



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

World Heritage

20 GA

WHC-15/20.GA/9
Paris, 5 October 2015
Original: French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
November 2015

Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List: Report on the Follow-up to Resolution 19 GA 9

Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List: Report on the Follow-up to Resolution 19 GA 9

SUMMARY

The General Assembly, at its 17th session, requested the World Heritage Centre to submit to its 18th session the independent evaluation by UNESCO's external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011. The 18th Session of the General Assembly approved the recommendations of the independent evaluation and decided to establish an open-ended working group, whose mandate was, on the one hand, to produce an implementation plan for the recommendations of the independent evaluation for consideration by the World Heritage Committee and, on the other hand, to present a final report to the 19th Session of the General Assembly. The 19th Session of the General Assembly, in its Resolution **19 GA 9**, endorsed the recommendations for the implementation of the recommendations of the independent evaluation presented in the open-ended working group's final report and requested that a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations on the Global Strategy be presented to its 20th Session in 2015.

The purpose of this document is to present the follow-up of the implementation of the recommendations on the Global Strategy since the 19th Session of the General Assembly, as shown by the decisions of the 38th and 39th Sessions of the World Heritage Committee. It first presents the follow-up of the recommendations which were not yet implemented by the 19th Session, and then, a table of the status of the plan prepared by the open-ended working group for the implementation of the recommendations of the independent evaluation.

I. BACKGROUND

1. During its 17th Session in 2009, the General Assembly requested the World Heritage Centre, in its Resolution **17 GA 9**, to present to its 18th Session an independent evaluation by UNESCO's external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011. This independent evaluation was submitted to the General Assembly in document WHC-11/18.GA/8.
2. During its 18th Session in 2011, the General Assembly, in its Resolution **18 GA 8**, approved the recommendations of the independent evaluation of the implementation of the Global Strategy. By the same Resolution, the General Assembly decided to put in place an open-ended working group whose mandate was, on the one hand, to prepare an implementation plan for the recommendations of the independent evaluation for examination by the World Heritage Committee and to present a final report to the 19th Session of the General Assembly. By the same Resolution, **18 GA 8**, the 18th Session also invited the World Heritage Centre to produce a working document for the open-ended working group, to propose a prioritized list of recommendations for the implementation of the goals of the Strategic Action Plan (adopted in its Resolution **18 GA 11**¹). This document should specify the financial implications and suggest an allocation of responsibilities among the States Parties, the General Assembly, the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.
3. During the 19th Session of the General Assembly, document WHC-13/19.GA/9 recognised the progress of the Implementation Plan for the Global Strategy, as of July 2013, i.e. as shown in the examination of its follow-up by the 36th and 37th Sessions of the World Heritage Committee. In this regard, document WHC-13/19.GA/9 mentioned that several recommendations had not yet been implemented and would be performed later by the States Parties, the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as the case may be.
4. The General Assembly, by its Resolution **19 GA 9** appreciated the work done by the open-ended working group and approved its recommendations for the implementation of the recommendations of the independent evaluation presented in its final report. By its Resolution, the General Assembly requested that a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations on the Global Strategy be presented during its 20th Session in 2015.
5. In accordance with notification sent on 31 October 2014 to the Director General of the Organisation and the Director of the World Heritage Centre, two auditors performed a mission in UNESCO's Heritage Division and World Heritage Centre from 17 to 28 November 2014 to follow-up on the independent evaluation

¹The Strategic Action Plan was prepared in the framework of the reflection on the Future of the World Heritage Convention.

performed in 2011 on the implementation of the Global Strategy. In addition to the detailed examination of the follow-up of the implementation of each of the recommendations formulated during the independent evaluation in 2011 (presented in document 196 EX/23.INF.4²), the external auditors stressed two points and formulated a new recommendation (document 196 EX/23 Part IV). It appears in the agenda of the 197th Session of the UNESCO Executive Board (document 197 EX/24.INF³).

