



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

19 GA

WHC-13/19.GA/9
Paris, 7 October 2013
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
19- 21 November 2013

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Global Strategy for a representative,
balanced and credible World Heritage List: Report on the Follow-up to
Resolution 18 GA 8**

**Report on the Follow-up to Resolution 18 GA 8 on the Evaluation of the
Global Strategy and PACT initiative**

SUMMARY

The General Assembly, at its 17th session, requested the World Heritage Centre to submit to the General Assembly at its 18th session in 2011 the independent evaluation by UNESCO's external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011 and the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT), which were provided in documents WHC-11/18.GA/8 and WHC-11/18.GA/INF.8.

By Resolution **18 GA 8** the General Assembly decided to establish an open-ended working group to examine the report of the External Auditor, in order to produce an implementation plan for the recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee and to present a final report to the 19th session of the General Assembly. The open-ended working group met twice in May 2012 and February 2013 at UNESCO and provided detailed reports to the 36th (WHC-12/36.COM/9A) and 37th sessions (WHC-13/37.COM/INF.5D) of the World Heritage Committee. These detailed reports can be found at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2012/whc12-36com-9A-en.pdf> and <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2013/whc13-37com-5Dinf-en.pdf>. This document provides a full report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Report of the External Auditor on the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative.

Draft Resolution 19 GA 9: see point V.

I. BACKGROUND

1. The General Assembly at its 17th session requested the World Heritage Centre to provide at its 18th session in 2011 “with a summary of the work undertaken in relation to the reflection on the future of the Convention, including an independent evaluation by UNESCO’s external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011 and the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT), based on indicators and approaches to be developed during the 34th and 35th sessions of the World Heritage Committee”.
2. The Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) with Decision **35 COM 9A** requested the World Heritage Centre to transmit the independent evaluation by the UNESCO’s External Auditor to the 18th session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2011) for examination. The General Assembly decided (Resolution **18 GA 8**) to establish an open-ended working group including experts from the different geographic regions, whose composition would be determined by States Parties and depending significantly on extrabudgetary funds. This open-ended working group was requested to examine the report of the External Auditor, in order to produce an implementation plan for the recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee and to present a final report to the 19th session of the General Assembly.
3. Resolution **18 GA 8** of the General Assembly invited UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre to implement the recommendations of the External Auditor concerning PACT, and notably to harmonize PACT with UNESCO’s development of partnership strategies.
4. The General Assembly at its 18th session also invited “the World Heritage Centre, in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to produce by 1 February 2012 a working document, which: a) proposes a prioritized list of recommendations in the framework of the objectives of the Strategic Action Plan, adopted in Resolution 18 GA 11, and considering Decisions 35 COM 12A to 35 COM 12E, b) indicates the financial implications, c) suggests the allocation of responsibility between States Parties, the General Assembly, the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.” This working document was dispatched by Circular Letters on 1 February 2012 and 24 April 2012 respectively.
5. The General Assembly also recommended that this open-ended working group meets “before the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, in order to report to the Committee on the work undertaken”.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY’S RESOLUTIONS

6. The open-ended working group met from 15 to 16 May 2012 at UNESCO. It elected Mr David D. Hamadziripi (Zimbabwe) as Chairperson, Ms Vera Lacoëuilhe (Saint Lucia) as Vice Chairperson and Ms Kristien Dubois (Belgium) as Rapporteur. The open-ended working group debated during 3 sessions the Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the external auditor on the Global Strategy which have been endorsed by the 18th General Assembly. The open-ended working group prepared an Implementation Plan which indicates how to implement the recommendation, by whom, by when and the costs or funding required. The group worked in order of priorities (from the highest priority to low priority), except where a clustered approach between different recommendations from different priorities was considered more useful. This methodology is reflected in the Implementation Plan, which was presented to the 36th session of the Committee. All documents of the open-ended working group, including the letters sent to all States Parties and

background information are posted on the World Heritage Centre website at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/open-ended-working-group/>.

7. The open-ended working group concluded its deliberations on the section on Global Strategy and decided to meet again prior to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee to discuss the recommendations on the PACT Initiative.
8. The second meeting of the open-ended working group took place on 1 February 2013. Chaired by Mr David D. Hamadziripi (Zimbabwe) and with Ms Kristien Dubois (Belgium) as Rapporteur, the Working Group adopted an implementation plan for the recommendations of the External Auditor on the PACT Initiative.
9. Following Resolution **18 GA 8** of the General Assembly the World Heritage Centre's PACT work was harmonized with UNESCO's development of partnership strategies, notably the endorsement by the 190th session of the Executive Board of the umbrella statement of the "Policy Framework for Strategic Partnership: a comprehensive partnership strategy" and the accompanying "separate strategies for engagement with individual categories of partners".
10. Moreover, following Decision **36 COM 5A**, the Centre presented a revised PACT strategy to the 37th session of the Committee, taking into account the results of the evaluation of the External Auditor on the PACT Initiative, the Plan of Action proposed by the open-ended working group (OEWG) on the recommendations of the External Auditor concerning PACT and the decision adopted during the 190th Executive Board session regarding the UNESCO Framework for Strategic Partnerships. This Strategy was adopted by the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee.
11. The Implementation Plans for the Global Strategy (Section III) and PACT (Section IV) provided below in tabular format have been updated to include the status of implementation as of July 2013. The update of the Implementation Plan is based on the results of the process explained above in these phases:
 - implementation of recommendations from the open-ended working group at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (see document WHC-12/36.COM/9A available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2012/whc12-36com-9A-en.pdf>); The Decisions by the 36th session of the Committee (Saint Petersburg, 2012) are available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM>;
 - implementation of recommendations from the open-ended working group at the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (see document WHC-13/37.COM/INF.5D available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2013/whc13-37com-5Dinf-en.pdf>); The Decisions by the 37th session of the Committee (Phnom Penh, 2013) are available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>;
 - a few recommendations have not been implemented and will go to the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee or will be further pursued by the States Parties, the Committee, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies as appropriate; these may also involve other bodies, such as the cooperation with other international Conventions;

III. STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN BY THE WORKING GROUP FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR ON THE GLOBAL STRATEGY (2012-13)

1. HIGHEST PRIORITY (Ht.P)						
No.	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Status in 2013 (after 37 COM)
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>	<p>37 COM</p> <p>19 GA</p>	Desk Study USD 15,000 and 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 specific information;</p> <p>Refocus on conservation reaffirmed in Strategic Action plan (see document WHC-13/19 GA/10)</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>	Operational Guidelines / Budget Working Group 36 COM	No additional cost (Review by International Assistance Panel/ Capacity Building Strategy)	World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, International Assistance panel, Category 2 centres	Done see Decision 36 COM 13.1 and Operational Guidelines para 235;
17. Hi.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 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;	37 COM	No additional cost (review by Operational Guidelines Working Group; priority International Assistance for management plans)	World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies	Discussed at the Operational Guidelines Working Group in 2013 and will be reported back in 2015 (see Decision 37 COM 12.II)

	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.					
18. Ht.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 participation of experts from the Advisory Bodies in the preparation of periodic reports; actively promote best practice exchanges for conservation.	<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 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</p>	<p>From 3rd cycle of Periodic Reporting</p> <p>37 COM</p> <p>Immediately</p> <p>Immediately</p>	<p>No additional cost (Coordination of the preparation of the Periodic Reporting through Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre meetings; Flanders financed project on threats and monitoring of trends);</p> <p>No additional cost: Best practice promotion: web-page</p> <p>No additional cost;</p>	<p>World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Committee, States Parties</p>	<p>3rd cycle of Periodic Reporting 2017-2023 and reflection year in 2016</p> <p>Tools already linked through State of Conversation Information System (on-line tool by using same indicators for trends)</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 Press)</p> <p>Increasingly recognized by States Parties;</p>

		the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property (paragraph 172 of <i>Operational Guidelines</i>);				
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	Proposal developed and funding continues to be explored
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 number of conservation projects for each site on the Danger List;</p> <p>- 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;</p> <p>- 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;</p> <p>- 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;</p> <p>- The Working Group invites the World Heritage Centre to report regularly on the costed Action Plan and funding provided;</p>	<p>At the latest 37 COM Item Rules of procedures</p> <p>Immediately</p> <p>37 COM</p> <p>38 COM at the latest</p> <p>37 COM</p> <p>36 COM / 37 COM</p>	<p>No additional cost</p> <p>No additional cost (web, publications, press releases and conferences at Committee meetings, etc.)</p> <p>No additional costs for the other recommendations</p>	World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre, States Parties	<p>Revisions to Rules of Procedures presented to 37 COM; see Decision 37 COM 11</p> <p>Done through Web-pages, special focus on Mali, Syria etc. including through major donor meetings and conferences</p> <p>Special focus being given at the WHC with responsibility assigned to D/DIR/WHC, and specific strategy developed</p> <p>A number of projects for Danger sites have been approved in 2012/13 both through International Assistance and Extrabudgetary Funding</p> <p>Guidance for the Desired State of Conservation developed by Advisory Bodies and WHC and adopted by 37 COM (Decision 37 COM 7A.40)</p> <p>Included in TOR of selected missions;</p>

			38 COM at the latest			
21. Hi.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>- The Working Group reiterates that priority funding should go to conservation;</p> <p>- The Working Group invites the Committee to allocate the biggest part of the International Assistance budget of the World Heritage Fund to conservation;</p> <p>- 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;</p> <p>- The Working Group invites the Budget Working Group to discuss the study on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund at 36 COM;</p> <p>- 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>	<p>Working Group Operational Guidelines 36 COM</p> <p>Budget Working Group 36 COM</p> <p>38 COM at the latest</p> <p>36 COM</p> <p>36 COM / 37 COM</p>	<p>Elaborate programme: USD 30,000;</p> <p>Funding for 35 sites in Danger List: about USD 20 Million of extrabudgetary funding (each site requires specific funding strategy);</p>	World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, States Parties	<p>See Decisions 36 COM 13.I 36 COM 15 § 33 and 37 COM 15.I § 15: The World Heritage Committee recommends that WHC “give priority to conservation and monitoring activities” in the 2014-2015 budget.</p> <p>36 COM 15 § 28 and 37 COM 15.I § 34: The World Heritage Committee decides that additional contributions within appeals to States Parties “be utilized for International Assistance towards conservation and management of World Heritage properties.”</p> <p>Estimates of funding needed for Danger sites: To be included into state of conservation reports for 38 COM</p> <p>Study on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund was discussed at Budget Working Group at 36 COM and 37 COM, but no specific option was retained. Please see 36 COM 15 Part III and 37 COM 15.I Part III.</p> <p>Costed Action Plan: To be included in all TOR for missions to sites proposed for the Danger</p>

