

Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in Europe

Quantitative Summary – Section I

1-2 December 2014 – Fortress of Suomenlinna

1. Introduction

1.1 - States Parties

- 49 States Parties in EUR, of which 47 submitted questionnaires: 19 Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe (CESEE), 11 Mediterranean Europe (MED), 8 Nordic and Baltic Europe (N-B), 10 Western Europe (WEST).

1.2 - Date of ratification of the WH Convention

- Country specific, N/A for report (42 Agree, 5 Disagree)

1.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of Section I of the Periodic Reporting

	CESEE	MED	N-B	WEST	TOTAL
Governmental institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage	19	11	8	9	47
UNESCO National Commission	15	6	3	5	29
World Heritage property managers/coordinators	16	5	3	3	27
Non Governmental Organizations	5	1	0	2	8
ICOMOS International	2	2	0	0	4
IUCN International	2	0	0	0	2
ICCROM	0	0	0	0	0
ICOMOS national / regional	11	5	1	2	19
IUCN national / regional	2	1	0	0	3
External experts	8	1	2	1	12
Donors	1	0	0	0	1
Others	3	3	1	0	7

1.4 - Primary government authorities responsible for the implementation of the Convention

- Country specific (10 Agree, 37 Disagree)

1.5 - Other key institutions responsible

- Country specific, N/A for report

1.6 - Comments

- Country specific, N/A for report

2. Inventories/lists/registers for cultural and natural heritage

2.1 - Cultural Heritage (Level and Status)

If the State Party has established inventories/lists/registers of cultural heritage, at what level(s) are they compiled and what is their current status?]

2.2 - Natural Heritage (Level and Status)

If the State Party has established inventories/lists/registers of natural heritage, at what level(s) are they compiled and what is their current status?

CULTURAL INVENTORIES	Average National	Average Regional / provincial / state	Average Local	NATURAL INVENTORIES	Average National	Average Regional / provincial / state	Average Local
CESEE	3,68	3,50	2,93	CESEE	3,68	3,62	3,08
MED	3,70	3,40	3,00	MED	3,67	3,80	2,00
N-B	3,88	3,50	3,20	N-B	3,63	3,60	2,80
WEST	3,14	3,88	3,43	WEST	3,67	3,57	3,00
TOTAL	3,64	3,58	3,09	TOTAL	3,67	3,63	2,83

Table above shows average values per sub-regions. Numeric value 0= N/A, 1= No process established, 2= Process commenced, 3= Process well-advanced, 4= Process completed or continually updated. All SPs reporting value=0 or empty on this question have been set to N/A so that these numerical values are not included in the averages ("Other" not included due to very low N). Complete table below:

Quantitative Summary – Section I

CULTURAL INVENTORIES	National	Regional / provincial / state	Local	Other
Central, Eastern Europe and South-Eastern Europe	3,68	3,50	2,93	4,00
Albania	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Armenia	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Azerbaijan	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Belarus	3,00	2,00	1,00	N/A
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4,00	4,00	N/A	N/A
Bulgaria	3,00	3,00	2,00	N/A
Czech Republic	4,00	3,00	N/A	N/A
Georgia	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hungary	4,00	N/A	2,00	N/A
Moldova, Republic of	3,00	3,00	N/A	N/A
Montenegro	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Poland	3,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Romania	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Russian Federation	3,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Serbia	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Slovakia	4,00	N/A	4,00	N/A
Slovenia	4,00	N/A	1,00	N/A
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4,00	4,00	1,00	N/A
Ukraine	4,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Mediterranean Europe	3,70	3,40	3,00	3,00
Andorra	4,00	N/A	2,00	N/A
Cyprus	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greece	4,00	N/A	4,00	3,00
Holy See	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Israel	3,00	2,00	2,00	N/A
Italy	3,00	3,00	2,00	N/A
Malta	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Portugal	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
San Marino	N/A	4,00	N/A	N/A
Spain	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Turkey	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nordic and Baltic Europe	3,88	3,50	3,20	4,00
Denmark	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Estonia	4,00	N/A	N/A	4,00
Finland	4,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Iceland	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Latvia	4,00	N/A	3,00	N/A
Lithuania	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Norway	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sweden	4,00	3,00	2,00	N/A
Western Europe	3,14	3,88	3,43	2,00
Austria	3,00	3,00	2,00	N/A
Belgium	N/A	4,00	N/A	2,00
France	4,00	4,00	N/A	N/A
Germany	1,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Ireland	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Luxembourg	2,00	N/A	3,00	2,00
Netherlands	4,00	4,00	3,00	N/A
Switzerland	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	N/A	4,00	4,00	N/A
Total	3,64	3,58	3,09	3,17