II. Progress report on recommendations 12 and 20 not yet implemented during the 19th Session of the General Assembly

6. During the examination by the General Assembly of the implementation plan for the recommendations, it noted, in its Resolution **19 GA 9**, that the World Heritage Committee, in its 37th Session, decided not to implement **recommendations 12 and 20** of the open-ended working group concerning conflicts of interest and requested the Committee to re-examine them with a view to their implementation.
7. **Recommendation 12** recommended to “*Revise, for a better application of the Convention, the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to: - forbid a State Party to present a nomination during its mandate (or at least to suspend the examination of a file by the Committee as long as the State Party is present) and take part in the decision on the follow-up of state of conservation reports concerning a property located on its territory; - proscribe the practice of the presentation of signed amendments before the opening of the debate on the nomination of the site; effectively ensure the transparency of the process through the publicity of debates; - prohibit nominations that do not fulfil the conditions set out in the Guidelines.*” The terms of recommendation 12 were the subject of separate decisions, presented below.
8. In its Resolution **19 GA 9**, the General Assembly encouraged the States Parties not to submit a nomination of a property on the World Heritage List during their term on the World Heritage Committee (Resolution **19 GA 9 Paragraph 6**).
9. The World Heritage Committee, during its 38th Session in 2014, in its Decision **38 COM 9C**, recalled the principle according to which the submission of nominations to the World Heritage List is the exclusive prerogative of States Parties, in accordance with the *World Heritage Convention*; strongly encouraged the States Parties, except those having no property inscribed on the World Heritage List, to abstain voluntarily from submitting new nominations during their mandate, taking into consideration recommendation 12 of the External Auditor, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and in the context of the Global Strategy.
10. At its 37th Session (Phnom Penh, 2013), the World Heritage Committee amended its Rules of Procedure by adding Article 23.2, stipulating that “The proposed amendments or Decisions will only be accepted and communicated to the members of the Committee if they are signed only by the member of the

²The Secretariat wishes to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the numbering of the recommendations in Arabic numerals in document 196 EX/23.INF.4 which is different from that presented in document WHC-11/18.GA/8 submitted to the 18th Session.

³Item 24 of the Agenda: Report of the Director General of 31 May 2015 on the implementation of the recommendations of the External Auditors and their observations

Committee who is the author” intending thereby to proscribe the practice of the presenting of signed amendments before the opening of the debate on the nomination of the property. In addition, the World Heritage Committee decided during its 39th Session, by Decision **39 COM 13A**, to add Article 23.3 to its Rules of Procedure, intending to specify the modalities for submission of amendments, as follows: “New draft decisions/proposals and amendments thereto should, whenever possible, be submitted to the Secretariat at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned. The Rapporteur shall work with the Secretariat to distribute such draft decisions/proposals and amendments to all Committee Members in a timely manner.”

11. In addition, the issue of recommendation 12 intended to “*forbid a State Party to take part in the decision on the follow-up of state of conservation reports concerning a property located on its territory*” was also raised in the follow-up of the implementation of recommendation 20 (see paragraph 14).
12. **Recommendation 20** recommended to “*Fully use the mechanism of In-Danger listing, in conformity with the provisions of the Guidelines (both for inscription and removal); revise the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to forbid a State Party serving on the Committee to take part in the decision following debates on state of conservation reports concerning a property located in its territory.*”
13. In its Decision **38 COM 9C**, the World Heritage Committee decided to create an ad hoc working group which should meet during its 39th Session in 2015 to discuss recommendation 20 of the External Auditor. Due to timetable constraints, the Committee, acting on the proposal of its President, agreed that recommendation 20 would be discussed in working groups already planned for the 39th Session, especially on the review of the Operational Guidelines and the Budget.
14. By its Decision **39 COM 5E**, the World Heritage Committee decided to amend Article 22.7 of its Rules of Procedure as follows: “Representatives of a State Party, whether or not a member of the Committee, may be invited by the Chairperson to present their views once the Advisory Bodies have presented their evaluation of the site proposed by the State for inscription. The presentation shall be limited to a clarification or an update on the proposed site. After this permitted time, the State Party may be allowed to take the floor again, but only in order to answer questions, within a limited time, that have been asked. This provision also applies to other observers mentioned in Rule 8.”

III. Progress report (2014-2015) of the plan set forth by the open-ended working group for the implementation of the recommendations of the independent evaluation of the Global Strategy

15. The progress table 2014-2015 of the plan set forth by the open-ended working group is presented below. It has been updated on the basis of reports of activities of the World Heritage Centre and the follow-up Report on the independent evaluation by the external auditor (document 196 EX/23.INF.4) In order to facilitate its reading, the relevant paragraphs of this document have been mentioned in the follow-up 2014-2015 column.