* The Working Group noted a translation error in the English version: *Allocate **an increased part of the** funds to conservation;*

						List and to sites on the Danger List;
25. Ht.P	Render World Heritage properties examples of best practice in the service of heritage protection; develop new tools to provide full meaning to Articles 4 to 6 of the Convention and the recommendation of 1972 on the protection of the national plan for cultural and natural heritage; envisage, if need be, an additional protocol or new thematic conventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Working Group recommends to the Committee and States Parties to enhance best practices and promote them for preventive conservation (see also Recommendation 18); - The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to further develop Resource Manuals; - The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to make the 1972 <i>Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage</i> more visible on the website and through other media; - The Working Group recommends to States Parties to ensure implementation of articles 4 to 6 of the Convention; - The Working Group notes that new Conventions are not encouraged by the Executive Board and recommends international cooperation within the existing frameworks; 	<p>Immediately</p> <p>19 GA</p> <p>Immediately</p> <p>Immediately</p>	No additional cost. New Conventions are not encouraged due to budget constraints; collaboration envisaged within existing frameworks (e.g. 186 EX/Decision 21 on landscapes)	World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, States Parties	<p>See implementation under Recommendation 18</p> <p>Done: Resource Manuals available at http://whc.unesco.org/en/resourcemanuals/</p> <p>Translations in process for existing titles, however no funding available for new manuals.</p> <p>Done: integrated into web-page at http://whc.unesco.org/en/convention/</p> <p>Cooperation enhanced through coordination with other Conventions (see also Decisions 36 COM 5A and 37 COM 5A)</p>

2. HIGH PRIORITY (Hi.P.)						
No.	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-ended Working Group	Time line	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	
2. Hi.P	Establish criteria and monitoring indicators for the Global Strategy, and more generally the implementation of the Convention, indicators that must concern not only the representativity of the List, but also and specifically the effectiveness of the nomination to the List, as a conservation tool.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Working Group recalls the provisions in the Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2012-2022 which covers criteria and monitoring indicators under item 2.1 (see Document WHC-12/36 COM/12A); - The Working Group invites the Committee to ensure that Statements of Outstanding Universal Value clearly indicate the attributes of the site. 	<p>36 COM</p> <p>Start 36 COM</p>	<p>An update of the gap analysis by the Advisory Bodies would require extrabudgetary funds: USD 10,000</p> <p>No additional cost</p>	World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies	<p>No funding obtained for gap Analysis so far</p> <p>Taken into account for new and retrospective Statements of OUV</p>
3. Hi.P	Establish more pertinent statistics by sub-region rather than the arbitrary zoning currently in use; avoid the approach by country and political region in favour of scientific analysis grids that the Advisory	- The Working Group recommends to the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre to establish regional and subregional statistical analysis (ref. Document WHC-10/34.COM/7C) to identify, among others, common threats on the basis of subregions established through the Periodic Reporting process;	37 COM	No additional cost/ Advisory Body contract (World Heritage Fund)	Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre, States Parties	Statistics available through 'advanced search' for nominations and through State of Conservation Information System

