

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirtieth Session

Vilnius, Lithuania
8-16 July 2006

Item 11 of the Provisional Agenda: Periodic Reports

11G. Reflection on the preparation of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting

SUMMARY

As per Article 29 of the *World Heritage Convention*, Periodic Reporting on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* is a process whereby States Parties report to the UNESCO General Conference, through the World Heritage Committee, on the status of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in their respective territories.

The first cycle of Periodic Reporting covering all geographical regions over a six-year period (2000-2006) is now completed. Aware of the need to “study and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting, develop strategic direction on the forms and the format of the Periodic Reports, training priorities and international cooperation priorities; and streamline the Committee’s consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting relating to inscribed properties”, the World Heritage Committee decided by its Decision **7 EXT.COM 5** “to suspend for one year the commencement of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting” and to launch a Periodic Reporting Reflection Year. To pave the way of this Periodic Reporting Reflection Year, the World Heritage Centre organized two preparatory meetings whose main conclusions and recommendations are submitted to the World Heritage Committee for discussion and adoption.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 11G, see Point IV

I. Introduction

1. As per Article 29 of the *World Heritage Convention*, Periodic Reporting on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is a process whereby States Parties report to the UNESCO General Conference, through the World Heritage Committee, on the status of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in their respective territories. The 29th session of the General Conference of UNESCO invited the States Parties to the Convention, through the World Heritage Centre, “to report on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the *World Heritage Convention*, including the State of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on their territories”.
2. At its 22nd session (Kyoto, 1998), the World Heritage Committee adopted a general reporting format as well as a six-year cycle for all the regions of the world and established the principles of the Periodic Reporting process as being regional, participatory and forward looking.
3. The first cycle of Periodic Reporting covered all geographical regions over a six-year period as follows¹:

Region	Examination of properties inscribed up to and including	Year of Examination by Committee
Arab States	1992	December 2000
Africa	1993	December 2001/July 2002
Asia and the Pacific	1994	June-July 2003
Latin America and the Caribbean	1995	June-July 2004
Europe and North America	1996/1998	June-July 2005/2006

4. To facilitate the work of the national authorities, a questionnaire was developed by the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, based on the format adopted by the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) which includes two sections: Section I focused on the

¹ The original cycle, 2000-2005, was modified in 2002 when the Committee modified its calendar. Thus Asia/Pacific, originally scheduled to report in December 2002, was re-scheduled to report in June-July 2003. The schedule of following regions was adjusted accordingly.

legislative and administrative action taken by the States parties in the application of the World Heritage Convention; Section II reported in detail on the state of conservation of individual World Heritage Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

5. On the basis of the periodic reports, the Secretariat consolidates national reports into regional State of World Heritage Reports, from which are developed long-term follow-up regional programmes structured according to the 4 Cs Strategic Objectives and their corresponding Actions Plans.
6. According to paragraph 201 of the Operational Guidelines (2005), Periodic Reporting serves four main purposes:
 - a) to provide an assessment of the application of the *World Heritage Convention* by the State Party;
 - b) to provide an assessment as to whether the outstanding universal value of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List is being maintained over time;
 - c) to provide up-dated information about the World Heritage properties to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the properties;
 - d) to provide a mechanism for regional co-operation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the *Convention* and World Heritage conservation.
7. The completion of the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting has generated important information regarding the state of implementation of the World Heritage Convention, as well as about the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. Some general conclusions can be drawn from the completion of the first cycle and some issues that need to be addressed in the future can be identified. However, the first Cycle has also exposed some flaws in the process and a need to revise the questionnaire and the type of information that can realistically be expected from States Parties.
8. In line with the Committee's Decision **7 EXT.COM 5**, "to study and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting", the World Heritage Centre organized two preparatory meetings to pave the way for the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007:
 - a) **10-11 November 2005 in Berlin, Germany**, (kindly hosted by the German National Commission jointly with the Swiss, Luxembourg and Austrian National Commissions).
 - b) **2-3 March 2006 at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, France**.
9. For logistical reasons, these meetings followed meetings on European Periodic Reporting. They brought together site managers, international experts and representatives from all regions who were responsible or fully involved in the Periodic Reporting of their respective regions, the Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS) and the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (Montreal,