NATURAL INVENTORIES	National	Regional / provincial / state	Local	Other
Central, Eastern Europe and South-Eastern Europe	3,68	3,62	3,08	3,00
Albania	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Armenia	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Azerbaijan	4,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Belarus	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2,00	4,00	2,00	N/A
Bulgaria	4,00	4,00	3,00	N/A
Czech Republic	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Georgia	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hungary	4,00	4,00	3,00	N/A
Moldova, Republic of	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Montenegro	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Poland	4,00	4,00	N/A	N/A
Romania	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
Russian Federation	3,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Serbia	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Slovakia	4,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Slovenia	4,00	N/A	1,00	N/A
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Ukraine	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mediterranean Europe	3,67	3,80	2,00	1,00
Andorra	4,00	N/A	1,00	N/A
Cyprus	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greece	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Holy See	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Israel	4,00	4,00	2,00	N/A
Italy	3,00	3,00	1,00	1,00
Malta	4,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Portugal	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
San Marino	N/A	4,00	N/A	N/A
Spain	4,00	4,00	N/A	N/A
Turkey	2,00	N/A	2,00	N/A
Nordic and Baltic Europe	3,63	3,60	2,80	2,67
Denmark	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
Estonia	4,00	N/A	N/A	4,00
Finland	4,00	4,00	3,00	N/A
Iceland	4,00	3,00	2,00	2,00
Latvia	3,00	N/A	N/A	2,00
Lithuania	3,00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Norway	3,00	3,00	3,00	N/A
Sweden	4,00	4,00	2,00	N/A
Western Europe	3,67	3,57	3,00	3,00
Austria	N/A	2,00	1,00	N/A
Belgium	N/A	3,00	N/A	N/A
France	4,00	4,00	N/A	N/A
Germany	4,00	4,00	N/A	N/A
Ireland	3,00	N/A	4,00	N/A
Luxembourg	3,00	N/A	2,00	3,00
Netherlands	4,00	4,00	3,00	N/A
Switzerland	4,00	4,00	4,00	N/A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	N/A	4,00	4,00	N/A
Total	3,67	3,63	2,83	2,50

2.3 - Are inventories/lists/registers adequate to capture the diversity of cultural and natural heritage in the State Party?

2.3.1	No inventories/lists/registers have been established for cultural and natural heritage.	0
2.3.2	Inventories/lists/registers are inadequate to capture the diversity of cultural and natural heritage.	0
2.3.3	Inventories/lists/registers capture some of the diversity of cultural and natural heritage.	10
2.3.4	Inventories/lists/registers capture the full diversity of cultural and natural heritage.	37

2.4 - Are inventories/lists/registers used to protect the identified cultural heritage?

2.4.1	No inventories/lists/registers have been established for cultural heritage.	0
2.4.2	Inventories/lists/registers are not actively used for the protection of cultural heritage.	0
2.4.3	Inventories/lists/registers are sometimes used for the protection of cultural heritage.	1
2.4.4	Inventories/lists/registers are frequently used for the protection of cultural heritage.	46

2.5 - Are inventories/lists/registers used to protect the identified natural heritage?

2.5.1	No inventories/lists/registers have been established for natural heritage.	1
2.5.2	Inventories/lists/registers are not actively used for the protection of natural heritage.	3
2.5.3	Inventories/lists/registers are sometimes used for the protection of natural heritage.	4
2.5.4	Inventories/lists/registers are frequently used for the protection of natural heritage.	39

2.6 - Are inventories/lists/registers used for the identification of properties for the Tentative List?