III. PROGRESS REPORT (2014-2015) ON THE PLAN SET FORTH BY THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION ON THE GLOBAL STRATEGY

1. HIGHEST PRIORITY (HtP)						
No.	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations of the Open-ended Working Group	Implementation Time line	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibilities	Status in 2015 (after the 39th Session of the Committee)
15. Ht.P	Define, together with the Advisory Bodies, a global conservation strategy that could in particular examine the points mentioned in the following recommendations.	<p>- The Working Group confirms conservation as the highest priority of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> and invites the Advisory Bodies to compile existing documentation and information (e.g. results of the expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties, Senegal 2011) into a Desk Study in order for the Committee to take this forward for a Global Conservation Strategy, which should include training, capacity building and management;</p> <p>-The Working Group notes that recommendation 15 is a chapeau-recommendation for recommendations 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21. Its implementation is interlinked with the implementation of these recommendations;</p>	19th GA	Desk Study USD15,000 Advisory Bodies Meeting Review	World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies	<p>No funding received for Desk Study; but Information System on State of Conservation has been established with all existing site.</p> <p>Refocus on conservation reaffirmed in Strategic Action plan (see document WHC-13/19 GA/10).</p> <p>Advisory missions and studies intended to help States Parties with conservation reflect the recommended strategy.</p> <p>See 196 EX/23.INF.4, paragraphs 50-54.</p>
16. Hi.P	Reconsider the priority accorded to Preparatory Assistance in comparison to assistance for conservation and management and reinforce training in the field of management and conservation.	<p>- The Working Group recommends to the Committee to revise the priority order of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> in order to give priority to assistance for conservation and management and to reflect this proposal when adopting the budgetary lines;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the Committee to consider limiting preparatory assistance to States Parties which have no site on the World Heritage List, during a predetermined number of years (e.g. duration of 4 years);</p> <p>- The Working Group encourages category 2 centres to play a more active role in capacity building in the field of management and conservation where possible;</p>		No additional cost (Review by the International Assistance Panel/ Capacity Building Strategy)	World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, International Assistance panel, Category 2 centres	<p>Done (see Decision 36 COM 13.1 and Operational Guidelines paragraph 235).</p> <p>The priority allocation of funding in international assistance reintroduced – see the World Heritage Fund budget 2014-2015, adopted in 2013 (International Assistance budget: 73.3% for conservation assistance and management and 26.7% for preparatory</p>

						<p>assistance).</p> <p>Active role demonstrated – see document WHC-15/39.COM/6 on the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Enhancing and the activities of World Heritage Category 2 centres.</p> <p>See document 196 EX/23.INF.4, paragraphs 55-59.</p>
17. Hi.P	<p>Review the provisions in paragraph 115 of the Guidelines that depart from the obligation to include an appropriate management plan or another documented management system in the nomination file: at least, strictly indicate under what circumstances derogation of the obligation may be accorded; ensure the effective establishment of an appropriate management plan; review the drafting of paragraph 116 of the Guidelines to make obligatory Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative WHC-11/18.GA/8, p. 10 the definition of a plan of action, approved by the Committee following consultation with the Advisory Bodies, on corrective measures concerning anthropogenic threats; inscribe in the Guidelines the requirement of a management plan for public use; require — and not only to recommend – the integration of a risk and catastrophe management plan into the management plan.</p>	<p>- The Working Group invites the Operational Guidelines Working Group to review this recommendation for 37 COM and requests a draft text for revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> from the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre on management plans;</p>				<p>The 39th Committee decided to delete paragraph 115 (see Decision 39 COM 11).</p> <p>See document 196 EX/23.INF.4, paragraphs 60-64.</p>
18. Ht.P	<p>Strengthen the monitoring of properties; define monitoring indicators for the state of conservation, establish proactive monitoring by the Advisory Bodies without waiting for the occurrence of serious problems; ensure the</p>	<p>- The Working Group recommends to the Committee, World Heritage Centre, and Advisory Bodies to review the state of conservation processes and in particular to:</p> <p>a) Link existing tools of state of conservation and Periodic Reporting and recall Decision 35 COM 7C (see outcome of the</p>	<p>From the 3rd Periodic Reporting cycle</p>	<p>No additional cost (Coordination of the preparation of the Periodic Reporting through Advisory</p>	<p>World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Committee, States Parties</p>	<p>a) The 39th Committee decided to suspend the third cycle of Periodic Reporting and to launch a two-year reflection period from 2015 to 2017.</p>