Canada). Both meetings benefited from the presence of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

10. These preparatory meetings offered a good opportunity to propose Terms of Reference for the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007, to make an overall assessment of the process of the first cycle of Periodic Reporting in all regions, and to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the format adopted by the World Heritage Committee and questionnaire developed by the World Heritage Centre. The conclusions of these meetings are summarized in the present document.
11. Many States Parties found the periodic reporting exercise a useful activity with numerous positive outcomes. Some World Heritage site managers met each other for the first time and started developing a professional network.
12. 496 properties from 146 States Parties were assessed through the first cycle of Periodic Reporting. Although the two processes are very different, it is worth noting that 142 properties were assessed during the same period through reactive monitoring.
13. Data on individual World Heritage properties was collected during the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting, but there was no assessment of that data in relation to data in the original nomination dossiers (the "baseline data"). Considering the absence of institutional memory at all levels, some concern was expressed about the quality of the data. The second Cycle, based on both a review of data from the first Cycle and the results of the Retrospective Inventory of the original nomination dossiers, should allow comparisons to be made between the baseline data and that of the first and second Cycles. It would be therefore advisable that the questionnaire design retain the same format and questions as in the first Cycle.
14. It was recognized that Periodic Reporting and monitoring are not an end in themselves. They are at the core of heritage conservation as they allow for the management of change. Periodic Reporting should remain a monitoring tool for States Parties, a decision-making tool for the World Heritage Committee and a dialogue tool among the World Heritage Community.

II. Main conclusions and recommendations of the two preparatory meetings on Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007

A. Proposed Terms of Reference of the Periodic Reporting Year of Reflection

15. According to the two Decisions 7 EXT.COM 5 and 29 COM 11 (See Annex I), it is proposed to structure the main objectives of the Periodic Reporting Year of Reflection in the following manner:
 1. Review the outcomes of and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting;

2. Develop strategic direction on the form and format of Periodic Reports;
 3. Streamline the Committee's consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting (Changes of names, changes of boundaries, revision of Statement of Outstanding Universal Value...);
 4. Ensure effective links between State of Conservation and Periodic Reporting as well as other processes (Nominations, Retrospective Inventory);
 5. Identify training and capacity development priorities from all Periodic Reports;
 6. Identify international cooperation priorities from all Periodic Reports;
 7. Undertake a reflection on a new regional grouping;
16. The preparatory meetings organized in Berlin and Paris already contributed to points 1, 2 and 3, and partially to point 4, in the following manner:

B. Summary of the review of the outcomes and reflection on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting

B.1 *General comments on the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting*

17. As expressed in the evaluation question at the end of the questionnaire, the States Parties considered the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting successful with many positive outcomes. Being a State Party-driven exercise, a close collaborative partnership was established within many regions for the first time. This has helped to strengthen regional cooperation through proposals for serial and transboundary nominations.
18. It also highlighted the specificity of regional approaches to conservation and the different understandings of the concepts of "Management Plan" and "Site Manager". The wealth of data gathered by the first Cycle is impressive and for some sites it was the first time since their inscription that the Committee received information on their state of conservation. For several States Parties, Periodic Reporting also constituted the first opportunity for monitoring the state of conservation of their properties. In many cases it would appear that management plans need to be developed or implemented to undertake monitoring.
19. This information also helped to identify areas where improvements are needed and in setting priorities at the national and regional levels. The first Cycle of Periodic Reporting revealed that many properties need boundary adjustments, boundary changes, names changes and in some cases revision of criteria and a new Statement of Significance. Needs for assistance were expressed by many States

Parties on this occasion and the World Heritage community is expected to comply with these requests.

B.2 Areas where improvement is needed for the Periodic Reporting process

20. Preparation: Many States Parties and local authorities were poorly prepared for the exercise and the objectives of the process were not completely understood or explained for many site managers. Moreover, site managers were not systematically engaged in the process. At the same time, very positive results were reported when they were involved.
21. Access to data: it appeared there is a consistent lack of institutional memory at all levels and in all regions. Moreover, baseline data, including nomination dossiers, was not fully available to States Parties. No process was established to review or register new information provided by Section II reports to compare with baseline data from nomination dossiers and clarify discrepancies.
22. Lack of coordination: a lack of coordination between cultural/natural focal points and between focal points from different federal entities or between different institutions was noted.
23. Geographical grouping: The presentation of reports was done by regions and sub-regions. But some sub-regional divisions did not make sense in terms of protection of heritage and some States Parties would have preferred a grouping with similar heritage experiences.
24. Report and follow up: Most regions noted a lack of guidance in the preparation of the regional report. No process was developed to provide direct feedback to States Parties and sites managers after each region's Periodic Reporting exercise.