2.6.1	No inventories/lists/registers have been established for cultural and natural heritage.	0
2.6.2	Inventories/lists/registers are not actively used for the identification of properties for inclusion on the Tentative List.	8
2.6.3	Inventories/lists/registers are sometimes used for the identification of potential World Heritage Properties.	8
2.6.4	Inventories/lists/registers are frequently used for the identification of potential World Heritage Properties.	31

Quantitative Summary – Section I

Q2.3-Q2.6

Numerical value 4 = refers to “best answer” in the four questions, i.e. “inventories/lists/registers capture the full diversity” and “frequently used”.

Numerical value 3 = refers to “inventories/lists/registers capture some of the diversity” and “sometimes used”.

Numerical value 2 = refers to inadequate inventories/lists/registers and “not actively used”.

Numerical value 1 = refers to “no inventories/lists/registers”

	Average Are inventories/lists/registers adequate to capture the diversity of cultural and natural heritage in the State Party?[radio qid=276 gid=48]	Average Are inventories / lists / registers used to protect the identified cultural heritage?[radio qid=277 gid=48]	Average Are inventories / lists / registers used to protect the identified natural heritage?[radio qid=278 gid=48]	Average Are inventories / lists / registers used for the identification of properties for the Tentative List?[radio qid=279 gid=48]
CESEE	3,74	3,95	3,68	3,84
Albania	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Armenia	3,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Azerbaijan	4,00	4,00	2,00	4,00
Belarus	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Bulgaria	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Czech Republic	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Georgia	3,00	4,00	2,00	4,00
Hungary	3,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Moldova, Republic of	3,00	4,00	4,00	3,00
Montenegro	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
Poland	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Romania	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Russian Federation	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00
Serbia	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Slovakia	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Slovenia	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Ukraine	4,00	4,00	3,00	4,00
MED	3,82	4,00	3,55	3,27
Andorra	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00
Cyprus	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Greece	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Holy See	4,00	4,00	1,00	2,00
Israel	3,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
Italy	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Malta	4,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
Portugal	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
San Marino	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00
Spain	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Turkey	4,00	4,00	3,00	4,00
N-B	3,75	4,00	3,75	2,88
Denmark	3,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
Estonia	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00
Finland	3,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
Iceland	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Latvia	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00
Lithuania	4,00	4,00	2,00	4,00
Norway	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00
Sweden	4,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
WEST	3,89	4,00	4,00	3,56
Austria	3,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Belgium	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
France	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Germany	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Ireland	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Luxembourg	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Netherlands	4,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
Switzerland	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4,00	4,00	4,00	2,00
Total	3,79	3,98	3,72	3,49

2.7 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to inventories/lists/registers of cultural and natural heritage (questions 2.1 to 2.6)


- Country specific

3. Tentative List

3.1 - Potential future nominations (Property name / anticipated year of nomination)

- Country specific


3.2 - Tools used for a preliminary assessment of the potential Outstanding Universal Value



of States Parties having used the different tools.

UNESCO's Global Strategy	ICOMOS thematic studies	Filling the gaps (ICOMOS)/Gaps analysis by IUCN	Regional meetings to harmonize Tentative Lists	IUCN thematic studies	Other global comparative analysis	Others	None used
33	32	26	23	18	13	10	7

3.3 - Level of involvement in the preparation of the Tentative List (n/a filtered out)



Aggregated means, level of involvement all countries. Sub-regional averages in table below, N/A / Missing not included. (Values: 4=Good / 3=Fair / 2=Poor / 1=No involvement / 0=N/A)

	Nation al gov. Inst.(s)	Site manager/ coord.(s)	Consultants / experts	UNESCO NatCom	Reg. /prov/ state/ gov.(s)	NGO(s)	Local auth. within or adjacent to the property	Local gov.(s)	Other gov. dep.s	Local comm./ residents	Indig. peoples	Landowners	Local industries
CESEE	4,00	3,35	3,74	3,53	2,94	2,95	2,78	2,81	2,75	2,06	2,11	2,13	1,86
MED	3,90	2,80	2,80	3,00	2,86	2,22	2,11	2,63	2,71	1,75	2,00	1,38	1,50
N-B	3,63	4,00	3,57	2,33	3,00	3,29	3,83	3,25	3,33	2,71	3,00	3,00	1,00
WEST	4,00	3,86	3,38	3,00	3,86	3,71	3,71	3,00	2,86	3,29	N/A	3,00	2,75
Total	3,91	3,49	3,43	3,15	3,11	2,98	2,95	2,90	2,86	2,33	2,31	2,29	1,77

3.4 - Was the authority(ies) listed in question 1.4 responsible for the approval and submission of the Tentative List?

