



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

39 COM

WHC-15/39.COM/10B

Paris, 15 May 2015

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-ninth session

**Bonn, Germany
28 June – 8 July 2015**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Periodic Reports

10B: Follow-up of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the other regions and general reflection on Periodic Reporting

SUMMARY

This document contains **two parts**. **Part one** presents a summary of the follow-up activities of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Asia and the Pacific (Section I), Africa (Section II), the Arab States (Section III) and Latin America and the Caribbean (Section IV). **Part two** presents a general reflection on Periodic Reporting following the end of the second cycle with the adoption, at the 39th session of the Committee, of the Periodic report of the Europe region (see document WHC-15/39.COM/10A).

Draft Decisions:

Part I : **39 COM 10B.1** see Section I;
 39 COM 10B.2 see Section II;
 39 COM 10B.3 see Section III;
 39 COM 10B.4 see Section IV.

Part II: **39 COM 10B.5**

PART. I FOLLOW-UP OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR THE OTHER REGIONS

I. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

A. Follow-up activities

1. As an ongoing follow-up to the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise in Asia and the Pacific and in application of Decision **38 COM 10B.1**, seven additional Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for cultural and natural properties in the region, for which the review process has been finalized, will be presented for adoption by the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee (see document WHC-15/39.COM/8E).
2. The World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for Asia and the Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP), in consultation with other capacity-building providers and States Parties in the region, concluded in 2014 the Capacity-Building Strategy and Associated Programmes for Asia and the Pacific (CBSAP-AP), which was endorsed by the Committee. It builds on the results of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the region, in particular the Suwon Action Plan for Asia and the Pacific World Heritage Action Plan. The outcome document is accessible at: <http://www.whitr-ap.org/index.php?classid=1489&newsid=2271&t=show>. To implement this capacity-building strategy, WHITR-AP organized an International Training Course on Heritage Impact Assessment for Cultural Heritage sites at Dujiangyan City, Sichuan Province of China, in October 2014. This activity gathered 25 participants from ten countries, as well as experts from ICCROM and ICOMOS, to study the application methods of heritage impact assessment through group discussions, field visits and case studies. WHITR-AP also organized the International Symposium on the UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) at Tongji University, in Shanghai from 9 to 10 December, 2014. The symposium brought together 100 participants, including representatives from the implementing agencies and partners, international institutions and interested professionals from China and six other countries. The symposium established an International Scientific Committee for the Historic Urban Landscape programme in China.
3. As a follow-up to the Pacific World Heritage Action Plan (2010 to 2015), a workshop for preparing the World Heritage nomination of the Ancient Capitals of the Kingdom of Tonga was held in Tonga from 5 to 9 October 2014. The workshop was jointly organized by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Tonga National Commission for UNESCO with the assistance from the Lapaha Town Council and support from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. The workshop developed a draft Action Plan for management of one of the property's two archaeological sites, the Ancient Royal Tombs of Lapaha in the village of Mu'a. Two World Heritage workshops for non-States Parties to the World Heritage Convention were held with the support of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust, in January 2015 for Nauru and in March 2015 for Tuvalu. The workshops aimed mainly to raise awareness; to encourage dialogue among government staff, heritage professionals, NGOs and local communities; to encourage community participation in all stages of the World Heritage process; to support the identification and protection of the countries' outstanding cultural and natural heritage; and to facilitate the ratification process of the World Heritage Convention. Both workshops resulted in follow-up documents: the Draft Strategy for World Heritage in Nauru and the Action Plan for World Heritage in Tuvalu.

4. To further enhance regional co-operation, the International Centre on Space Technologies for Natural and Cultural Heritage (HIST), China – a category 2 centre hosted by the Centre of Earth Observation and Digital Earth (CEODE) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and affiliated with the Natural Sciences Sector of UNESCO, but also related to World Heritage – has initiated cooperation with World Heritage properties such as Angkor (Cambodia) and East Rennell (Solomon Islands). The WHITR-AP and HIST have jointly formulated a project, supported by the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust, to help the Solomon Islands address the threats, as well as set up measures in order to ensure the long-term safeguarding of the World Heritage property which has been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 2013. This partnership aims to collect up-to-date satellite images to clearly establish the current state of conservation of the forest areas, inside as well as outside the World Heritage property, and help authorities develop a set of corrective measures and a proposal for the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.
5. The serial transnational World Heritage nomination process of the Silk Roads, initiated by five Central Asian countries and China, as part of the follow-up to the Periodic Reporting exercise, continues to be implemented. The Silk Roads nomination process now includes 12 countries, all members of the International Coordinating Committee, and has leveraged significant international funding. In line with the 2011 ICOMOS Silk Roads Thematic Study, the UNESCO/Japanese Funds-in-Trust and Chinese authorities have supported the development of two Silk Roads nomination dossiers in China and the Central Asian countries, with the assistance of ICOMOS, the International Institute for Central Asian Studies (IICAS) and the ICOMOS International Conservation Centre in Xi'an (IICC-Xi'an). Although not formally part of the Upstream processes, the project's combination of capacity-building efforts and sub-regional cooperation provides a good example for potential future developments of similar undertakings. While the project has raised new management concerns, it nonetheless represents an innovative approach for nominating complex heritage routes. The process culminated in two serial transnational nominations, both submitted in January 2013. One of them, entitled "*Silk Roads: The Routes Network of Chang'an-Tian-shan Corridor*", submitted by China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, was inscribed on the World Heritage List at the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (Doha, 2014).
6. The Silk Roads nomination process in South Asia has also been initiated following the same approach. A sub-regional workshop on the Nomination Strategy and Guidance for the South Asian Silk Roads was held from 23 to 25 September 2014 in Kathmandu, Nepal, with financial support from the Korean Funds-in-Trust at the World Heritage Centre. 60 participants from four South Asian countries (Bhutan, China, India and Nepal) as well as an international expert and UNESCO representatives attended the meeting. As a result, two documents – the 'South Asian Silk Roads: Draft Serial Transnational World Heritage Nomination Strategy' and the associated Draft Action Plan were adopted. Meanwhile, a National Inventory and Silk Roads Workshop was organized in Thimphu, Bhutan, from 20 to 22 August 2014. Ten national heritage officials of the Department of Culture, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs of Bhutan, were trained to develop a national inventory system for the protection of cultural heritage and to underpin the selection and management of monuments, sites and landscapes as part of the World Heritage nomination process. Also a working team, the Nepali National Coordination Committee for the Silk Roads, was established to oversee the national Silk Roads activities. Several national consultation meetings were organized in Nepal between late 2014 and early 2015. Among the results, provisions for the legal protection of cultural heritage sites along the heritage corridors are being considered in the next amendment of the existing national heritage legislation, the Ancient Monument Preservation Act 2013 (1956).