	Bodies should be responsible for preparing; complete the statistics according to these classifications.	- The Working Group recommends to the Committee to appeal to State Parties and Donors to identify and provide additional resources for thematic studies (see Decision 35 COM 9C);	36 COM	Extrabudgetary funds (USD 30,000 per study)		No additional funding received, except for criterion (vii) study by Australia; Study presented to 37 COM
4. Hi.P	Strengthen the representation of natural scientific experts within the World Heritage Centre and its regional units, as well as synergies between the mechanism of the 1972 Convention and other international mechanisms for environmental protection.	- The Working Group recognizes the importance of this recommendation, but is aware of the current financial constraints at UNESCO. The Working Group invites UNESCO to implement the recommendation as soon as the situation improves;	Report to 19 GA	Additional personnel costs under regular Programme Budget Synergies through Biodiversity Liaison Group (1 meeting per year/1 staff World Heritage Centre attends – USD 1000)	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	Financial constraints for additional staff; synergies with other Conventions enhanced through BLG meetings (see https://www.cbd.int/blg/);
7a. Hi.P	Refocus World Heritage nominations on the most outstanding properties and for the others, ...	<p>- The Working Group invites the Committee not to adopt Statements of Outstanding Universal Value on a provisional basis and not to inscribe sites whose Statements of Outstanding Universal Value have not been finalized;</p> <p>- The Working Group invites the Committee to strictly implement the provisions of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> for inscriptions which do not have a confirmed Statements of Outstanding Universal Value by using referral or deferral;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the Committee to further clarify the concept of Outstanding Universal Value if it deems so necessary (see also “Special Meeting of Experts of all regions on the concept of outstanding universal value”, Kazan, Russian Federation, 2005);</p>	<p>36 COM</p> <p>36 COM</p> <p>Report to 19 GA</p>	<p>Extrabudgetary funding for upstream processes including workshops;</p> <p>No additional cost</p>	World Heritage Committee, States Parties, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre	<p>Situation clearly improved: 34 COM adopted 12 provisional statements 35 COM adopted 11 provisional statements 36 COM adopted 4 provisional statements 37 COM adopted 3 provisional statements</p> <p>Document 8B at 36 COM presented by WHC and ABs reflection on referral and deferral</p> <p>The Operational Guidelines Working Group at 36 COM discussed this matter without a recommendation to change existing texts</p>
8. Hi.P	Encourage States Parties to update and harmonise the tentative lists at the regional level; study the possibility of establishing regional or thematic tentative lists during the next periodic reporting cycle; - condition the granting of Preparatory Assistance destined for the establishment of tentative lists on the commitment to nominate in priority on these lists sites recognized by the Advisory Bodies as corresponding to gaps on the List and to	<p>- The Working Group recommends to the Advisory Bodies to undertake a Desk exercise to review Tentative Lists (requires funding);</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to further enhance capacity building for preparations of Tentative Lists and</p>	<p>Report to 19 GA</p> <p>36 COM</p>	<p>Extrabudgetary funding for Harmonisation meetings USD 50,000/each Upstream process to be financed</p> <p>No additional cost / can be done by review panel of International Assistance based on gap analysis of Advisory</p>	World Heritage Centre, World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies	<p>No funding obtained for desk studies</p> <p>Capacity building for nominations enhanced through workshops /courses in Africa (2 per year) and SIDS (e.g. Caribbean course in</p>

	participate in the experimental « Upstream » process aiming at evaluating potential outstanding universal value prior to the preparation of a nomination file; - assist, if need be, States Parties lacking the capacity to maintain the values, integrity and authenticity of properties inscribed on their tentative lists and where the potential for nomination on the World Heritage List has been recognized by the Advisory Bodies.	nominations (see also Document WHC-12/36.COM/9B); - The Working Group recommends to the Advisory Bodies to update the existing gap analysis; - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to implement Decision 34 COM 12 taking into account that the Working Group gives first priority to conservation assistance (see recommendation No.16). However exceptions can be made for States Parties without sites;	38 COM 36 COM	Bodies Extrabudgetary funding International Assistance/ bilateral cooperation		two phases in 2012 and 2013); resource manual on nominations published; No funding for gap analysis obtained Assistance has been provided for example to 2 countries without sites: Djibouti and Myanmar in 2012-13;
9. Hi.P	Continue the diversification of the geographical origin of experts working with the Advisory Bodies; give consideration to travel costs of « panel » members in the contract between the Advisory Bodies for the implementation of the Convention.	- The Working Group recommends to the Advisory Bodies to continue progress in this regard;	Budget Working Group 36 COM	Travel costs to be included into Advisory Bodies contracts financed by World Heritage Fund	Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Committee	Progress made with regard to diversification by Advisory Bodies;
10. Hi.P	Ensure, as requested by the Committee at its 34th session (Decision 34.COM/5C), indication of the share of tasks between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to improve the effectiveness and economy of the mechanism.	- The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to continue reducing overlap and increase transparency and dialogue between Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre and States Parties; - The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to increase the use of electronic means to reduce travel costs; - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to avoid joint missions unless they are absolutely necessary; - The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to continue the work to find complementarities and efficiencies and to report back to the Committee;	36 COM Immediately 36 COM 37 COM	no additional costs (2 coordination meetings per year financed from World Heritage Fund (travel costs))	World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Committee and States Parties	A meeting was held 2-3 October 2012 at UNESCO Headquarters with the Advisory Bodies and the Director General of UNESCO and was reported to 37 COM (see also document WHC-13/19 GA/11.) Increasingly trilateral meetings were held on critical issues related to nominations (SP, ABs, WHC); Joint missions reduced in decisions at 36 and 37 COM Reports provided to 36 and 37 COM (see also document WHC-13/19 GA/11)
11. Hi.P	Ensure respect of the provisions contained in Article 9, paragraph 3 of the Convention whereby experts have a central role in delegations to the Committee, or otherwise take note of the current evolution and revise the	- The Working Group asks the Committee to strictly implement Article 9.3 of the <i>Convention</i> and Rule 5.2 of the <i>Rules of Procedures</i> ; - The Working Group encourages States Parties to give a central place in their delegations to scientific and heritage expertise and	36 COM 36 COM	Ticket and per diem of experts from Least Developed Countries covered from World Heritage Fund (USD 40,000/year)	World Heritage Committee and States Parties	Tickets by WHC only provided to experts based on their CVs (Least Developed Countries covered from World Heritage Fund);