- 36 YES
- 11 NO

3.5 - If not, what authority(ies) is responsible for the approval and submission of the Tentative List?

- Country specific, N/A for report

3.6 - Do you intend to update your Tentative List within the next six years?

- 38 YES
- 9 NO (Albania, Greece, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, San Marino, Sweden, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

3.7 - Comments


- Country specific

4. Nominations

4.1 - Property

- Country specific (22 Agree, 25 Disagree)


4.2 - Involvement in recent nominations (n/a filtered out)



Aggregated means, level of involvement all countries. Sub-regional averages in table below. N/A / Missing not included. (Values: 4=Good / 3=Fair / 2=Poor / 1=No involvement / 0=N/A)

	Nation al gov. Inst.(s)	Site manager/ coord.(s)	Consultants / experts	Reg. /prov./ state/ gov.(s)	Local auth. within or adjacent to the property	Local gov.(s)	Other gov. dep.s	Local comm./ residents	NGO(s)	UNESCO NatCom	Landowners	Local industries	Indig. peoples
CESEE	3,89	3,76	3,68	3,38	3,11	3,18	3,13	2,61	2,74	3,18	2,41	1,88	2,00
MED	4,00	3,57	3,78	3,14	3,33	3,33	3,40	2,44	2,44	2,63	2,44	1,71	1,50
N-B	3,63	3,83	3,88	3,40	3,67	3,50	3,50	3,43	3,33	2,14	3,43	2,17	4,00
WEST	4,00	3,88	3,83	4,00	3,71	3,43	3,20	3,13	3,00	2,57	3,00	3,00	N/A
Total	3,89	3,76	3,76	3,46	3,35	3,32	3,27	2,81	2,80	2,77	2,71	2,11	2,08

4.3 - Perceived benefits of inscribing properties on the World Heritage List (n/a filtered out)



Aggregated means, perceived benefits of inscription on WH list. Sub-regional averages in table below. N/A / Missing not included. (Values: 4=High benefit / 3=Some benefit / 2=Limited benefit / 1=Low benefit / 0=N/A)

	Enhanced honour / prestige	Increased recognition for tourism and public use	Strengthened protection of sites (legislative, regulatory, inst. and / or trad.)	Improved presentation of sites	Others	Catalyst for wider community appreciation of heritage	Enhanced conservation practices	Stimulus for enhanced partnerships	Additional tool for lobbying / political influence	Increased funding	Stimulus for economic development in surrounding communities
CESEE	3.79	3.53	3.63	3.47	N/A	3.26	3.47	3.42	3.00	3.16	2.95
MED	3.70	3.60	3.27	3.20	3.00	3.10	3.11	2.44	2.63	2.33	2.11
N-B	3.88	3.63	3.25	3.38	4.00	3.38	2.88	2.75	3.00	2.38	2.88
WEST	3.67	3.11	3.38	3.56	3.33	3.33	3.11	2.89	2.89	2.67	2.11
Total	3,76	3,48	3,43	3,41	3,40	3,26	3,22	3,00	2,91	2,76	2,60

4.4 - Comments

- Country specific

5. General Policy Development

5.1 - Legislation

- Country specific (6 Agree, 41 Disagree)


5.2 - Legislation not listed in 5.1

- Country specific, N/A for report

5.3 - Comment


- Country specific

5.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulations) adequate for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage?



Percentage of States Parties within sub-region reporting the legal framework is adequate/inadequate.

5.5 - Can the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulations) for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage be enforced?



Percentage of States Parties within sub-region reporting degree of capacity for enforcement of legal framework.