7. Regarding the presentation of the Silk Roads to the public, the Enhancing Silk Road Interpretation and Quality Guides Training initiative, part of the overall project Developing a Common Tourism Strategy for the Silk Roads Heritage Corridors in Central Asia and China, aims to train and provide heritage guides with specialized input and know-how on site interpretation and presentation linked to the Silk Road heritage corridors, World Heritage and sustainable tourism. Focused on the five countries cooperating with the UNESCO/UNWTO Silk Road Heritage Corridors Tourism Strategy (China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), it also aims to provide overall guidance on heritage conservation issues to all actors involved in encouraging Silk Road tourism. Upon successful completion of the training course, the participants representing the five countries will be certified international tourist guides, contributing to achieve the goals stipulated in the UNESCO/UNWTO Silk Roads Heritage Corridors Tourism Project. The training course will be jointly organized by UNESCO, UNWTO and the World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations (WFTGA) in the third quarter of 2015.
8. In addition, an Expert Meeting on the Serial World Heritage Nomination of the Rock Art in Central Asia was held from 22 to 23 January 2015 in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. The meeting brought together experts from five Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan), as well as Mongolia and the Russian Federation to discuss the preparation process of the Rock Art in Central Asia for World Heritage listing. The meeting resulted in the drafting and agreement among participants of a project proposal and work plan.

B. Draft Decision 39 COM 10B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/10B,
2. Recalling Decisions **36 COM 10A**, **37 COM 10C.1** and **38 COM 10B.1** adopted at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012), 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 38th session (Doha, 2014) respectively;
3. Welcomes the progress made in the follow-up of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Asia and the Pacific region;
4. Thanks the governments of Japan, Korea and the Netherlands for their contributions to supporting World Heritage follow-up activities on the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Asia and the Pacific region;
5. Also thanks the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITR-AP), a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO, for its contribution to the implementation of activities concluded in the Capacity-Building Strategy and Associated Programmes for Asia and the Pacific (CBSAP-AP) for the follow-up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting; and the International Centre on Space Technologies for Natural and Cultural Heritage (HIST, China) for its initiative in promoting regional cooperation on World Heritage in Asia and the Pacific;
6. Takes note of the progress made on the Silk Roads nomination process, initiated by the Asian States Parties in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre, that includes fruitful cooperation between national institutions from various Asian States Parties resulting in an example of best practice for other serial transnational nominations, and developing a tool for international cooperation, shared approaches, better management and conservation practice, as well as sustainable tourism management of the Silk Road heritage corridors;

7. *Reiterates its invitation to Asia and the Pacific States Parties to actively implement the respective sub-Regional Action Plans and also encourages them to intensify their contributions to the implementation of follow-up activities while working closely with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
8. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to present a progress report on the follow-up activities to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting at its 40th session in 2016.*

II. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR AFRICA

A. Follow-up activities

1. Following the Committee's endorsement of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Africa Region and the regional Action Plan (Saint Petersburg, 2012), activities to implement Decision **36 COM 10A** have continued to be organized in cooperation with States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO Field Offices, the Advisory Bodies and the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) - a UNESCO category 2 centre. An update on the status of implementation of the Action Plan 2012 – 2017 for the Africa Region can be found at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/africa/>.
2. Within the framework of the Action Plan 2012 – 2017 for the Africa Region and its regional capacity-building programmes and in addition to detailed activities listed in the updated Action Plan as well as in Document WHC-15/39.COM/5A, activities undertaken since mid-2014 include:
 - a) In the framework of the three-year Implementation Programme of Second Periodic Report in Africa for cultural heritage financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the AWHF and UNESCO:
 - i) Two nomination training workshops organized in Botswana and Burkina Faso (26 participants coming from ten sites registered on the Tentative Lists of Eritrea, Botswana, Madagascar, Ghana, Malawi, Zambia, Niger, Chad and Guinea Bissau);
 - ii) Two entrepreneurship/business planning workshops organized in Ghana and Senegal and one field workshop carried out in Zambia (68 participants from 17 sites);
 - iii) Two disaster risk preparedness workshops in Mozambique and Cape Verde for sites managers and community representatives from Lusophone African countries (27 participants from seven sites);
 - iv) One workshop on Traditional Management Systems organized in Harare, Zimbabwe during which case studies were undertaken on documenting traditional management systems in five sub-regions of Africa (25 participants); the publication of the results is currently underway by the AWHF;
 - v) The seminar Experiences of World Heritage in Africa was organized by AWHF and UNESCO from 14 to 16 October in Morocco;
 - vi) The AWHF also organized a seminar on the Nara Document on Authenticity – From Himeji (Japan) to Robben Island (South Africa) – the Future of the Nara Document in Africa. Celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Nara Document (on authenticity) and Democracy – in South Africa from 8 to 9 July 2014 in South Africa.