	<p>participation of experts from the Advisory Bodies in the preparation of periodic reports; actively promote best practice exchanges for conservation.</p>	<p>expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties, Senegal 2011);</p> <p>b) Strengthen the Advisory Bodies' role in the Periodic Reporting review;</p> <p>c) Define the extent and standards of proactive monitoring and request IUCN and ICOMOS to report on this issue to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the States Parties, World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to make better use of best practice exercises;</p> <p>- The Working Group invites States Parties to inform the Committee, through the Secretariat, as soon as possible of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property (paragraph 172 of <i>Operational Guidelines</i>);</p>	<p>37th COM Session</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Bodies and World Heritage Centre meetings; Flanders financed project on threats and monitoring of trends);</p> <p>No additional cost: promotion of best practices: webpage</p> <p>No supplementary cost</p>		<p>The World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties will prepare an updated format of the questionnaire and proposals for enhancing the process, relevance, analysis and use of Periodic Reporting data (Decision: 39 COM 10B.5).</p> <p>.</p> <p>Tools already linked through State of Conversation Information System (on-line tool by using same indicators for trends)</p> <p>b) the role of the Advisory Bodies in the two-year reflection from 2015-2017 is ensured.</p> <p>c) Proactive follow-up in place: IUCN launched an online monitoring tool in 2014 (Conservation Outlook Assessments) for all Natural World Heritage Properties (process ongoing)</p> <p>Since its 37th Session in 2013, advisory missions have been used more often for the follow-up on the state of conservation of properties, on the recommendation of the Committee or at the request of States Parties themselves.</p> <p>Best practice dissemination enhanced through: 1. best practice recognition at Kyoto 2012; 2. Online publishing of best practices; 3. Focus in WH Review nr 67 (May 2013); and 4. publication "World Heritage beyond Borders" (UNESCO/Cambridge University</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--	---

						<p>Press) Increasingly recognized by States Parties.</p> <p>The Committee adopted (39 COM 7) an obligatory format for the submission of reports on the state of conservation by States Parties, in which there is a section where, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>, the States Parties must describe all projects which may be undertaken and which may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.</p> <p>See document 196 EX/23.INF.4, Paragraphs 65-68.</p>
19. M.P	Study the establishment of a «rapid reaction » fund for threatened cultural properties.	The Working Group notes that the World Heritage Centre developed a funding proposal for rapid reaction for cultural and natural heritage, however no funding has yet been identified;	Medium term	Proposal for ‘rapid reaction’ fund has been developed (extrabudgetary funding):USD 6 million	World Heritage Centre	<p>Proposal developed and funding pending</p> <p>See document 196 EX/23.INF.4, Paragraphs 74-77.</p>
20. Ht.P	Fully use the mechanism of In-Danger listing, in conformity with the provisions of the Guidelines (both for inscription and removal); revise the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to forbid a State Party serving on the Committee to take part in the decision following debates on state of conservation reports concerning a property located in its territory.	<p>- The Working Group recalls that the <i>Rules of Procedures</i> were amended in 2011, but are not yet in line with this recommendation; it invites the Committee to introduce a provision in its <i>Rules of Procedures</i>, in order to prevent members of the Committee to take part and vote on the decision on the state of conservation of properties located in their territory;</p> <p>- The Working Group stressed the need to promote Danger Listing as an international tool for conservation and to change the negative image of it by using the following incentives for Danger Listing: mobilization of International Assistance; the promotion of the States Parties’ efforts for improvements with regard to the conservation of the site and; publicity for the removal from the Danger List;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the Committee, States Parties and other stakeholders to focus efforts on a select</p>	<p>At the latest 37th COM, Item Rules of procedure</p> <p>Immediately</p> <p>37th COM Session</p>	<p>No additional cost</p> <p>No additional cost (web, publications, press releases and conferences at Committee meetings, etc.) No additional costs for the other recommendations</p>	World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre, States Parties	<p>See Part II of this document.</p> <p>Done through webpages, special focus on States Parties in conflict situations, including through meetings and conferences of the main donors, see document WHC-15/39.COM/7 and Decision 39 COM 7).</p> <p>In 2014, the “Cultural and Works Fund” (<i>Fonds Culturel Arts & Ouvrages</i>”) approved funding (USD 420,000 over 3 years) for conservation activities for 3 properties in danger.</p>