Quantitative Summary – Section I

(Q5.4: NUMERIC VALUE=3 ADEQUATE, 2=INADEQUATE)

(Q5.5: NUMERIC VALUE 4=EXCELLENT CAPACITY, 3=COULD BE STRENGTHENED)

	Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulations) adequate for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage?[radio qid=294 gid=51]	Can the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulations) for the identification, conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and natural heritage be enforced?[radio qid=295 gid=51]
Central, Eastern Europe and South-Eastern Europe	2,84	3,16
Albania	2,00	3,00
Armenia	3,00	3,00
Azerbaijan	3,00	3,00
Belarus	3,00	3,00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3,00	3,00
Bulgaria	3,00	3,00
Czech Republic	3,00	4,00
Georgia	3,00	3,00
Hungary	3,00	3,00
Moldova, Republic of	2,00	4,00
Montenegro	3,00	3,00
Poland	2,00	3,00
Romania	3,00	4,00
Russian Federation	3,00	3,00
Serbia	3,00	3,00
Slovakia	3,00	3,00
Slovenia	3,00	3,00
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3,00	3,00
Ukraine	3,00	3,00
Mediterranean Europe	3,00	3,36
Andorra	3,00	3,00
Cyprus	3,00	3,00
Greece	3,00	3,00
Holy See	3,00	3,00
Israel	3,00	3,00
Italy	3,00	4,00
Malta	3,00	3,00
Portugal	3,00	4,00
San Marino	3,00	4,00
Spain	3,00	4,00
Turkey	3,00	3,00
Nordic and Baltic Europe	3,00	3,13
Denmark	3,00	4,00
Estonia	3,00	3,00
Finland	3,00	3,00
Iceland	3,00	3,00
Latvia	3,00	3,00
Lithuania	3,00	3,00
Norway	3,00	3,00
Sweden	3,00	3,00
Western Europe	2,78	3,56
Austria	2,00	3,00
Belgium	3,00	3,00
France	3,00	4,00
Germany	3,00	4,00
Ireland	3,00	3,00
Luxembourg	2,00	3,00
Netherlands	3,00	4,00
Switzerland	3,00	4,00
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	3,00	4,00
Total	2,89	3,28

5.6 - Other International conventions adhered

Comment

- Country specific (1 Validate 46 Update)

5.7 - Implementation of International Conventions into national policies

Level of coordination and integration.

	Adequate	Limited	No coordination/Integration
CESEE	10	9	0
MED	9	2	0
N-B	6	2	0
WEST	8	1	0
TOTAL	33	14	0

5.8 - States party's policies to give heritage a function in the life of communities

Policies to give heritage a function in the life of communities

	Effective	Some def. In impl.	Ad hoc	No policies
CESEE	3	12	4	0
MED	2	5	3	1
N-B	1	4	3	0
WEST	6	3	0	0
TOTAL	12	24	10	1

5.9 - Integration of heritage into comprehensive /larger scale planning programmes

Policies to integrate heritage into comprehensive/larger scale planning

	Effective	Some def. In impl.	Ad hoc	No policies
CESEE	3	13	2	1
MED	2	5	4	0
N-B	1	6	1	0
WEST	6	2	1	0
TOTAL	12	26	8	1

(Q5.7: NUMERIC VALUE=3 ADEQUATE, 2=LIMITED COORDINATION/INTEGRATION, 1=NO COORD./INTEGRATION)

(Q5.8/5.9: NUMERIC VALUE 4=EFFECTIVE, 3=SOME DEFICIENCIES, 2=AD HOC, 1=NO SPECIFIC POLICIES)

	Is the implementation of these international conventions coordinated and integrated into the development of national policies for the conservation, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage?[radio qid=297 gid=51]	How effectively do the State Party's policies give cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of communities?[radio qid=299 gid=51]	How effectively do the State Party's policies integrate the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage into comprehensive/larger scale planning programmes?[radio qid=300 gid=51]
Central, Eastern Europe and South-Eastern Europe	2,53	2,95	2,95
Albania	3	3	3
Armenia	3	4	4
Azerbaijan	3	2	1
Belarus	3	3	3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	4	4
Bulgaria	3	3	3
Czech Republic	2	3	3
Georgia	2	2	2
Hungary	2	3	3
Moldova, Republic of	2	3	3
Montenegro	2	3	3
Poland	2	3	3
Romania	3	4	3
Russian Federation	2	2	2
Serbia	2	2	4
Slovakia	3	3	3
Slovenia	3	3	3
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3	3	3
Ukraine	2	3	3
Mediterranean Europe	2,82	2,73	2,82
Andorra	2	2	2
Cyprus	3	4	3
Greece	3	3	4
Holy See	3	1	2
Israel	3	3	3
Italy	3	2	3
Malta	3	3	3
Portugal	3	3	3
San Marino	3	4	4
Spain	3	2	2
Turkey	2	3	2
Nordic and Baltic Europe	2,75	2,75	3,00
Denmark	3	2	4
Estonia	2	2	3
Finland	2	3	3
Iceland	3	2	2
Latvia	3	3	3
Lithuania	3	3	3
Norway	3	4	3
Sweden	3	3	3
Western Europe	2,89	3,67	3,56
Austria	2	3	2
Belgium	3	4	3
France	3	4	4
Germany	3	4	4
Ireland	3	4	4
Luxembourg	3	3	3
Netherlands	3	3	4
Switzerland	3	4	4
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	3	4	4
Total	2,70	3,00	3,04