	Convention to clearly recognize it is more geopolitical rather than the scientific nature.	expertise of the Convention; - The Working Group recalls that Committee Members should have both cultural and natural experts in their delegations;	36 COM	Also tickets by other bodies, (e.g. NWHF USD 25,000/ year)		
12. Hi.P	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 Working Group recommends to the Committee to address any potential conflicts of interest of its members (see also Recommendation No. 20); - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to refine Decision 35 COM 12B, confirming a transitional period on a voluntary basis for the States Parties presently members of the Committee; - The Working Group invites the Committee, after this period, to postpone the examination of nominations presented by members of the Committee during their mandate, with the exception of referred back and transboundary nominations; - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to consider the possibility of establishing a mechanism of allowing outgoing members of the Committee to catch up on the nominations-backlog; - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to make the necessary changes in relevant documents, including <i>Rules of Procedures</i> , with regard to the 3 last points in Recommendation 12;	Review <i>Rules of Procedures</i> (37 COM) Transition period for existing Committee members until 20 GA 38 COM 37 COM	No additional cost	World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre	WHC provided document accordingly, but Committee at 37 COM did not adopt the text as proposed (see Decision 37 COM 11); Concerning nominations presented by members of the Committee: this requires review by 38 COM (see Decision 35 COM 12B point 14) WHC provided document accordingly, but Committee at 37 COM did not adopt this text (see Decision 37 COM 11);
13. Hi.P	Delete from the List properties that have irremediably lost their outstanding universal value, in conformity with the provisions of paragraphs 192 to 198 of the Guidelines.	- The Working Group recommends to the Committee to revisit Decision 33 COM 9 with a view to establish clear standards for delisting (see also link to Recommendation No. 20);	Operational Guidelines Working Group (37 COM) to review whether provisions need to be revisited;	Reactive Monitoring mission costs to be covered by World Heritage Fund;	World Heritage Committee	Provisions were discussed, but not revised by the Operational Guidelines working group; however guidelines for the Desired State of Conservation were adopted by 37 COM (see Decision 37 COM 7A.40)

3. MEDIUM-HIGH PRIORITY (M.H.)

[†] The Working Group noted that there is a translation issue in the English version of working document WHC-11/18.GA/8 Recommendation 12, which should read ***Prohibit the practice of the presentation of signed amendments before the opening of the debate on the nomination of the site.***

No.	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-ended Working Group	Time line	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	
6. M.H	Take into account the evolution noted since 2007 and re-examine the appropriateness of amendments to the Suzhou Decision.	- The Working Group invites the Committee to review Decision 35 COM 8B.61 and to make an informed and evidence-based decision with regard to returning to the original Suzhou-decision (1 cultural and 1 natural nomination per State Party) in conformity with the Global Strategy;	38 COM	No additional cost (Committee decision required)	World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Committee	Agenda item to be included for 39 COM and WHC and ABs to prepare evaluation of Suzhou-Cairns Decisions as per para. 61 of the Operational Guidelines
7b. M.H envisage new tools for recognition and preservation at the regional level or by themes under the auspices of UNESCO or in concert with regional organizations.	<p>- The Working Group underlines the importance of the implementation of Decision 34 COM 12;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to take into account alternative tools (Biosphere Reserves, Geoparks) in the upstream processes;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to broaden the approach to thematic studies to cover additional regions and categories of heritage (link to No.8 on harmonization tentative list);</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to States Parties the use of other tools, including Heritage labels (e.g. Mercosur Heritage label), Biosphere Reserves, Geoparks, and use of national schemes;</p> <p>- The Working Group encourages education programmes to promote the recognition of other heritage labels at national or regional levels;</p>	<p>Immediately</p> <p>Immediately (depends on extrabudgetary funds)</p> <p>Immediately</p> <p>Immediately</p>	<p>Extrabudgetary funding for upstream processes including workshops; Cooperation with other organizations: funding for travel required</p> <p>No additional cost</p> <p>No additional cost</p>	World Heritage Committee, States Parties, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre	<p>Cooperation with other instruments enhanced (see report by the secretariat under item 5 at 36 COM and 37 COM)</p> <p>No funding for further thematic studies received</p> <p>Information provided including through web-pages and WH Review;</p> <p>Done: World Heritage Youth Forums, such as Patrimonio Joven 2013, focused on Intangible heritage and WH</p>
23. M.P	Establish a convention between UNESCO and the other United Nations institutions to organise cooperation on World Heritage properties.	- The Working Group notes that agreements exist with UNEP as well as other Conventions (RAMSAR, Convention on migratory species - CMS, Convention on Biological Diversity - CBD) and invites the World Heritage Centre to continue to cooperate within the UN-system (see document WHC-12/36.COM/INF.5A.1);	Immediately	No additional cost: Memorandum of Understanding exist with several partners in UN system	World Heritage Centre	Cooperation with these Conventions exists and was further enhanced through BLG meetings, see Decision 36 COM 5A and 37 COM 5A .