B.3 Proposed process for the next cycle

- a) The Committee should re-confirm the objectives of the next Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise ensuring that they correspond to the actual expectations of States Parties;
- b) The next Cycle should include all properties inscribed at the date of the launching of the respective regional Periodic Reporting Exercise (316 properties are not yet covered by the Periodic Reporting Exercise at present);
- c) Maintaining flexibility for the implementation of the reporting process is important in order to adapt to the specific conditions of each region and sub- region;
- d) One of the underlying principles of the *Convention* is the integration of culture and nature. In future Periodic Reporting exercises, cultural and natural heritage therefore need to be treated together as much as possible, rather than separately as was largely the case;
- e) An information/training strategy on Periodic Reporting for States Parties, World Heritage focal points, site managers, UNESCO field

offices, other Conventions should be put in place while starting the second Cycle;

- f) Participation and broad consultancy are key elements of the Periodic Reporting exercise. There should be better communication within States Parties to make sure that all stakeholders, in particular site managers where they exist, are aware of and engaged in the process;
 - g) Adequate human and financial resources and timeframes need to be allocated for Periodic Reporting, especially in the case of regions that require capacity building endeavours to implement the process with success;
 - h) Improvement of the accessibility of baseline data (including accurate nomination files) for States Parties;
 - i) The Advisory Bodies should be involved more at all levels;
 - j) The Periodic Reporting process should have a coordinator, in addition to the regional working group, who will be responsible for the management of all processes;
 - k) At the end of the process, implementation of Regional Programmes and Action Plans should be assessed.
25. **Recommendation 1 for consideration by the World Heritage Committee:** The Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007 is the opportunity for the Committee to confirm the objectives and concrete outputs of the next Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise ensuring that they correspond to the actual expectations of States Parties and to ensure a better preparation of the next Cycle at all levels.

C. Develop strategic direction on the form and format of Periodic Report

C.1 *Strengths and weaknesses of the present format and questionnaires.*

- 26. The first Cycle of Periodic Reporting has been an evolving process. Even if the format adopted by the Committee was used by all the Regions, there was over time a constant improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire. This reduced considerably the possibility for cross-regional analyses. While the other regions used a paper questionnaire, the European States Parties were the first to fill in their data into an online questionnaire. In general, the Periodic Reporting questionnaire was poorly suited to certain types of constitutional structures (e.g. federal), as well as for reporting mixed, transboundary sites and serial properties, especially where reporting responsibilities fell on multiple agencies. The North America Region only used the format without developing a specific questionnaire.
- 27. The lack of replies to certain questions might reflect an insufficient knowledge of the *World Heritage Convention* but it could also be due to a lack of understanding of a particular question because of the bad formulation of the questions, or language problems. This might also be due to the fact that the Periodic Reporting questionnaires are time-consuming with complex questions requiring long answers.

28. The Periodic Reporting format and questionnaires consist of two Sections:
 - a) Section I refers to the legislative and administrative provisions which the States Parties have adopted for the application of the *World Heritage Convention*. Section I was relatively well understood, but a clarification about its scope is required as to whether it intends to address all national heritage conservation, protection and presentation programmes or just those related to World Heritage.
 - b) Section II refers to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties located on the territory of the States concerned.
29. Deficiencies in the formulation of Section II of the questionnaire were perceived by States Parties (“the right questions were not always asked”) and it was seen as being too complex and repetitive. In addition, questions were often too descriptive, producing responses not easily quantifiable; indicators (including statistical indicators) were also missing. Questions should not be asked for which the information is already available at the World Heritage Centre (e.g. names, criteria, date of inscription, and statements of significance...); questionnaires should be pre-filled instead and verified by the States Parties.