- vii) A national buffer zone workshop was organized by the AWHF in South Africa (27 participants from the eight World Heritage sites of South Africa).
- b) In the framework of the Africa Nature Programme financed by the Governments of Flanders (Belgium), Spain, the Netherlands and the MAVA Foundation, implemented in close cooperation with IUCN and AWHF:
 - i) A series of practical training and field workshops were carried out from January to May 2015 in the framework of the project Testing the How-to Guides in the Destination Management Field in four Africa Nature sites, in partnership with the AWHF, the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Field offices in Zimbabwe and Tanzania. The project is funded by the Government of Flanders;
 - ii) Three workshops were organized between November 2014 to May 2015 in three African World Heritage sites on how to improve the involvement of local communities in the conservation of natural World Heritage;
 - iii) A workspace and knowledge-sharing web platform dedicated to the Africa Nature Programme was hosted by the World Heritage Centre within UNESTEAMS: <http://teams.unesco.org/>. This platform is intended to ensure a lively forum for conservation stakeholders and site managers.
 - iv) The publication of World Heritage Paper Series N°40: *Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage*.

B. Draft Decision 39 COM 10B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/10B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 10A**, Decision **37 COM 10C.2** and Decision **38 COM 10B.2** adopted at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012), 37th session (Phnom-Penh, 2013) and 38th session (Doha, 2014) respectively;
3. Welcomes the progress made in the follow-up of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Africa Region, while expressing its concerns regarding the weak implementation rate of the regional Action Plan by African States Parties;
4. Notes with appreciation the financial contribution of the Governments of Norway, Flanders (Belgium), Spain, South Africa and the Netherlands, IUCN, the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme, the MAVA Foundation, the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) as well as the host countries of all capacity-building workshops to activities carried out in the framework of the implementation of the Action Plan for the Africa Region and its regional capacity-building programme;
5. Calls upon States Parties to financially and technically support the implementation of the Regional Action Plan for the Africa Region through follow-up activities with the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the African World Heritage Fund;
6. Commends the States Parties of the Africa Region who have been actively implementing the Action Plan; and requests States Parties, who have not already done so, to establish their National World Heritage Committees and to develop their National Action Plans and Budgets, as well as to inform the World Heritage Centre when they are operational;

7. *Further reminds States Parties which have not already done so to submit their Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value by **1 February 2016** at the latest, as well as clarifications of boundaries by **1 December 2015** at the latest;*
8. *Also requests the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, and with the support of States Parties, to continue its efforts to coordinate and implement the Regional Capacity-Building Programme according to the Action Plan 2012 – 2017;*
9. *Further requests the States Parties, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to pay special attention to the management of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
10. *Furthermore requests the World Heritage Centre to present a progress report on the implementation of the Action Plan for the Africa Region at its 40th session in 2016.*

III. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR ARAB STATES

A. Follow-up activities

1. The second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States was presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The Regional Programme prepared by the Arab States was approved the following year by the Committee, during its 35th session (Paris, 2011). Since then, the activities developed in the framework of the Programme have been carried out with the support of the World Heritage Centre, the national bodies for World Heritage, the Advisory Bodies and the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH).
2. Since the launch of the second cycle of Period Reporting in the Arab States in 2008, several designated focal points have kept their role; consequently they have acquired a valuable experience in regard to the mechanisms of implementation of the *Convention*. On the other hand, other States Parties have frequently changed their focal points or no longer have any.
3. Capacity-building and technical support to States Parties constitute the priorities of the Regional Programme. In this regard, training workshops have been held on topics such as the development of the Tentative Lists (Oman, Qatar), the reporting mechanisms to the World Heritage Committee (Palestine), the emergency measures for the protection of built heritage (Syria), the damage assessment and field surveys (Cairo, Egypt) and the comparative analysis mechanism (regional workshop, Bahrain). Technical workshops concerning the nomination of the following sites to the World Heritage List have also been organized: Abraj Al Kuwait (Kuwait), Al Salt (Jordan), Casablanca (Morocco) and Qalhat (Oman). In addition, advisory missions to the following cities have been carried out: the Historic Cairo (Egypt), Carthage (Tunisia) and Petra (Jordan).
4. Within the field of cultural and natural heritage conservation, several activities have been implemented. Technical studies on threats and emergency consolidation measures for the Siq in Petra (Jordan) have been coordinated by the UNESCO office in Amman (Jordan), while the UNESCO office in Baghdad (Iraq) has carried out technical studies and works of restoration at Erbil (Iraq). Finally, in Egypt, an important urban rehabilitation project of the Historic Cairo has been led by the World Heritage Centre.

5. In the framework of the emergency safeguarding project of the Syrian heritage, monitoring, evaluation and risk reduction activities were implemented, with particular emphasis on sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and those included in the Tentative List.
6. The Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH), established as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO, provides sustained financial support to the above-mentioned activities. While the ARC-WH focuses on natural heritage, it also intends to provide additional support for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, the ARC-WH is concerned by threats to World Heritage in conflict areas and supports States Parties in the preparation of nomination files (Les Marais, Iraq) and tentative lists (Saudi Arabia).
7. The World Heritage Cities Programme continues to support the Regional Programme of the Arab States in the field of urban conservation, particularly to safeguard the modern urban and architectural heritage of the Arab world. These actions are spearheaded by the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL). A conference on the Recommendation will be held in December 2015, in Kuwait. It will focus on the means to strengthen the training of architects and planners of the Arab world. This initiative is supported by a draft Charter for the conservation of urban heritage in the Arab world, led by the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO)

B. Draft Decision 39 COM 10B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined document WHC-15/39.COM/10B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 10C.3** adopted at its 35th session (Paris, UNESCO, 2011),
3. Acknowledges the progress accomplished in the follow-up of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States and encourages them to continue their efforts in the implementation of recommendations;
4. Notes with concern the decrease in the number of focal points and strongly encourages States Parties concerned to designate one focal point for cultural heritage and another one for natural heritage;
5. Further encourages States Parties to follow the recommendation of the Chairperson of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee (Paris, UNESCO, 2011), contained in her letter addressed to all the Arab countries on the establishment of national entities for World Heritage;
6. Also encourages States Parties to continue the implementation of the Recommendation regarding the Historic Urban Landscape in order to enhance the conservation of urban heritage sites inscribed on the World Heritage List;
7. Notes with satisfaction the commitment and important financial contribution of the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH), based in Bahrain, and invites Arab States to strengthen their cooperation with the ARC-WH;