4. LOW PRIORITY (L.P.)

No.	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-ended Working Group	Time line	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	
1. L.P	Indicate in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention objectives for the Global Strategy and determine their compatibility with the objectives of the	- The Working Group invites the Operational Guidelines Working Group to ensure that provisions on and interpretations of Global Strategy are in line with the Convention;	Operational Guidelines Working group 36 COM	No additional cost	World Heritage Centre and World Heritage Committee	Done by Operational Guidelines Group; evaluation of Suzhou-Cairns Decision in 2015 as per para. 61 of the Operational Guidelines

	1972 World Heritage Convention.					
5. L.P	Reflect upon appropriate means to preserve the sites that are outside of the sovereignty of States Parties responding to the conditions of outstanding universal value.	- The Working Group notes that studies are under way (e.g. Marine Heritage in high seas outside territorial waters, 2012) and asks the World Heritage Centre to pay particular attention to a close collaboration with other international and regional instruments;	36 COM 19 GA	Desk study USD 50000 (funding already received for marine heritage)	World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies	The study on Marine Heritage in high seas outside territorial waters is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2013
22. L.P	In the spirit of the initiative « United in action [‡] », establish an annual report presenting in an exhaustive manner, extra-budgetary funding of United Nations institutions that benefit World Heritage properties and create a database on funding of all kinds (public or private) benefitting World Heritage properties.	<p>- The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre the creation of a database for extrabudgetary funding benefitting World Heritage sites, to provide a full picture of extrabudgetary funding prior to the allocation of funding from the World Heritage Fund, with the aim to better use the limited resources;</p> <p>- The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to collect data from States Parties on allocated and received funds for site conservation in order to complete the proposed database;</p> <p>- The Working Group notes that the World Heritage Centre has reintegrated the column on extrabudgetary resources received for conservation of sites in the budget document to ensure a more complete overview of the resources available and insists on the usefulness of this column;</p> <p>- The Working Group encourages the World Heritage Centre/UNESCO to ensure within the UN-country programme the mobilization of funds for heritage conservation;</p>	<p>Long term(depending on extrabudgetary funding)</p> <p>3rd periodic reporting cycle</p> <p>36 COM</p> <p>Immediately</p>	USD 20,000 Database creation (extrabudgetary funding)	World Heritage Centre, States Parties	<p>No funding received;</p> <p>To be integrated into 3rd cycle of Periodic Reporting after 2016</p> <p>Done see budget document 15 at 36 and 37 COM</p> <p>Country programming documents are reviewed by WHC staff</p>
24. L.P	Strengthen cooperation between the mechanism of the World Heritage Convention and the United Nations mechanisms on sustainable development and the other United Nations conventions in the field of culture and the environment.	- The Working Group notes the collaboration with other conventions in the field of Culture and Environment (see also recommendation 23 and Document WHC-12/36.COM/INF.5A.1);	Immediately	No additional cost	World Heritage Centre	Cooperation strengthened through inputs towards key UN processes on culture and development (i.e. the “UN Global Sustainable Development Report”, the special debate on Culture and Development at the UN GA, the ECOSOC thematic session and the SG Report on Culture and Development further to GA Res. 66/208). These enabled the recognition of the role of heritage in sustainable

[‡]Translation error in English: This should read *Delivering as One*.

						development towards the UN post-2015 agenda; synergies with UN Agencies/ mechanisms on sustainable development also enhanced through the Hangzhou Congress on “Culture: Key to Sustainable Development” (May 2013). The resulting Declaration (see http://www.unesco.org/new/fr/culture/themes/culture-and-development/hangzhou-congress/) emphasized the contribution of heritage to the various dimensions of sustainable development;
14. L.P.	Limit the period for new nominations by subordinating their reconsideration for a new examination after consultation with the Advisory Bodies. [§]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Working Group interpreted this recommendation that no legal revision of the 1972 Convention was required, that the obligations to the Convention should be taken seriously by States Parties and that a regular review of newly inscribed sites be carried out, including through the periodic Reporting; - The Working Group recalled that conservation should also start with the tentative listing process and review; - The Working Group notes that the <i>Convention</i> does not foresee provisions to inscribe sites for a limited period of time, but has provisions for Danger listing and delisting; - The Working Group recommends to the Committee to make full use of the provisions of referral and deferral (see also Recommendation 7a); 	Long term	No additional cost	World Heritage Committee	No change to Convention possible; but provisions of the Convention and Operational Guidelines on Danger Listing and Delisting can be fully applied; Information on deferral and referral presented under item 8 to 36 COM and recalled at 37 COM

[§] The Working Group noted a problem in the English translation of this Recommendation.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN BY THE WORKING GROUP FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR ON THE PACT INITIATIVE

Key:
Ht.P = Highest Priority
Hi.P = High Priority
M.P = Medium Priority

BSP/CFS = Bureau of Strategic Planning/Cooperation with the Private Sector
WHC/CEP/PACT = World Heritage Centre/Communication, Education and Partnerships Unit/
Partnerships for Conservation
WHC/AO = World Heritage Centre/Administrative Unit

BFM = Bureau of Financial Management
ERI = Sector for External Relations and Public Information
LA = Legal Affairs