C.2 *Proposals for the future questionnaire.*

- a) The new questionnaire should include a mechanism to adequately reflect the complexity, and multiple levels of responsibility, of serial and transboundary properties, cultural landscapes, and mixed properties;
- b) Harmonization of reporting with other Conventions and programmes should be envisaged;
- c) Although the use of the local language will facilitate the use of the questionnaire by local and national authorities, provision must be made to re-translate the responses back into English or French for analysis and comparison with existing baseline and first Cycle data;
- d) Accurate indicators are needed to identify trends, measure success, and compare situations in one cycle versus a new one after implementation of comprehensive actions;
- e) The electronic tool should be used as much as possible;
- f) The reporting system could be re-organised into a bi-partite system of:
 - a data sheet of quantifiable information; site area, personnel, visitors (locals and tourists), surroundings (buffer zone area, population in local district), overall or proportion of finance;
 - a more qualitative survey of predominantly yes/no questions, which could take the form of a checklist or matrix;
30. Section I and Section II are still both needed but should be pre-filled with existing data from both nomination files and first Cycle Periodic Reporting;

- a) For Section I, States Parties should mainly check and update the data instead of entering it;
 - b) Section II should be simplified and its use for site managers increased: a rapid assessment / score card system could be explored.
31. **Recommendation 2 for consideration by the World Heritage Committee:** It is recommended that the present Periodic Reporting questionnaire be simplified according to the above-mentioned guidelines and that State of Conservation indicators be developed that may be used to monitor the condition of sites over time. This work could be undertaken by a small Working Group composed of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics/international experts/Committee Members/ Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre (see proposed timetable in point III).

D. Streamline the Committee's consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting (changes of names, changes of boundaries, revision of Statement of Outstanding Universal Value...)

- 32. Periodic Reporting is intended to help in identifying general trends and priority issues. These issues and specific requests by States Parties need to be addressed before the next Cycle if the Periodic Reporting process is to retain its credibility and the commitment of participants to subsequent reporting. This first Cycle needs to be brought to a close, acknowledging its results and providing feedback to the States Parties and World Heritage property's managers. Critical areas where work needs to be done include: revision of Statements of Significance, changes of names, changes of boundaries and buffer zones and clarification of boundaries. This entails a significant amount of work for all parties involved (States Parties, World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies) and capacity building at different levels in each region. States Parties need to formulate their requests for their various properties to provide the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies with a reliable estimate of the future workload and schedule.
- 33. Changes of names, boundaries, criteria, or Statements of Significance are addressed in the relevant paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines*. Each type of change has its own submission requirements, review process and deadline. The procedures for each type of change are summarized in the table attached in Annex II. A circular letter with this table was addressed to States Parties of Europe and North America in January 2006.²
- 34. More than 80 potential requests for modification were identified from the European Periodic Report. For example, France has identified 21 buffer zones to be created and/or modified in its World Heritage properties. Some requests for name changes and minor boundary changes are to be dealt with by the Committee at its 30th session, but for the other numerous requests to be studied and

² Also available on the web at <http://whc.unesco.org/circs/circ06-01e.pdf>

examined by the Committee; it is proposed **to organize an Extraordinary Session in October 2008**. The length of this extraordinary session will depend on the number of requests received by the Secretariat. This session will constitute a unique opportunity, through an accelerated procedure for the Committee to examine all requests arising from the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting for modifications to existing properties (both major and minor boundary changes and renominations with new criteria).

35. It is essential to keep the momentum that Periodic Reporting has created within the regions. In this spirit and as a test case, it is proposed to present to the Committee at its 30th session revised Statements of Significance for 30 of the North American properties examined in the first Cycle. These statements, reviewed by ICOMOS and IUCN, are presented in Document *WHC-06/30.COM/11B*).
36. **Recommendation 3 for consideration by the World Heritage Committee:** It is recommended that significant modifications to boundaries and changes to the criteria used to justify inscription on the World Heritage List (renominations) requested by States Parties as a follow up to the first Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise should not enter into the limit imposed by the Suzhou-Cairns Decision (Decision 28 COM 13.1).
37. Any request presented by 1 February 2007 resulting from of the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting will be reviewed by the appropriate Advisory Body during an Extraordinary session of the Committee in October 2008.