	<p>number of conservation projects for each site on the Danger List;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to ensure that all sites on the Danger List have a Desired State of Conservation by 38 COM at the latest; - The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to formulate more precise standards with regard to the removal of a site from the Danger List; - The Working Group invites the Advisory Bodies in cooperation with States Parties to provide a costed Action Plan when proposing a site for the World Heritage List in Danger and to identify the sources of financing; - The Working Group invites the World Heritage Centre to report regularly on the costed Action Plan and funding provided; 	<p>Systematic</p> <p>37th COM Session</p> <p>Systematic</p>		<p>A certain number of projects for Danger Sites have been approved in 2012-2014 both through International Assistance (9 requests) and Extrabudgetary Funding (11 new projects). The request for drawing up a Desired State of Conservation desired is systematic for properties in danger since the 37th Session.</p> <p>Included in TOR of selected missions. However, such costed action plans are not always relevant (for example, in the case of a property for which the state of conservation is seriously threatened by a lack of governance).</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p>21. Hi.P</p>	<p>Allocate a part of accumulated funds to conservation; estimate the funding needs for the safeguarding of properties in danger in conformity with the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Convention; elaborate a conservation programme for properties requiring assistance from the international community, financed from permanent resources and not allocated, by implementing the funding solutions examined at the 34th session and in allocating funds in accordance with the degree of urgency of the intervention, evaluated by the Advisory Bodies; study the possibility of collecting ad hoc resources for conservation through public campaigns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Working Group reiterates that priority funding should go to conservation; - The Working Group invites the Committee to allocate the biggest part of the International Assistance budget of the World Heritage Fund to conservation; - The Working Group invites States Parties to provide to the World Heritage Centre estimates of funding needs for conservation of sites on the Danger List; - The Working Group invites the Budget Working Group to discuss the study on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund at 36 COM; - The Working Group invites the Advisory Bodies in cooperation with States Parties to provide a costed Action Plan when proposing a site for the World Heritage List in Danger (See also Recommendation 20); 	<p>Systematic</p>	<p>Elaborate programme: USD 30,000;</p> <p>Funding of 35 sites in Danger List: about USD 20 Million of extrabudgetary funding (each site requires specific funding strategy); (for example, 21.3 Million Euros were necessary for the implementation of an Emergency Plan for the Niokolo-Koba National Park, Senegal in 2008).</p>	<p>World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, States Parties</p>	<p>See Decision 39 COM 15.</p> <p>See document 196 EX/23.INF.4, Paragraphs 78-82.</p> <p>The sustainability of the World Heritage Fund has been the subject of discussions in the budget working group since the 36th COM. This question has also been raised by the 19th GA in 2013, (see Resolution 19 GA.8) which recommended a selection of options for the payment by States Parties of voluntary additional contributions to the Fund.</p> <p>The Centre has participated in enhancing synergies between the 6 cultural conventions through the Cultural Convention Liaison Group (CCLG) and the preparation of options for synergies between the multilateral environmental agreements concerning biodiversity (see document WHC-15/39.COM/5A).</p>
---------------------	---	--	-------------------	---	--	--

V. Draft Resolution

Draft Resolution: 20 GA 9

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined document WHC-15/20.GA/9,*
2. *Recalling Resolution **19 GA 9** of the 19th Session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2013)*
3. *Takes note of the good follow-up of most of the recommendations of the implementation as detailed in the implementation plan updated for 2014-2015 and document 196 EX/23.INF.4;*
4. *Also takes note of the amendments made by the World Heritage Committee to its Rules of Procedure in order to implement recommendations 12 and 20 of the independent evaluation;*
5. *Strongly urges the World Heritage Committee to continue implementing any pending requests in relation to its mandate;*
6. *Also urges the World Heritage Committee to pursue the efforts undertaken to link the follow-up of the Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the independent evaluation on the Global Strategy and the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan drawn up as part of the reflections on the Future of the World Heritage Convention;*

Requests the World Heritage Centre to include any further follow-up in the Report of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on its activities (2016-2017) to be presented to the General Assembly at its 21st Session in 2017.