5.10 - Comments


- Country specific

6. Status of Services for Protection, Conservation and Presentation


6.1 - To what degree do the principal agencies/institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of this heritage?

6.2 - To what degree do other government agencies cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of natural and cultural heritage?

6.3 - To what degree do different levels of government cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage?



6.4 - Are the services provided by the agencies/institutions adequate for the conservation, protection and presentation of World Heritage properties in your country?



Quantitative Summary – Section I

(Q6.1-6.3: NUMERIC VALUE=4 EXCELLENT, 3=COOPERATION BUT DEFICIENCIES, 2=LIMITED COOPERATION)
(Q6.4: NUMERIC VALUE 4=EXCELLENT, 3=ADEQUATE, 2=SOME CAPACITY BUT SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCIES)

	To what degree do the principal agencies / institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of this heritage?	To what degree do other government agencies (e.g. responsible for tourism, defence, public works, fishery, etc.) cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of natural and cultural heritage?	To what degree do different levels of government cooperate in the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage?	Are the services provided by the agencies / institutions adequate for the conservation, protection and presentation of World Heritage properties in your country?
Central, Eastern Europe and South-Eastern Europe	3,32	3,05	3,05	2,79
Albania	3	3	3	3
Armenia	4	4	4	3
Azerbaijan	3	3	2	3
Belarus	3	3	3	3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	3	4	3
Bulgaria	4	4	4	3
Czech Republic	3	2	2	3
Georgia	3	3	3	3
Hungary	3	3	3	2
Moldova, Republic of	3	2	2	2
Montenegro	3	3	2	2
Poland	3	3	3	2
Romania	4	4	4	3
Russian Federation	3	3	3	3
Serbia	4	3	3	3
Slovakia	4	3	3	3
Slovenia	4	4	3	3
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3	2	3	3
Ukraine	3	3	4	3
Mediterranean Europe	3,36	2,91	3,18	3,00
Andorra	3	2	2	2
Cyprus	4	4	4	3
Greece	3	3	3	4
Holy See	3	3	4	4
Israel	3	3	2	2
Italy	3	3	3	3
Malta	4	2	3	3
Portugal	3	3	3	4
San Marino	4	4	4	3
Spain	4	3	4	3
Turkey	3	2	3	2
Nordic and Baltic Europe	3,38	3,13	3,13	3,00
Denmark	4	4	3	4
Estonia	4	3	3	3
Finland	3	3	3	3
Iceland	3	3	3	3
Latvia	3	3	3	3
Lithuania	3	3	3	2
Norway	4	3	4	3
Sweden	3	3	3	3
Western Europe	3,33	3,22	3,56	3,33
Austria	3	3	3	3
Belgium	2	2	2	3
France	4	4	4	4
Germany	4	3	4	4
Ireland	4	4	4	4
Luxembourg	3	3	3	3
Netherlands	4	3	4	3
Switzerland	3	3	4	3
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	3	4	4	3
Total	3,34	3,06	3,19	2,98

6.5 - Comments

- Country specific

7. Scientific and Technical Studies and Research

7.1 - Is there a research programme or project specifically for the benefit of World Heritage properties?

- Research specifically addressing WH

	No research	Some research	Comprehensive research
CESEE	1	17	1
MED	6	4	1
N-B	3	5	
WEST	1	7	1
TOTAL	11	33	3

7.2 - Research projects


- Country specific, N/A for report

7.3 - Comments

- Country specific

8. Financial Status and Human Resources

8.1 - Sources of funding



- Relative importance of funding sources in sub-regions, ranked order (EUR). N/A / Missing not included.