E. Ensure effective links between State of Conservation and Periodic Reporting as well as other processes (Nominations, Retrospective Inventory)

E.1 *Links between Periodic Reporting and the Retrospective Inventory*

38. The Retrospective Inventory project, approved by the Committee at its 7th Extraordinary Session,³ reveals what we know and do not know about the composition of many World Heritage properties (see Document *WHC-06/30.COM/15*). By examining the respective archives of nomination files at ICOMOS, IUCN, and the World Heritage Centre, the Retrospective Inventory is changing the way in which the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies review and recommend strategies for individual properties. Undertaken initially to support the European Periodic Reporting exercise, the Retrospective Inventory has helped to acquire baseline data (geographic identification, criteria and statements of significance, legal protection, management tools, statistical indicators) for each property. This has enabled States Parties and their Periodic Reporting focal points to be better prepared to complete the Section II reports. It is now also being used in the preparation of missions.

³ Decision 7 EXT.COM 7.1

39. It is recommended that each region's second Cycle Periodic Reporting exercise be preceded by a Retrospective Inventory examination of the sites in that region in order to collect the baseline data for each property. This data will be used to pre-fill the second Cycle questionnaire where possible. The Retrospective Inventory review of properties of the Arab States (1978-2004) will be completed in June 2006. In addition to the individual letters to each State Party reporting the findings of the Inventory, a circular letter will be sent to all States Parties at the end of the review, summarizing the requests made for changes to boundaries, criteria, and statements of significance, and requesting confirmation as to whether those changes, requested in 2000, are still valid. If the Committee accepts the recommended draft decision below, the States Parties will be asked to formally submit their requests for examination at the proposed 8th extraordinary session in 2008.
40. The same process will need to be undertaken for Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The following schedule is anticipated for the Retrospective Inventory for those regions (see below III. B. Timeframe): It is important to recognize that the Periodic Reporting cycle for each region cannot be undertaken until the Retrospective Inventory has identified the baseline data which will be used to "pre-fill" the Questionnaire for each site in the region.

E.2 *Management of Data*

41. The Periodic Reporting exercise revealed that baseline data concerning World Heritage sites was fragmented at best, and often not available in any single location, whether with the site, national authority, World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS or IUCN. Instead, over time, the information has become extremely fragmented. Consequently, in the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting, it was often impossible for States Parties to retrieve information concerning their own properties, either through their own national administration or through the World Heritage Centre. Furthermore, nominations circulated on CD proved to be unreliable, incomplete and often based on early versions of a nomination, superseded by a later version and only available at the respective Advisory Body. There is an urgent need to assemble a comprehensive overview of the archives of the Centre and Advisory Bodies, to digitize the best available data and place this information at the disposal of the States Parties for the second Cycle of Periodic Reporting. An integration of all existing databases concerning World Heritage Properties (Nominations database, State of conservation reports database, International Assistance database ...) is being currently studied.
42. **Recommendation 4 for consideration by the World Heritage Committee:** It is recommended that additional support be provided to the Retrospective Inventory project to prepare for the next Cycle of Periodic Reporting in cooperation with the Regional Units of the World Heritage Centre.

43. Furthermore, a thorough re-organization of data management at the World Heritage Centre should be undertaken by the Centre by means of a several year project to facilitate access to data for States Parties for the next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

III. Workload, timetable and funding

44. By its Decision 29 COM 11A, the Committee requested "The Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties concerned, to report at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) on the proposed structure, time-schedule and resources needed for the implementation of the measures." It is necessary to evaluate the size of the workload of the follow up of the Periodic Reporting exercise for all stakeholders : the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and to decide on the appropriate course of action for follow-up, as well as funding allocations for its implementation.

A. Workload

45. In 2006 and as a pilot case, ICOMOS and IUCN reviewed the revised Statements of Significance submitted by the USA and Canada through the Periodic Reporting process. The aim of this pilot was to assess the workload involved and budget required in revising Statements of Significance for World Heritage properties and to agree on the most appropriate format for these Statements. Considering the input of staff of the Advisory Bodies and their consultants, and if the entire process is included, **the revision of a Statement of Significance for one property requires at least four hours or half a day of work.** This would include the first and second reviews and redrafting of the statements. It should be noted that complex serial or transboundary properties, and properties which have been extended or modified over time require a certain level of additional research, thus taking more time than simple single site properties. (see Annex III.)