8. *Further reminds States Parties which have not already done so to submit their Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value by 1 February 2016 at the latest, as well as clarifications of boundaries by 1 December 2015 at the latest.*

IV. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

A. Follow-up activities

1. As a follow-up to the approval by the World Heritage Committee of the Action Plan for World Heritage in the Latin America and the Caribbean region at its 38th session (Doha, 2014) (Decision **38 COM 10B.4**), the World Heritage Centre, in close cooperation with States Parties, the Advisory Bodies as well as relevant category 2 centres, organized two meetings to develop action plans with a focus on the specific needs of each sub-region.
2. The sub-regional meeting on the Caribbean Action Plan for World Heritage (2015-2019) took place in La Havana (Cuba) from 26 to 28 November 2014. Jointly organized by the WHC and the UNESCO Offices in La Havana (Cuba) and Kingston (Jamaica), and in cooperation with the UNESCO Office in Port au Prince (Haiti), with the financial support of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust, this meeting allowed the adoption of the sub-regional Action Plan for the Caribbean. The second phase of the Caribbean Capacity-Building Programme (CCBP) was discussed during the meeting and a work-plan approved for the following years.
3. The sub-regional meeting for the elaboration of the World Heritage Action Plan for South America (2015-2020) was held from 5 to 7 May 2015 in Cuzco (Peru). This meeting was made possible thanks to the financial support of the Government of Peru and was jointly organized by the WHC, the Ministry of Culture of Peru and with the support of the UNESCO Office in Lima. At the end of the meeting, the participants adopted the sub-regional Action Plan for South America.
4. Category 2 centres of the region have made significant progress in the process of reinforcing their institutional frameworks. The States Parties of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mozambique, Peru and Uruguay formally expressed their willingness to participate in the activities of the Regional Heritage Management Training Centre Lucio Costa, a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO, located in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil).
5. The States Parties of Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama expressed their willingness to participate in the activities of the Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas, a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO in Zacatecas (Mexico). It is expected that the category 2 centre in the region plays an important role in developing capacity-building activities at the national and regional level, in support to the activities foreseen in the regional and sub-regional Plans.
6. In compliance with Decision **38 COM 10B.4**, a progress report on the regional Action Plan and sub-regional Action Plans will be presented at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2016.

B. Draft Decision 39 COM 10B.4

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined document WHC-15/39.COM/10B,*

2. Recalling Decision **38 COM 10B.4** adopted at the 38th session (Doha, 2014);
3. Takes note of the progress accomplished in the follow-up activities of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting for Latin America and the Caribbean and encourages the States Parties of the region to continue their efforts in the implementation of its recommendations;
4. Notes with appreciation the elaboration of the two sub-regional Action Plans for the Caribbean and for South America;
5. Further notes with appreciation the support of the Government of Peru for the organization of the sub-regional meeting for the elaboration of the World Heritage Action Plan for South America (Cuzco, 5 to 7 May 2015);
6. Encourages Central American States Parties to work in close coordination with the World Heritage Centre to organize a meeting for the establishment of a sub-regional Action Plan with the participation of all stakeholders;
7. Encourages Mexico and Brazil to continue their efforts in view to consolidate the establishment of the UNESCO category 2 centres for World Heritage in Zacatecas (Mexico) and in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil);
8. Reminds States Parties which have not already done so to submit their Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value by **1 February 2016** at the latest, as well as clarifications of boundaries by **1 December 2015** at the latest;
9. Takes note that, in conformity with Decision **38 COM 10B.4**, the World Heritage Centre will provide a report on the progress made in the implementation of the regional and sub-regional Action Plans at its 40th session in 2016.

PART. II GENERAL REFLECTION ON PERIODIC REPORTING

I. BACKGROUND

1. Periodic Reporting (PR) is a statutory process based on Article 29 of the *World Heritage Convention* and is further regulated by the *Operational Guidelines* in Chapter V: Periodic Reporting on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. According to Paragraph 199 of the *Operational Guidelines*, "States Parties are requested to submit reports to the UNESCO General Conference through the World Heritage Committee on the legislative and administrative provisions they have adopted and other actions which they have taken for the application of the *Convention*, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on their territories."
2. The main purposes of the Periodic Reporting exercise are defined by Paragraph 201 of the *Operational Guidelines*, namely:
 - a) to provide an assessment of the application of the *World Heritage Convention* by the State Party;
 - b) to provide an assessment as to whether the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List is being maintained over time;

- c) to provide updated information about the World Heritage properties to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the properties;
 - d) to provide a mechanism for regional co-operation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the *Convention* and World Heritage conservation.
3. The first decision on the process and format of the Periodic Reporting exercise (Decision **22 COM VI.7**) was taken by the Committee at its 22nd session (Kyoto, 1998). The first cycle of Periodic reporting took place, on a regional basis, between 2000 and 2006. The reports and respective Regional Action Plans were examined and adopted by the World Heritage Committee, at its 24th (Cairns, 2000), 25th (Helsinki, 2001), 27th (UNESCO, 2003), 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 30th (Vilnius, 2006) sessions respectively.
 4. The completion of the first cycle of Periodic Reporting generated important information regarding the state of implementation of the World Heritage Convention, as well as about the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. Some general conclusions were drawn from the completion of this cycle and issues that need to be addressed in the future were identified. At the same time, the first cycle also exposed some flaws in the process and the need to revise the questionnaire in order to collect the type of information that could realistically be expected from States Parties.
 5. In line with the Committee's Decision **7 EXT.COM 5**, in view of the need "to study and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting, develop strategic direction on the forms and the format of the Periodic Reports, training priorities and international cooperation priorities and to streamline the Committee's consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting relating to inscribed properties", the launch of the second cycle was suspended by one year. Two preparatory meetings to pave the way for the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007 were organized by the World Heritage Centre.
 6. At its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the Committee examined the outcomes of the preparation for the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007 and adopted the Terms of Reference for the Reflection Year, as well as the timeline for the second Periodic Reporting cycle. By its Decision **30 COM 11G**, it decided to entrust to a small Working Group composed of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics / international experts / Committee Members/Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre with the simplification of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire including the elaboration of indicators.
 7. The results of the work of the Working Group were examined by the Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) and 32nd session (Quebec, 2008) and the respective decisions **30 COM 11D.1** and **32 COM 11E** were adopted. By its Decision **32 COM 11E**, the Committee approved the new format of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire and launched the second cycle of Periodic Reporting. The Decision also welcomed the web-based tool to be used by all regions for the second cycle. In addition, it acknowledged that it had not been possible, within the available timeframe (between 31st and 32nd sessions) and financial resources, to develop comprehensive indicators for World Heritage properties, and invited this matter to be addressed through an expert meeting, subject to extra-budgetary funding.

II. SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

8. The Committee launched the second cycle of Periodic Reporting at its 32nd session (Quebec, 2008). The exercise concerned 18 States Parties from the Arab region, 15 of which had properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and covered some 64 properties, for which 59 reports were received. The second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise in the Africa region was launched in 2009 and involved 44 States Parties to the Convention, 78 properties in 30 States Parties were reported on. In the Asia

Pacific Region, all States Parties that ratified the Convention before the launch in 2010 joined the Periodic Reporting exercise, which involved 41 States Parties and 198 properties. In the Latin America and the Caribbean region, 29 out of the 32 States Parties of the region took part in the second cycle, covering 122 out of the 128 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise in the Europe and North America region was launched in 2012, and 50 out of 51 States Parties in the Europe and North America region took part in the two-year exercise, covering some 443 World Heritage properties.

9. All regions used the web-based Periodic Reporting format of the questionnaire (Section I and Section II), updated as a result of the Periodic Reporting Reflection Year 2007. It should be noted that the Africa region reportedly experienced challenges with this system due to the lack of reliable internet service.
10. The respective Periodic Reports for the regions were adopted by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2009) for the Arab region; 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) for Africa; 36th session (St Petersburg, 2012) for the Asia and the Pacific region; 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013) for Latin America and the Caribbean and 38th session (Doha, 2014) for North America. The Periodic Report for the Europe region will be examined by the Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015) (See Document WHC-15/39.COM/10A).
11. In comparison with the first cycle, which applied to the World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List up to 1998, the second cycle applied to all World Heritage properties inscribed on the List at the time when the exercise was launched for each respective region. Therefore, the number of properties which were included in the second cycle comprised practically the entirety of World Heritage properties on the List (some 930 properties), thus allowing to establish a more complete picture of the implementation of the Convention in all States Parties, as well as a more precise worldwide snapshot of the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties over time and their state of conservation, including trends and tendencies, both global and regions-specific.
12. The second cycle of Periodic Reporting generated a wealth of information and thus, fully complied with the main purposes of the Periodic Reporting exercise defined by Paragraph 201 of the *Operational Guidelines*.
13. The second cycle brought to light that important efforts are being made to improve site management and made it clear that while issues from within the properties were coming under better control, the external pressures on sites with regard to integrating site management with the larger development planning issues is emerging as a leading challenge for World Heritage sites in many regions. As a result, the World Heritage Committee's recommendations focus more and more on these large development and planning issues. A small but telling example is the emphasis that the Committee and the heritage community now place on Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs).
14. For some of the regions, the Periodic Reporting exercise has helped to focus World Heritage International Assistance and cooperation on the key and most critical of safeguarding matters in response to the evolution of the most pressing internal and external issues identified through the Periodic Reporting exercise.
15. At the same time, during the second cycle a number of issues were identified regarding the process and format by different World Heritage stakeholders, which the Committee may wish to address during a Reflection period, in view of further improving the modalities of this exercise and updating it with the evolving factors, trends and requirements.

A. INVOLVEMENT AND WORKLOAD OF STAKEHOLDERS CONCERNED DURING THE SECOND CYCLE

16. The second cycle involved a very significant workload for all stakeholders concerned and required substantial human and financial resources to address all relevant elements, including the Periodic Reporting questionnaires, the retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and the Retrospective Inventory. The overview presented below addresses only the workload related directly to the Periodic Reporting exercise and submission of questionnaires, excluding the workload of the various World Heritage stakeholders related to the Retrospective Inventory and the process of elaboration, processing and adoption of retrospective Statements for Outstanding Universal Value.

World Heritage Centre

17. To support the smooth running of the Second Periodic Reporting exercise, the World Heritage Centre, with the involvement of Advisory Bodies, where appropriate:

- a) Manually pre-filled the Section I questionnaires for all States Parties of the Convention at the time of launch for each respective region as well as Section II questionnaires for all World Heritage properties with the available statutory information, prior to releasing those questionnaires to the Focal Points and Site Managers for validation and/or update;
- b) Prepared training materials before and during the second cycle of Periodic Reporting: for some regions, special video tutorials were edited (Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and North America); a Handbook for Site Managers (Europe) was prepared and translated into a number of languages; Guidelines as well as a Frequently Asked Questions document were also made available;
- c) Provided Desk Support for all Focal Points and Site Managers for most regions throughout the exercise, providing advice and support on all technical issues and questions of content;
- d) Co-organised with host countries during the preparation and the process itself more than 30 workshops dedicated to Periodic Reporting and organised numerous side-events during statutory meetings. In most cases, these meetings were organized as capacity-building events as they were also an opportunity to address World Heritage matters beyond the strict scope of the Periodic Reporting exercise;
- e) In a number of regions, involved World Heritage experts in the capacity of mentors/advisors in the exercise, to provide support and advise to the stakeholders of the exercise in the region (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Arab States);
- f) Shared National Data Sets with States Parties as soon as feasible after the end of the exercise to enable the respective World Heritage stakeholders of States Parties to make the best use of the available data for adjusting and improving respective policies and management practices (Europe);
- g) Posted the short Periodic Reporting reports, with the responses to both Section I and II, on the web page, subject to agreement by States Parties (Europe);
- h) Analysed 182 Section I questionnaires and 927 Section II questionnaires, hiring external help where necessary, and produced the Periodic Reports for the five regions which were consulted with the States Parties of the regions and endorsed by the Committee.
- i) On the basis of the Periodic Reports, organized the publication of the outcomes of the second cycle for each of the regions, including main conclusions, trends, lessons learnt, in view of sharing the results of the exercise with a larger number of stakeholders in a more accessible and illustrative manner than the standard format of