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Implementation status
1. Ht.P	<i>Recommendation n° 4 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Indicate in agreements the obligations of the partner as regards activity reports and use of the emblem of the Convention; use tools to measure the impact of information diffused on the Convention and the sites and the contribution to World Heritage conservation.	<p>1.a) The Working Group stresses that Conservation of World Heritage sites needs to be at the core of the objectives of private sector partnerships.</p> <p>1.b) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and the Committee to give priority to long-term strategic partnerships.</p> <p>1.c) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include in partnership agreements an obligatory evaluation and monitoring clause, especially for important partnerships, which takes into account the evaluation of the partnership before renewal.</p> <p>1.d) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to establish clear partnership frameworks with timelines, responsibilities, performance indicators, expected results and evaluation.</p> <p>1.e) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to involve the Advisory Bodies and other experts during the development of important partnerships and their evaluation.</p> <p>1.f) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to avail itself of professional expert advice when establishing and negotiating private partnership agreements in order to ensure: i) experts' advice on specifics linked to private partnerships ii) the added value of a partnership iii) a balanced partnership with equal benefits for all parties.</p> <p>1.g) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to safeguard the value of the World Heritage emblem in</p>	19 GA Ongoing	<p>Estimations of additional costs for involvement of Advisory Bodies and external experts will have to be prepared.</p> <p>The other recommendations have no additional costs.</p>	<p>WHC/CEP/PACT</p> <p>WH Committee</p> <p>BSP/CFS</p> <p>Advisory Bodies</p>	<p>1a and 1b: Done as for all PACT agreements with the private sector, the overarching goal is to "mobilize sustainable resources for the long term conservation of WH ;"... first expected outcome is "Enhanced international cooperation with the private sector to help the conservation of the world cultural and natural heritage and sustainable development".</p> <p>1c: Done, as all agreements now contain specific clauses on evaluations.</p> <p>1d: Done, as partnerships frameworks are associated to a detailed Logframe.</p> <p>1e: Partly implemented with</p>

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Implementation status
		conformity with the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (Strategic Plan 2012-2022).				consultations taking place when required. 1f: Partly implemented, as the WHC Focal Point for PACT is an experienced professional in business, international affairs and negotiations. Moreover, WHC has taken action to establish a list of experts' contacts on development of important partnerships in the future. 1g: Done.
2 Ht.P	<i>Recommendation n°8 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Improve information of the «focal point for private sector cooperation» on partnerships in the Organization, by constituting a database to facilitate coordination. <i>[As per the Auditor's report, this recommendation may also concern other UNESCO Sectors]</i>	2.a) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to develop an updated list of prospective partnerships on Conservation in order to facilitate and encourage a proactive attitude towards the establishment of partnerships. 2.b) In order to enhance the collaboration with National Commissions, the Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to provide information on PACT to National Commissions at their annual meeting at UNESCO to encourage them to proactively seek partnerships for World Heritage conservation.	Ongoing	No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT BSP/CFS	2a: Done. 2b: Not yet implemented as the next annual meeting has not taken place.
3 Ht.P	<i>Recommendation n°5 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Inspired by good practices observed in certain PACT partnerships, envisage the establishment of a consultative entity, associating qualified personalities.	3.a) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include in the new PACT Strategy, proposals on a more systemic use of a consultative entity for important partnerships, which includes external experts, in order to strengthen the expertise in the monitoring and evaluation of the partnerships.	Ongoing	Include the costs for a consultative entity with external experts in the budget of important partnerships	WHC/CEP/ PACT	Done, as stipulated in the PACT strategy adopted at 37 COM, paragraphs 21 and 23b.

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Implementation status
4 Ht.P	<i>Recommendation n°3 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Implement the recommendations of the Administrative Manual for private sector partnerships: role of the focal point of the Division for Cooperation with Extrabudgetary Funding Resources, respect of the delegation of authority and signature; consultation with national commissions.	<p>4.a) The Working Group takes note of the established procedure with regard to the attribution of different visas for non-standards agreements (which go up to a maximum of 5) before entering into a new partnership.</p> <p>4.b) The Working Group recommends to BSP/CFS, in order to ensure efficient consultations with States Parties and their timely reaction on the establishment of a new partnership, to systematically inform the relevant Permanent Delegations at the same time as the National Commissions concerned are consulted.</p> <p>4.c) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include the Advisory Bodies in the risk analysis of potential partners when requested.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Additional costs for Advisory Bodies' implication need to be calculated.</p> <p>The other recommendations have no additional costs.</p>	BSP/CFS WHC/CEP/ PACT	<p>4a and 4b: Fully implemented with BSP/CFS.</p> <p>4c: Not yet implemented because the situation has not yet occurred.</p>