B. Time schedule

46. 24 and 25 October 2006

It is proposed to organize a meeting on the simplification of the Periodic Reporting Questionnaire and the identification of indicators on 24 and 25 October 2006 at UNESCO Headquarters. A Working Group will be established on the revision of the questionnaire and the use of indicators. This Working Group will operate by e-mail as from now and report to the Reflection Year Meeting to be held on 26 and 27 October 2006.

47. 26 and 27 October 2006

To keep up the momentum, a Periodic Reporting Reflection Year Meeting will be organized on 26 and 27 October 2006. It will discuss the first

conclusions of the Working Group on Questionnaire and Indicators and also address points 4 and 5 of Terms of Reference of the Reflection Year: - 4. Ensure effective links between State of Conservation and Periodic Reporting as well as other processes (Nominations, Retrospective Inventory) - 5. Identify training priorities from all Periodic Reports

48. 17 January 2007

It is proposed to organize a second working group meeting on the simplification of the Periodic Reporting Questionnaire and the identification of indicators at UNESCO Headquarters which will report to the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year Meeting on 18-19 January 2007.

49. 18 and 19 January 2007

It is proposed to address the remaining points of the Terms of Reference of the Reflection Year at another Periodic Reporting Reflection Year Meeting on 18 and 19 January 2007 at UNESCO Headquarters: 6. Identify international cooperation priorities from all Periodic Reports. 7. Undertake a reflection on a new regional grouping

50. June 2007

The World Heritage Committee at its 31st session will adopt the final conclusions of the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year and launch the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for the Arab States Region.

51. October 2008

An Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee on Periodic Reporting to review exclusively the requests of modifications arising from the first cycle of Periodic Reporting for properties mainly in Europe, North America, and the Arab States.

52. The following schedule is anticipated for the Retrospective Inventory and the second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for all regions:

Region	Retrospective Inventory	Review of first Cycle of Periodic Reporting requests for changes	Launch of second Cycle of PR/Dates of submission of Regional Report to the Committee
Europe-North America	2004-2005	8 EXT.COM 2008	2011/2013
Arab States	2005-2006	8 EXT.COM 2008	2007/2009
Africa	2006-2007	8 EXT.COM 2008	2008/2010
Asia-Pacific	2007-2008	8 EXT.COM 2008	2009/2011
Latin America and the Caribbean	2008-2009	8 EXT.COM 2008	2010/2012

C. **Funding from the World Heritage Fund**

53. For the current biennium (2006-2007)

1) Support for the development of a new questionnaire including development of new indicators: Fees for two consultants (one nature/one culture):	USD 30,000
2) Organization of two supplementary meetings for the Working Group on questionnaires and indicators:	USD 15,000
3) Additional support to Retrospective Inventory	USD 50,000
Total	USD 95,000

54. For the next biennium (2008-2009)

The technical nature and specialization of the revision of Statement of Significance requires engaging high level experts who are very knowledgeable about the *World Heritage Convention*, the properties and site management. Therefore, consultancy fees of US\$ 300 a day are considered the minimum level required. In addition, staff time and project management costs are required for the Advisory Bodies, at approximately US\$ 200 a day. Based on the pilot case, 70% of the work is carried out by a consultant, and 30% by the staff members. It is therefore estimated that **the revision of a Statement of Significance for one property will cost from US\$ 135 to US\$ 150**. These data should be taken into consideration while organizing the Extraordinary Session of Fall 2008.

IV. **Draft Decision**

Draft Decision: 30 COM 11G

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/11G,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 25 COM VII.25-27 adopted at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001), 7 EXT.COM 5 and 7 EXT.COM 5A.1 adopted at its 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004), and 29 COM 11.A adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2006),*
3. *Adopts the Terms of Reference of the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year as proposed in the Document WHC-06/30.COM/11G;*
4. *Adopts the time-frame for the second Cycle of Periodic Reporting as proposed in the Document WHC-06/30.COM/11G;*
5. *Decides that significant modifications to boundaries and changes to the criteria (renominations) and revisions of the statements of Significance/Outstanding Universal Value requested by States Parties as a follow up to the first Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise do not enter into the limit imposed by the Suzhou-Cairns Decision (Decision 28 COM 13.1);*