a working Committee document; thanks to extra-budgetary funding, the abovementioned outcome publication for the Asia Pacific region included an interactive DVD, which provides full information on factors affecting the properties in Asia and the Pacific, providing the users, in particular site managers, with a tool to search properties that are affected by the same factors. This tool further allows the users to search properties by subject (chrono-regional, thematic, biophysical landscape/seascape, and the types of material used), and find information on properties and site managers;

- j) Initiated and organized with the Focal Points of the States Parties in each respective region, a discussion of outcomes of the exercise, needs and priorities and elaborated the Action Plans, further to the discussion. In some cases, the Action plans were elaborated in a fully participative manner by the Focal Points (Helsinki Action Plan);
- k) Launched, for some regions, the so-called 'post-filling', a largely manual process, which includes processing of all responses and comments and the enormous amount of statutory information which should be updated as a follow-up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting through the related statutory procedures;
- l) Resolved technical difficulties encountered during the exercise, including temporary unavailability of the questionnaires, saving issues, indications of completeness of the questionnaire and correct displays of responses. Thanks to the extensive and useful feedback collected from the Focal Points, the web-based questionnaire was improved from an IT perspective. An estimated two to four months of IT support per region (including pre-filling, improvement of questionnaire and data export function, Periodic Reporting Platform) was put into the second cycle.

18. Overall, the lessons learnt from the second cycle, with regard to the involvement and workload of the World Heritage Centre, show that:

- a) The workload associated with Periodic Reporting and following up on the implementation of the regional Action Plans at the World Heritage Centre is considerable and, in the current financial and human resources, not sustainable. Depending on the size of the region and number of World Heritage properties, a member of the Unit has always been tasked, full- or part-time, with the follow-up of the Periodic Reporting exercise, and required the assistance of other staff in the Units, part-time consultants and other temporary staff;
- b) In addition, while essential to the preparation and follow-up of Periodic Reporting, Periodic Reporting capacity-building has also represented a substantial strain on human and financial resources at the World Heritage Centre;
- c) Unless additional or extra-budgetary funding is provided specifically for the purposes of Periodic Reporting, the World Heritage Centre will not be able to organize the exercise in the same manner during next cycles and provide the same level of service and assistance to the States Parties.

States Parties

19. Each State Party organized the Periodic Reporting exercise in its own way. Based on the feedback received it has involved the following:

- a) Designation of Focal Point and Site Manager responsible for filling in the questionnaire;
- b) Organization of national workshops, teleconferences or meetings to train the site managers on the Periodic Reporting questionnaire;
- c) Filling in the questionnaires (ranging from 1 to 50 questionnaires depending on the State Party);

- d) Ensuring technical assistance by Focal Points on an ongoing basis and replying to questions raised by Site Managers directly or liaising with the World Heritage Centre;
- e) Translated, in many cases, the questionnaire in the national language in view of ensuring that the questionnaire is being fully understood by all Site Managers responsible for filling in the English / French version of the online questionnaire;
- f) Liaising with the World Heritage Centre on the content and technical aspects of the questionnaire and providing feedback;
- g) Organising, in a number of States Parties, follow-up on a national basis, according to their own vision and priorities.

20. Overall, the Periodic Reporting exercise can be summarized as resource- and time-consuming for the States Parties, Focal Points and Site Managers and therefore adequate resourcing, planned well in advance of the exercise, is important. It is worth noting however that many States Parties do not have clear objectives and views as to the use of Periodic Reporting data and outcomes at the national level. This is an important element on which reflection and exchange of good practices in the future will be beneficial.

B. FEEDBACK ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

21. Throughout the second cycle, valuable feedback was received both in terms of replies to the Evaluation chapter of the questionnaire, and through direct comments and reactions from different World Heritage stakeholders in all regions including Focal Points, Site Managers, Advisory Bodies, Periodic Reporting experts and advisors. Questions were raised and proposals were made with regard to the improvement of the exercise for the next cycles, both content- and process-wise. These matters have been addressed more specifically towards the end of the second cycle. For example, Europe region, further to the expectations and comments of the Focal Points in the region, included a special item on the agenda of its final Periodic Reporting meeting that took place in Helsinki in December 2014 (See Document 10 of the Helsinki meeting (<http://whc.unesco.org/document/134467>) as well as the Meeting Report (<http://whc.unesco.org/document/134614>)).

Summary of feedback further to the Evaluation chapter of the questionnaire (Questions 6.4-6.9)

22. The figures indicated below are an average of the statistics between the regions:
- 85% of the Site Managers indicated that the information needed to complete the questionnaire was easily accessible to them.
 - 77.5% of the Site Managers indicated that the questionnaire helped them better understand the importance of managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value.
 - 80% of the Site Managers indicated that it helped them better understand the importance of monitoring and reporting.
 - 72.5% of the Site Managers indicated that the questionnaire improved their understanding of management effectiveness.

Summary of feedback from States Parties (Focal Points and Site Managers) outside of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

23. The Periodic Reporting meetings and workshops organized in all the regions throughout the process allowed the Centre to collect valuable feedback from the Focal Points and/or

Site Managers, Periodic Reporting experts, mentors and advisors on the pertinence and usefulness of the Periodic Reporting exercise, in addition to its main purposes defined by the *Operational Guidelines*. The areas indicated below provide a succinct summary of various feedbacks received, according to which the Periodic Reporting Exercise encouraged:

- States Parties to update their baseline data about the World Heritage properties;
- Site Managers to think about their World Heritage property in new ways;
- States Parties to consider World Heritage in a broader (inter)national context;
- National and (sub)-regional Site Managers networks to be established or reinforced;
- Better (sub)-regional cooperation on site management level and exchange of good practices and lessons learnt;
- Strengthening communication between national and site management level.