8.2 - Involvement of State Party in the establishment of foundations or associations for raising funds and donation for the protection of World Heritage

	YES	NO
CESEE	8	11
MED	3	8
N-B	3	5
WEST	3	6
TOTAL	17	30

8.3 - National policies for the allocation of site revenues for conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage

	YES	NO
CESEE	13	6
MED	6	5
N-B	4	4
WEST	3	6
TOTAL	26	21


8.4 - Is the current budget sufficient to conserve, protect and present cultural and natural heritage effectively at the national level?



- Average reported budget levels per sub-region

	Inadequate	Could be improved	Acceptable	Sufficient, but inadequate to meet intern. standards
CESEE	4	11	2	2
MED	1	3	4	3
N-B	2	4	2	0
WEST	0	3	2	4
TOTAL	7	21	10	9

8.5 - Are available human resources adequate to conserve, protect and present cultural and natural heritage effectively at the national level?



- Average reported HR levels per sub-region. N/A / Missing not included.

	Inadequate	Below optimum	Adequate	Adequate, unable to meet int. best practice
CESEE	2	6	2	9
MED	1	3	3	4
N-B	5	3	3	5
WEST	3	16	10	18
TOTAL	3	16	10	18

8.6 - Comments


- Country specific

9. Training

9.1 - Formal training / educational institutions / programs

- Country specific

9.2 - Training needs



Relative priority for training needs for conservation, protection and presentation of cultural and natural heritage, ranked order (EUR). N/A / Missing not included.

9.3 - Does the State Party have a national training/ educational strategy to strengthen capacity development in the field of heritage conservation, protection and presentation?

	No strategy	Ad hoc	Deficiencies in implementation	Effectively implemented
CESEE	1	11	6	1
MED		6	1	4
N-B	1	4	2	1
WEST	1	5	2	1
TOTAL	3	26	11	7


9.4 - Comments

- Country specific

10. International Cooperation

10.1 - Cooperation with other States Parties

Number of countries reporting different types of international cooperation:



10.2 - Twinned World Heritage properties with others


	YES	NO
CESEE	8	11
MED	5	6
N-B	5	3
WEST	4	5
TOTAL	22	25

10.3 - Comments

- Country specific

11. Education, Information and Awareness Building

11.1. Media used for World Heritage sites promotion



- Additive index of promotion/media use – i.e. as a measure of activity level, the y-axis shows number of occurrences registered for the different activities in Q11.1.1-11.1.8

11.1.9 - Comments


- Country specific

11.2. Education, Information and Awareness Building

11.2.1 - Strategy to raise awareness among different stakeholders

	No strategy	Ad hoc	Deficiencies in implementation	Effectively implemented
CESEE	1	11	6	1
MED	1	5	3	2
N-B	1	5	1	1
WEST		3	4	2
TOTAL	3	24	14	6

11.2.2 - Level of general awareness




- Aggregated means, level of general awareness, ranked order (EUR). N/A / Missing not included.

11.2.3 - Does the State Party participate in UNESCO's *World Heritage in Young Hands* programme?

	Does not participate	Intends to participate	Participates	Participates, integrated in curricula
CESEE	5	3	10	1
MED	5	2	3	1
N-B	4		3	1
WEST	5	1	3	
TOTAL	19	6	19	3

11.2.4 - Level of frequency of activities



- Level of activity among SPs participating in the programme, ranked order (EUR). N/A / Missing not included.

11.2.5 - Comments

- Country specific

12. Conclusions and Recommended Actions

AUTOGENERATED SUMMARY TABLES

13. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise


13.1 - Was the questionnaire easy to use and clear to understand?

	YES	NO
CESEE	17	2
MED	11	
N-B	3	5
WEST	6	3
TOTAL	37	10

13.2 - Please provide suggestions for improvement:

- Country specific


13.3 - Please rate the level of support from the following entities for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire



13.4 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

	Not all info accessible	Most info accessible	All required info accessible
CESEE	3	12	4
MED		7	4
N-B	1	4	3
WEST		6	3
TOTAL	4	29	14

13.5 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from the previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities



N/A / Missing not included.

13.6 - Comments

Country specific