6. *Decides to entrust to a small Working Group composed of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics/international experts/Committee Members/Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre the simplification of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire including the elaboration of indicators and to allocate US\$ 45,000 for the functioning of this Working Group whose works will be submitted to the Committee at its 31st session in 2007;*
7. *Decides to allocate additional support (US\$ 50,000) to the Retrospective Inventory project to prepare for the next Cycle of Periodic Reporting in cooperation with the Regional Units of the World Heritage Centre;*
8. *Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to prepare a project proposal for the re-organization of the data management at the World Heritage Centre and to submit it to the Committee at its 31st session in 2007;*
9. *Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to prepare a final report on the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year including all the above-mentioned elements to be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

**DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE CONCERNING
PERIODIC REPORTING**

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5

1. *Having examined Documents WHC-04/7EXT.COM/5A, WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5B, WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5C, WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5D and WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5E,*
2. *Aware of the need to:*
 - a) *study and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting;*
 - b) *develop strategic direction on the forms and the format of the Periodic Reports, training priorities and international cooperation priorities; and*
 - c) *streamline the Committee's consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting relating to inscribed properties;*
3. *Decides to suspend for one year the commencement of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting.*

Decision 29 COM.11A

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-05/29.COM/11A,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **25 COM VII.25-27** adopted at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001) and **7 EXT.COM 5** and **7 EXT.COM 5A.1** adopted at its 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004),*
3. *Welcomes with appreciation the synthesis report of the North American region illustrating very effective cooperation between the States Parties of Canada and the United States of America;*
4. *Takes note of the Periodic Report and its specific recommendations for revised statements of significance, name changes, revisions of criteria and other clarifications regarding inscriptions of World Heritage properties in the region;*
5. *Acknowledges the recommendations for reviewing the importance of local populations in or adjacent to natural World Heritage properties; guidelines for management plans and principles for evaluating visual impacts for activities in and adjacent World Heritage properties;*
6. *Requests that the meeting concerning the “reflection year” referred to in Decision **7 EXT.COM 5** include:*
 - a) *forms and format of the Report;*
 - b) *training priorities arising from all reports;*
 - c) *international cooperation issues; and*
 - d) *a reflection on a new regional grouping;*
7. *Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties concerned, to report at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) on the proposed structure, time-schedule and resources needed for the implementation of the measures outlined in paragraph 6;*
8. *Strongly encourages the States Parties of Canada and the United States of America to continue the existing level of excellent cooperation.*

Table of Actions and Procedures Required by States Parties of Europe and North America in the Periodic Reporting Exercise in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*

Issue	<i>Operational Guidelines</i> ref	Advisory Body involvement	Committee involvement	Length of time required
Name Changes				
Name Changes	§ 167	information only	approval	3 mo in advance of Committee
Boundary Changes				
a. "clarifications" of boundary in response to Retrospective Inventory *	(not discussed)	information only	Noting	6 mo in advance of Committee
b. Minor boundary changes	§ 163-164	Recommendation	approval	6 mo in advance of Committee session
c. Extensions / Significant boundary changes	§ 165	Recommendation	Approval	18 months
Criteria				
Criteria changes ("Re-nomination")	§ 166	Recommendation	Approval	18 months
-- natural criteria (i) and (ii)	In 1994, the criterion number assigned to geological values was changed, from N(ii) to N(i). As a result, sites inscribed before 1994 for geological values were no longer accurately represented by the current criteria.	IUCN: this change would potentially affect up to 47 sites;	Approval	none
Statements of Significance / OUV				
Revisions to, or new Statements of Outstanding Universal Value	Annex 7, § II.2	Recommendation	Noting / Approval	undetermined (dependent on AB time & budget)

* The *Operational Guidelines* does not address the issue of how boundary "clarifications" submitted in response to the Retrospective Inventory should be reviewed by the World Heritage Committee. We believe that these are not so much "minor modifications" to the boundary of the inscribed site (as envisaged by para. 163 of the *Guidelines*, as they are "clarifications" of the intention of the State Party and the Committee's decision at the time of inscription. Nevertheless, for the purpose of the Committee's record, and to avoid any misunderstanding in the future, it is important that the Committee "takes note" of the clarification provided by the State Party.

