968)

Letters to States Parties & Responses

Røros (NO-55, 1980)
Letters to States Parties & Responses

Single monuments and Cadastral boundaries:

In cases of ambiguity, the cadastral limit of the property should be considered as the boundary of the World Heritage site.

Église de Saint-Savin sur Gartempe (FR-230)

Findings & Conclusions

Of 265 nominations examined

- 8 had no maps
- ~30% had no boundaries or imprecise boundaries
- less than 5% of cultural nominations contained information about the size of the property
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Findings & Conclusions

Of 265 nominations examined

- 40% were represented by relevant maps only at ICOMOS
- 42% of maps were also missing from the scanned versions of the nominations
- ~10-20 % of scanned nominations included the wrong version of the nomination
- ~50-60 % of scanned nominations were missing critical supplementary information
Findings & Conclusions

Of the 410 properties in Europe

• 122 sites (30%) were found to be serial properties in 26 States Parties
• 1,720 additional locations identified as serial
• Spain, Italy, Germany, Russian Federation had 10 or more World Heritage sites identified as serial

Findings & Conclusions

Of 265 nominations examined

• 8 had no maps
• ~30% had no boundaries or imprecise boundaries
• less than 5% of cultural nominations contained information about the size of the property
• Management plans exist on file at the Centre for less than 10% of the European sites

Baseline Data

• Geographic identification
• Statements of significance
• Site name
Baseline Data

- Geographic identification (single and serial property boundaries and size in hectares)
- Criteria and statements of significance (SP proposed, Advisory Body recommended; Committee decision)
- Legal protection (citations for protective acts, regulations)

Baseline Data

- Management tools (Citations for Management plans, or identification of "management mechanism")
- Statistical indicators, including but not limited to: resident population in core and buffer zones; tourism figures, number of staff (staff/visitor, staff/size of site), level of financial support, species counts, ... and any other indicators that illuminate potential threats.

Baseline Data

- Baseline data is essential both for reactive monitoring and equally importantly to prepare and to analyze Periodic Reports for World Heritage properties.
- Baseline data does not exist in any consistent, easily retrievable form for most World Heritage sites.

Baseline Data

- Baseline data (and statistical indicators) are the missing links between State of Conservation Reports and the Periodic Reporting exercise, called for by the Committee (7EXT.COM 4B.1 and 29COM 7B.c).
- Both mission reports and state of conservation reports to the Committee should highlight the presence or absence of key baseline data such as clearly identified boundaries and management plans.
Periodic Reporting

• No procedure was developed to evaluate the Section II reports against the baseline data in the original nomination dossiers.
• Future regional cycles of Periodic Reporting should not be undertaken until baseline data has been collected for sites in that region;

Periodic Reporting

• No uniform approach was adopted by the Secretariat either to questionnaire or to the analysis of the returns.

Future Cycles:
• States Parties cannot be asked for the same data a second time.
• No question should be asked for which the information is already known or available to the Centre or already provided in the Cycle 1 questionnaires. Questionnaires should be pre-filled with baseline data from nomination files and from (verified) cycle 1 Periodic Reports.

Periodic Reporting

• Far too much information was requested which the Centre has not been able to verify or incorporate into its work;
• Periodic Reporting format should be simplified;
• Section I (SP information) should not be asked in Cycle 2;
• Section 2 should concentrate of baseline data and statistical indicators.

Periodic Reporting

• Database updates – such as revised Site manager information should be routined made via the WHC web site and be not dependent on Periodic Reporting cycles

Periodic Reporting

• A coordinator, in association with regional desks and Advisory Bodies, should be responsible for coordinating Periodic Reporting Cycle 2 to avoid inconsistencies in approaches;
• Redesign of the Periodic Reporting Format, Questionnaire, and Electronic Reporting tool cannot be successful concluded in only one year.
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