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA = General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Implementation status
5 Hi.P	<i>Recommendation n°7 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Make more precise the provisions of the Administrative Manual so as to constitute an operational guide for the managers of private sector partnerships, in particular to define objectives and modalities of the partnership, the selection of the partner, the comparison of costs and benefits, risk analysis, piloting mechanism for the partnership and the final assessment of the results obtained. <i>[Following the Auditor's report, this recommendation may also concern other UNESCO Sectors]</i>	5.a) The Working Group notes that the UNESCO Administrative Manual contains guiding principles for selecting, monitoring and implementing partnerships and that the Manual is being updated in conformity with the UNESCO Strategy on Partnerships with the Private Sector. 5.b) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and to UNESCO to make the Administrative Manual accessible to States Parties and National Commissions.	Ongoing	No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT BSP/CFS	5a & 5b: Done. The Administrative Manual is available on UNESCO's intranet (UNESCO.Int. Portal for Member States).
6 Hi.P	<i>Recommendation n°6 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Make permanently available to the Committee exact information on partnerships.	6.a) The Working Group welcomes the current template for reporting to the Committee. However, the Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to improve the information given on prospective and renewed partnerships, including the result of their evaluation. For new partnerships and renewals, more analytical information should be provided on expected benefits for World Heritage conservation including the experts' opinions on the partnership where appropriate. 6.b) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to bring proposals for the use of the emblem for commercial use, which can only be done on an exceptional basis, to the	Committee in 2014 Ongoing	No additional costs since the cost of the experts are already included in priority no. 1 of this table. No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT BSP/CFS	6a: Implementation in progress since 37COM. 6b, c, d: Implementation in progress. 6e: Done, as private sector partners are informed about UNESCO's

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Implementation status
		<p>Committee for approval when possible. For new partnerships, if the time frame does not allow consultation of the Committee in advance, the Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to report to the Committee afterwards on the exceptionality of the use of the emblem for commercial use. For renewals of partnerships, consultation of the Committee is always required in advance.</p> <p>6.c) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include a summary on PACT implementation in the reporting of the Strategic Action plan to the Committee and to the Budget Working Group in order for the Group to have a clearer overview of the funds available.</p> <p>6.d) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to show more clearly in the Budget the funds received from partnerships which go to the World Heritage Fund.</p> <p>6.e) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to organize, when convenient, events with private partners and States Parties and link them to important World Heritage meetings or events.</p> <p>6.f) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and to BSP/CFS to ensure accessibility by States Parties to the full partnership agreements.</p>		<p>No additional costs</p> <p>Costs to be determined according to type and place of event.</p> <p>No additional costs</p>		<p>international events and their participation is proposed and supported.</p> <p>6f: Done, as all partnerships agreements are accessible on WHC's website for States Parties to consult.</p>
7 Hi.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°9 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Include in the current reflections on partnerships at the Organization level, the establishment of a consultative body to ensure that partnership projects and developments or renewal of partnerships respect the regulations on which a consensus exists within the United Nations system.</p> <p><i>[Following the Auditor's report,</i></p>	<p>7.a) The Working Group notes that BSP, BFM, ERI, LA and the Programme Sectors form an internal consultative body and meet regularly, on a case by case basis, to discuss new important strategic partnerships. The Working Group recommends to this internal consultative body to also systematically discuss the evaluation of strategic partnerships before their renewal.</p>	19 GA	No additional costs	BSP/CFS	<p>Done: Evaluations of partnerships with the private sector is now a systematic process, reviewed by BSP, LA and IOS with WHC. BFM and ERi are consulted on a case by case basis.</p>

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility	Implementation status
	<i>this recommendation may also concern other UNESCO Sectors]</i>					
8. Hi.P	<i>Recommendation n°2 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Establish a reporting tool based on the FABS budgetary and financial system which would feed into a database providing the Secretariat (BSP/CFS) reliable information on partnerships.	8.a) The Working Group notes the establishment of the reporting tool which ensures traceability of the funds coming from partnerships and recommends to the World Heritage Centre to utilize this tool to enhance transparency and the quality of reporting to the Committee and States Parties.	Committee in 2014	No additional costs	WHC/AO WHC/CEP/ PACT	Done: WHC/AO updates the reporting tool in a very detailed excel format, on a regular basis, fed by FABS and available to BSP/CFS (8a).
9 M.P	<i>Recommendation n°1 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Proceed with a clearly defined archiving method for documents relating to PACT and ensure the computerized safeguarding of information.	9.a) The Working Group notes the ongoing implementation of this recommendation and recommends to the World Heritage Centre to continue archiving all documents according to the established method.	Ongoing	No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT	Done.

V. Draft Resolution

Draft Resolution: 19 GA 9

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/19.GA/9,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **35 COM 9A** and **36 COM 9A** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively and Resolution **18 GA 8** of the 18th session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Appreciates the work of the open-ended working group on the Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the External Auditor on the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative carried out in 2012 and 2013 and endorses its recommendations;*
4. *Notes the implementation of a number of recommendations as indicated in the updated implementation plan and further notes that the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session decided not to implement requests concerning conflicts of interest related to its Rules of Procedures;*
5. *Urges the World Heritage Committee to continue implementing any pending requests in relation to its mandate;*
6. *Welcomes the efforts to link the follow-up to the Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the External Auditor on the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative with the implementation on the Strategic Action Plan for the World Heritage Convention;*
7. *Also welcomes the harmonization of PACT with UNESCO's partnership strategies;*
8. *Notes the adoption by the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (Phnom Penh, 2013) of the PACT strategy to improve the development of partnerships for World Heritage with the private sector, their implementation and their evaluation through adequate tools and guidelines;*
9. *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 (2013-2014) to be presented to the General Assembly at its 20th session in 2015.*