Revision of Statements of Significance: Pilot case - North America

In 2006 and as a pilot case, ICOMOS and IUCN reviewed the revised Statements of Significance submitted by the USA and Canada through the Periodic Reporting process. The aim of this pilot was to assess the workload involved and budget required in revising Statements of Significance for World Heritage properties and to agree on the most appropriate format for these Statements.

Methodology

The pilot began in April 2006 and included the revision of a total of 30 natural and cultural properties in the USA and Canada. Each Advisory Body engaged a consultant to carry out the work; the consultants were experts who are very knowledgeable of the World Heritage Convention and the properties concerned, as well as site management issues. In addition, the work of the consultants was checked by staff of the Advisory Bodies and discussed further with the consultants before being submitted to the World Heritage Centre and forwarded to the States Parties for review.

The consultants were requested to redraft or edit the revised Statements of Significance proposed by the States Parties for each property, ensuring that they were consistent with the original intention of the Advisory Body statement and of the Committee (if it made a statement) at the time of inscription; and followed the format for the Statement of Significance, agreed in advance between IUCN, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. In carrying out the review, the consultants were asked to take into account,

- a. The revised Statement of Significance proposed by the State Party
- b. The decision of the World Heritage Committee;
- c. The Advisory Body evaluation and recommendation; and
- d. The original justification by the State Party from the nomination.

In relation to the format, it was proposed that the Statement of Significance should,

- a. be short and concise (e.g. a brief summary paragraph of no more than 100 words, followed by a paragraph up to a maximum of 70 words for each criterion);
- b. concentrate only on the key features / values that led to inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, i.e. the features of 'outstanding universal value';
- c. specify the reasons why the property has been inscribed for each criterion separately;
- d. not include any purely descriptive text;
- e. be useful for management and management planning;
- f. assist, to the extent possible, in future decision-making in relation to the state of conservation of the property's 'outstanding universal value';
- g. be written with the future structure of a "Statement of Outstanding Universal Value" in mind (Operational Guidelines, 2005, paragraphs

154-157) so that the Statement of Significance will logically make up the first part of a future Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The States Parties subsequently consulted their site managers and re-edited the Statements for final review by the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre.

Workload

Considering the input of staff of the Advisory Bodies and their consultants, and if the entire process is included, **the revision of a Statement of Significance for one property requires at least four hours or half a day of work.** This would include the first and second reviews and redrafting of the statements. It should be noted that complex serial or transboundary properties, and properties which have been extended or modified over time require a certain level of additional research, thus taking more time than simple single site properties.

Budget

The technical nature and specialization of this work means that it is essential to engage high level experts who are very knowledgeable about the World Heritage Convention, the properties and site management. Therefore, consultancy fees of US\$ 300 a day are considered the minimum level required. In addition, staff time and project management costs are required for the Advisory Bodies, at approximately US\$ 200 a day. Based on the pilot case, 70% of the work is carried out by a consultant, and 30% by the staff members. It is therefore estimated that **the revision of a Statement of Significance for one property will cost from US\$ 135 to US\$ 150.**

Conclusions / Recommendations

The Advisory Bodies recognize the importance of preparing and revising accurate Statements of Significance that will be used for both management of and communication relating to World Heritage properties. The task of revising Statements of Significance is quite complex can be politically sensitive, and needs adequate time and resourcing. The work is particularly difficult for properties inscribed 20 or 30 years ago when reporting and documentation was less detailed than it is today, and for serial properties or properties extended over time; in such cases additional research is required.

The following recommendations are proposed for any future work in revising Statements of Significance:

1. The format (including length) and aims (linked to audience and management issues) of the Statements of Significance should be approved by the Committee for all future Statements;
2. Clear guidance on the format of the Statements of Significance should be prepared so that States Parties can already submit their revisions in the correct format;
3. Adequate time is required by the Advisory Bodies and States Parties for carrying out research and consultation;

4. Adequate resourcing is necessary for the Advisory Bodies to carry out the process;
5. The Committee may wish to consider lessons learned and recommendations of the States Parties of Canada and USA in this pilot case.