24. The general considerations presented below, as well as the questionnaire-specific considerations, represent a non-exhaustive summary of the feedback received from different stakeholders in all regions regarding issues which they consider important to be addressed. The feedback has been collected and structured by the World Heritage Centre, and completed on the basis of statutory needs and requirements, as well as the Centre's own experience and reflections.

C. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Periodicity and Nature of the Questionnaire

- Need to explore whether the periodicity of the Periodic Reporting exercise is still appropriate;
- Need to include new indicators and benchmarks and thus take on board Recommendation 1 made in the Evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-Setting Work of the Culture Sector, 1972 Convention (Decision **38 COM 5F.2**), namely "Strengthen the existing results reporting framework, which includes the Periodic Reports, through the development of indicators and benchmarks to improve follow up on progress made by State Parties with the implementation of both the 1972 Convention and the 1972 Recommendation." In the framework of the follow-up to the Evaluation, the World Heritage Committee noted that the current Periodic Reporting mechanism already includes a number of indicators and considered that Recommendation 1 should be addressed in the framework of the reflection period after the end of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting;
- Explore the possibility to streamline the reporting exercises for the different Culture Conventions of UNESCO, in particular with regard to Section I. More specifically, explore streamlining possibilities with the 1954 Hague Convention and its Second Protocol (1999);
- Review whether the focus on state of conservation of World Heritage properties is sufficient (Section II) and explore options to make Section I less generic;
- Explore the need to re-focus questions and ensure their relevance;
- While streamlining the process and questionnaire, need to ensure that the Periodic Reporting exercise continues to be an all-encompassing tool to confirm or to update statutory information through follow-up of statutory processes and that this aspect is not discarded for the upcoming cycles without appropriate mechanisms to replace it;

- Explore the possibility to make the Periodic Reporting questionnaire available to States Parties who request it as a monitoring tool to be used independently on a national level between the Periodic Reporting Cycles;
- Explore how to ensure efficient statutory follow-up processes without overloading States Parties, the World Heritage Centre or Advisory Bodies.

Reliability and Comparability of the Data

- The questionnaire being a self-assessment tool, there is a need to improve it, namely with regard to the validity and comparability of data, and to ensure the reliability and consistency of the answers provided. While the Periodic Reporting questionnaire includes inevitably a certain level of subjective appreciation, it must be ensured that the information and data obtained could be usable in a way that is both credible and result-oriented.
- Need to reduce the amount of ambiguity and interpretation of questions and to ensure that the questions are formulated so as to collect the right and relevant data;
- Explore how to maintain the comparability of the questionnaire across the cycles, in order to establish trends over time.

Analysis & Use of the Data

- Need to ensure that a follow-up of the respective cycle of Periodic Reporting is carried out in the best possible way, at regional, national and site-level, as it has been difficult to properly monitor the follow-up of the first cycle of Periodic Reporting. No specific question is currently included in the Questionnaire.
- Explore ways to encourage the appropriation of the results of the Periodic Reporting cycle by Focal Points, Site Managers, and other relevant stakeholders.
- Data and analyses from Periodic Reporting cycles must be made easily usable at sub-regional, national and/or regional level.
- Determine whether the analyses of the data and the future questionnaires should focus on the differences between properties and States Parties rather than similarities.
- Need to ensure cross-reference data across platforms on World Heritage (notably with the World Heritage Centre State of Conservation database).
- Explore how the questionnaire could be used as an opportunity for Focal Points and Site Managers to share their World Heritage management experiences.
- Explore how the outputs of the Periodic Reporting exercise could be improved – Short Summary Reports, Export function of the Periodic Reporting questionnaires, Regional Reports.
- Explore the possibility of ensuring that there is a follow-up in terms of use of data and analysis through building constantly on previous efforts – the information collected during each cycle being stored in a usable format to be of use at a later stage. Thus a system of reporting could be established that feeds into a framework which can continue to be used by World Heritage stakeholders, including site managers and Focal Points during subsequent cycles. This system could be a basis for assessing progress in responding to the outcome of previous reporting exercise and adding on new information for the next reporting process. It could also be linked to the State of Conservation database. Thus, the framework could be used for comparison and differentiation between sites across regions, which could automatically allow for global trends to be assessed through the available reporting information at the World Heritage Centre.

Coordination and Funding of the Third Cycle

- How should the coordination of the third cycle of Periodic Reporting be organised?
- How can Periodic Reporting become a more States Parties-led process?
- How to ensure funding of the third cycle, bearing in mind the financial situation of the World Heritage Fund and the various requirements of a Periodic Reporting cycle?

D. SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING SECTION I AND SECTION II OF THE CURRENT PERIODIC REPORTING QUESTIONNAIRE

