



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 34 COM

Limited Distribution

WHC-10/34.COM/7.2  
Paris, 31 May 2010  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF  
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-fourth session

Brasilia, Brazil  
25 July – 3 August 2010

**Item 7.2 of the Provisional Agenda: Report on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism**

## SUMMARY

This document presents the activities undertaken under the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) by Decision **31 COM 5.2** and provides a report on the implementation of this mechanism since the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009, Decision **33 COM 7.2**).

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7.2** see point III

## I. Introduction

1. Following the decision adopted by the Executive Board at its 176th session (176 EX/Special Plenary Meeting/Decision), which “requests the Director-General within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*, to propose to the World Heritage Committee at its forthcoming session a mechanism to ensure the proper implementation of the World Heritage Committee decisions”, the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was established by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Decision **31 COM 5.2**) to allow the sending of one or a series of reports to the World Heritage Committee in the interval between two sessions. In 2007, it was applied to three cases (seven properties) at the request of the World Heritage Committee: Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany, Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls and the five natural heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
2. The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) enlarged the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM) to 4 additional properties reaching a total of 11 cases. It continued to be applied for the seven properties requested in 2007 (all on the List of World Heritage in Danger), while the four additional properties were not: Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru), Timbuktu (Mali), Bordeaux, Port of the moon (France), and Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan). At the same time, the Committee requested a review of the operational aspects of the RMM.
3. Prior to the 33rd session, the RMM was decided for two additional properties by Decision of the Director-General of UNESCO: (a) the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia), in response to a request for a mission by the State Party following the shooting incident of 15 October 2008 and (b) Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) following a mission to the site carried out from 19 to 22 January 2009 by the UNESCO BRESCE Office which recommended applying RMM. After having carefully considered the situation, the Director-General decided to apply the RMM to this property on 1 April 2009.
4. The World Heritage Committee Decision **32 COM 7.3** requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to refine the operational aspects of the RMM. This review and considerations were presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).
5. The World Heritage Committee in its Decision **33 COM 7.2** took note of the operational aspects that had been presented by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, and especially of their proposal to clearly state the nature of the monitoring mission and the frequency of reporting required. The World Heritage Committee decided to review each application of the RMM annually and stated that it was designed to assist only in exceptional and specific cases as defined by document *WHC-09/33.COM/7.2* paragraph 27, and predominantly restricted to the monitoring of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger where the World Heritage Committee fears the loss of Outstanding Universal Value in the short-term.
6. The World Heritage Committee also noted at its 33rd session that if the RMM is used as an alternative to established monitoring procedures such as the inclusion of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it creates potential for ambiguity and may reduce the credibility of the existing reactive monitoring system and its procedures.

## II. Overview of Application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism

7. The following table provides an overview of the situation with regards to all properties under the RMM since its first application in 2007 and until 2010 in a chronological order of decisions:

**Table of properties under the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM)**

<b>World Heritage property</b>	<b>Decisions of the Committee with date of application</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	<b>31 COM 7A.32</b> 2007-	All 5 properties are on the Danger List. RMM has been applied to all 5 properties since 2007, because of the continued threat to their OUV as a result of the (post) conflict situation. At its 33 session, by Decision <b>33 COM 7A.8</b> , the Committee decided not to continue RMM for the <b>Okapi Wildlife Reserve</b> , following the conclusion of the 2009 monitoring mission, which noted that conditions were in place to enable a beginning of the regeneration of the OUV.
<b>Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan)</b>	<b>31 COM 7A. 18</b> 2007-	The property is on the List of World Heritage in Danger. RMM applied only to the issue of the design for the Mughrabi Ascent. Seven reports sent to the members of the World Heritage Committee in between the annual sessions.
<b>Dresden-Elbe Valley (Germany)</b>	<b>31 COM 7A.21</b> 2007-2009	The property was on the Danger List . By Decision <b>33 COM 7A.26</b> , , the property was deleted from the World Heritage List in 2009.
<b>Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)</b>	<b>32 COM 7B. 44</b> 2008-2009	RMM was requested by the Committee for two years in 2008. The Committee in its Decision <b>33 COM 7B.42</b> decided not to continue to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to the property.
<b>Samarkand, Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan)</b>	<b>32 COM 7B.79</b> 2008-2009	The application of the RMM was discontinued by the Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 (Decision <b>33 COM 7B.84</b> ), based on the findings of a 2009 reactive monitoring mission to the property.

<b>Timbuktu (Mali)</b>	<b>32 COM 7B.49</b> 2008-2009	The Committee in its decision <b>33 COM 7B.45</b> decided not to continue to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to the property.
<b>Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France)</b>	<b>32 COM 7B.89</b> 2008-2009	The Committee in its decision <b>33 COM 7B.101</b> decided not to continue to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to the property
<b>Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia)</b>	2008-	The RMM was applied by the Director General following the Committee decision <b>32 COM 8B.102</b> . In its Decision <b>33 COM 7B.65</b> , the Committee decided not to interrupt the RMM. However, the Committee did not specify the required periodicity of the reporting. Since the 33rd session of the Committee, no missions have taken place and no particular need for interim RM reports has been identified.
<b>Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia)</b>	2009-	The property is on the List of World Heritage in Danger.  The RMM was applied by the Director General following a mission by the UNESCO BRESCE Office which recommended RMM.
<b>Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic)</b>	<b>33 COM 7A.1</b> 2009-2010	The property is on the List of World Heritage in Danger.  The Committee decided to apply RMM at its 34 session, following the conclusion of the 2009 monitoring mission that there was a high risk of losing the OUV of this property, if no urgent measures are taken.

8. As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session, an updated report on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in the cases applied in view of assessing its formalization in the *Operational Guidelines* will be prepared for its 35th session in 2011.
9. Concerning the budgetary ceiling the same as for 2009 is proposed which sets the budget for the operation of the RMM at USD 50,000, which would include the review process indicated above.

### III. Draft Decision

#### **Draft Decision: 34 COM 7.2**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.2,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 5.2**, **32 COM 7.3** and **33 COM 7.2** adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd sessions (Seville, 2009) respectively,*
3. *Notes the update report on the implementation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM);*
4. *Reiterates its request to the World Heritage Centre via the Chairperson to provide to the members of the World Heritage Committee a report on each activity undertaken within the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism as soon as it is available;*
5. *Decides to set the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism at USD 50,000 for 2010;*
6. *Further decides to review the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in 2011 at its 35th session and requests the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to present to the World Heritage Committee, at its 35th session in 2011, a report regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in view of assessing its formalization in the Operational Guidelines.*