25. Various specific considerations were also made with regard to Section I and Section II of the current questionnaire. Without entering into technical details, which is not the purpose of the present working document, it is worth noting that a number of meaningful issues were raised and comments and proposals made. The succinct summary below provides a couple of examples of pertinent issues raised.
26. With regard to Section I, some feedback addressed the appropriateness of the Periodic Reporting tool to collect information on details for national World Heritage contacts (TL, the Government institution responsible, site managers etc.). Other questions addressed the appropriateness of deriving the national legal framework (question 5.1 in the questionnaire for the second cycle) from the Database of National Cultural Heritage Laws, which lists the national laws currently in force related to the protection of cultural heritage in general. Another issue concerned research which is considered important for all World Heritage properties, but to what extent should and can it be measured and assessed as part of the questionnaire? Can (potential) areas of international cooperation be better identified within the questionnaire, along with the modalities of their implementation?
27. With regard to Section II, should the third cycle of Periodic reporting offer an opportunity to review the Protection and Management Requirements section of existing Statements of Outstanding Universal Value? In this context, it is to be noted that further to feedback from States Parties, the proposed revised *Operational Guidelines* submitted for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015) includes a revision of the relevant provision of the *Operational Guidelines* (Paragraph 155) to include a mechanism for the review and update of the Protection and Management Requirements of the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties (See document WHC-15/39.COM/11). Further, it is considered that the current list of primary and secondary factors could be reviewed in terms of comprehensiveness and ease of comprehension. It is also indicated that there is a need to also focus on success stories and report in more detail on positive factors/impact in addition to negative ones. It was also requested that the management responses to the identified current negative factors be better shown within the questionnaire / captured in the analysis reports. Another matter raised is the need to improve the questionnaire with regard to the specific issues of trans-boundary and serial transnational properties.

III. REFLECTION PERIOD

28. The feedback received throughout the second cycle undoubtedly confirms the pertinence and usefulness of the Periodic Reporting exercise, for all World Heritage stakeholders alike and at the same time it clearly illustrates the need for further improvement and change of the process itself, of the main tool used for submission of data, of the use and analysis of data, of the distribution of roles and responsibilities, and of the funding and coordination, taking into account the current financial constraints. Possibilities of streamlining of the Periodic Reporting exercise with the reporting of other culture conventions of UNESCO should also be explored. Clearly, the format of the Periodic

Reporting questionnaire also needs to be reviewed, streamlined and adjusted to the new realities.

29. The Committee may therefore wish to consider suspending the launch of the third cycle of Periodic Reporting and launching a two-year reflection period (June 2015-June 2017) with a view of streamlining and refining the Periodic Reporting exercise, in terms of content, process and in technical terms. The aim of this reflection should be to improve the forthcoming cycles, while building on existing mechanisms, avoiding overlap of reporting mechanisms, working towards a result-based reporting and ensuring greater efficiency.
30. In this regard, the Committee may wish to request the World Heritage Centre to launch a questionnaire to the attention of the States Parties, in view of receiving coordinated and structured feedback on the improvement of the process, format, coordination and efficiency of the Periodic Reporting Exercise. States Parties could be invited to host at least two Periodic Reporting reflection meetings, with the participation of selected representatives of States Parties from all regions, Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO field offices, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, category 2 centres and experts that have been involved in the second cycle of Periodic Reporting. The updating of format and process could be entrusted to a small expert Working Group and coordinated by the World Heritage Centre. The Terms of Reference of the Working Group could be presented for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session, within the progress report concerning the implementation of the related decision. In this regard, a financial provision in the form of seed money should be made in the draft Budget for 2016-2017.
31. The Committee may also wish to note that the proposed current revision of the *Operational Guidelines* does not include a proposal for a revised version of Chapter V of the *Operational Guidelines* (Periodic Reporting on the Implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*) and Annex 7 (Format for the Periodic Reporting of the application of the *World Heritage Convention*). These will need to be duly updated once the Reflection Period is completed.
32. It is also suggested that an information document on the Periodic Reporting reflection further to the second cycle be presented to the General Assembly at its 20th session in 2015.

IV. Draft Decision 39 COM 10B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined document WHC-15/39.COM 10B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **34 COM 10A**, **35 COM 10A**, **36 COM 10A**, **37 COM 10A** and **38 COM 5F** adopted respectively at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011), 36th (Saint Petersburg, 2012), 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions,*
3. *Congratulates the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention for having actively participated and completed the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise and takes note of their efforts to ensure relevant follow-up at the regional, national and site levels;*
4. *Notes with appreciation that the outcomes of the Second Cycle relate fully to the main purposes of the Periodic Reporting exercise as defined by Paragraph 201 of the *Operational Guidelines*;*

5. *Also notes that valuable feedback has been received from States Parties and other World Heritage stakeholders with regard to the process, format, relevance, use and analysis of data derived from the Periodic Reporting;*
6. *Further notes that the existing results reporting framework, which includes the Periodic Reports, should be strengthened through the development of comprehensive indicators and benchmarks to improve follow-up on progress made by State Parties with the implementation of both the 1972 Convention and the 1972 Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage, further to Recommendation 1 of the Evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-Setting Work of the Culture Sector, 1972 Convention, acknowledged by Decision **38 COM 5F.2** of the Committee, according to which the matter will be addressed during the Reflection Period on Periodic Reporting;*
7. *Decides to suspend the third cycle of Periodic Reporting and launch a two-year Periodic Reporting Reflection Period from 2015-2017;*
8. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to bring this matter to the attention of the General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention, at its 20th session (Paris, 2015), in an information document and also requests that the comments of the States Parties be sought on the matters of reviewing the process, format, relevance, use and analysis of data and efficiency of the Periodic Reporting exercise as well as synergies with other UNESCO culture conventions, preferably by means of a questionnaire;*
9. *Calls upon States Parties and other World Heritage stakeholders to provide extra-budgetary resources to ensure a proper reflection, including through hosting at least two Periodic Reporting reflection meetings with the participation of selected representatives of States Parties from all regions, Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO Field offices, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, category 2 centres as well as experts that have been involved in the second cycle of Periodic Reporting;*
10. *Further decides that a small expert working group will be entrusted with drafting an updated format of the questionnaire and proposals for improving the process, relevance, analysis and use of data, further to feedback of States Parties and outcomes of Reflection meetings, in accordance with Terms of Reference which will be included in the progress report to be presented to the World Heritage Committee at the 40th session in 2016;*
11. *Requests furthermore the World Heritage Centre to present for examination by the World Heritage Committee an updated format of the questionnaire and proposals for improving the process, relevance, analysis and use of data, as well as a proposal of a revised version of Chapter V of the Operational Guidelines (Periodic Reporting on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention) and Annex 7 (Format for the Periodic Reporting of the application of the World Heritage Convention), at its 41st session in 2017.*