



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

**World Heritage**

**38 COM**

**WHC-14/38.COM/10A**

**Paris, 16 May 2014**

**Original: English**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF  
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Thirty-eighth session**

**Doha, Qatar  
15 – 25 June 2014**

**Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Periodic Reports**

**10A. Final report on the results of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for North America and Progress report for the Europe and North America region**

**SUMMARY**

This document presents the outcomes of the Periodic Reporting in the sub-region of North America (Part I) and contains a progress report on the activities undertaken for the implementation of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Europe and North America region (Part II).

The web platform designed to assist in the implementation and follow-up of the second cycle is available at the following web address:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/EUR-NA>

**Draft Decisions: 38 COM 10A.1 and 38 COM 10A.2, see Part III**

## **I. PERIODIC REPORT FOR NORTH AMERICA**

1. At its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the World Heritage Committee took note of the First Cycle Periodic Report for North America.
2. The World Heritage Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013), by Decision **37 COM 10B**, requested a report on the Periodic Reporting exercise for North America be presented to its 38th session.
3. The Periodic Report for North America presented below was prepared by the Focal Points for World Heritage of the two States Parties in the sub-region, Canada and the United States of America.
4. The translation of the Periodic Report for North America into French was kindly provided by the State Party of Canada.

## PERIODIC REPORT FOR NORTH AMERICA – SECOND CYCLE

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the outcomes of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise in the sub-region of North America, consisting of two States Parties, Canada and the United States of America. The exercise was addressed to the two States Parties, both of which ratified the *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* in the 1970s, and the 37 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List from 1978 to 2012. Both States Parties submitted the questionnaires for Section I on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, and all 37 World Heritage properties in the sub-region submitted the questionnaires for Section II on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties in the sub-region. Each State Party identified a Focal Point to coordinate the Periodic Reporting, as well as a site manager as a representative of each property responsible for filling in the questionnaire. The World Heritage site managers filled out the questionnaires and participated in conference calls organized by each State Party, as well as a meeting for the Canadian site managers that focused on part on Periodic Reporting.

The World Heritage Committee launched the Periodic Reporting exercise at its 36th session in 2012 by Decision **36 COM 10B** and requested that the States Parties of the Europe and North America Region actively participate in the process. The process commenced on 1 September 2012, when the World Heritage Centre sent the Focal Points notification emails providing them access to the electronic system to complete the questionnaires, with completion requested by 31 July 2013. Since the First Cycle of the Periodic Reporting, the outcome of which was reported to the World Heritage Committee in 2005 (see document: [WHC-05/29 COM 11.A](#)), there have been several successes in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the North America sub-region. The number of inscribed World Heritage properties in the sub-region increased from 33 to 37, including the inscription of the first mixed site in North America (Papahānaumokuākea). One property (Everglades National Park) was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger (2007) and subsequently re-inscribed in 2010, maintaining only one property on this List in the sub-region. The Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting provided the States Parties with an opportunity to assess the progress made both nationally and sub-regionally since the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting and to continue to identify challenges and solutions to improve the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. Involvement in the Periodic Reporting exercise has also increased awareness among site managers about the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and has fostered a greater level of cooperation and networking between Focal Points and site managers.

### INTRODUCTION

Article 29 of the *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* stipulates that Periodic Reporting on the implementation of the Convention is a procedure by which States Parties, through the intermediary of the World Heritage Committee, report on the status of the implementation of the Convention in their respective territories to the UNESCO General Conference.

As stated in Paragraph 201 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, the four main purposes of Periodic Reporting are:

- To provide an assessment of the application of the World Heritage Convention by the State Party;

- 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;
- To provide updated information about World Heritage properties and record the changing circumstances and the properties' state of conservation; and
- To provide a mechanism for regional cooperation and exchange of information and experiences among States Parties concerning the implementation of the Convention and World Heritage conservation.

Within this framework, the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Europe and North America Region was launched at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in July 2012. This report presents the results of the Second Cycle of the exercise in the sub-region of North America to the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

## **FIRST CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING IN NORTH AMERICA**

The strategy for Periodic Reporting was outlined in the document WHC-98/CONF.203/06 presented at the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Kyoto, 1998). Europe and North America was the fifth region to submit a Periodic Report after the Arab States, Africa, Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean. The First Cycle was a pilot project in many respects. The questionnaires consisted of two sections – Section I: Application of the *World Heritage Convention*, which for the sub-region of North America includes Canada and the United States of America, and Section II: State of conservation of World Heritage properties, which covered the 33 properties located on their territory. The format of the First Cycle was primarily narrative in nature, with both States Parties and site managers providing written descriptions of their current situations and issues. The final report of the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting was submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005; document [WHC-05/28.COM/11A](#): Periodic Reporting: State of World Heritage in Europe and North America, 2005).

## **SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING IN NORTH AMERICA**

### **a. Background**

Following the completion of the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting for all regions (2000-2006), the World Heritage Committee decided to launch a Periodic Reporting Reflection Year to study and reflect on the First Cycle and develop the strategic direction of the Second Cycle (Decision **7EXT.COM 5**). The World Heritage Committee revised the timetable for the Second Cycle (Decision **30 COM 11G**) and it was decided that the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Europe and North America would be launched in 2012. It was also decided to allow two years for this region, given the high number of States Parties and World Heritage properties involved.

In parallel, in Decision **32 COM 11E**, the World Heritage Committee requested “all States Parties, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to finalise all missing Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for properties in their territory.” Moreover, the World Heritage Committee decided to launch a Retrospective Inventory in Decision **7EXT.COM 7.1** in order to identify and fill gaps, with particular attention to cartographic information, in the files of the properties inscribed between 1978 and 1998. One year before launching the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting, the States Parties of the North America sub-region began working with site managers to develop retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). As a consequence, prior to the launch of the Second

Cycle, the World Heritage Centre had received 31 draft retrospective Statements of OUV, including for two U.S. – Canada transboundary sites.

## **b. Scope**

In order to comply with the Decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee, both North American States Parties were requested to submit the following documents:

- By 1 February 2012: Draft retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties inscribed from 1978 to 2006, according to Decision **34 COM 10B.3**;
- By 31 July 2013: Responses to the Periodic Reporting online questionnaire, which consists of Section I (Implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* on a national level) for all the States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* and Section II (State of conservation of each World Heritage property) for the World Heritage properties inscribed from 1978 to 2012; and
- By 1 December 2013: Requested cartographic information on World Heritage properties inscribed from 1978 to 1999 for Retrospective Inventory, according to Decision **37 COM 8D**.

This means that in the sub-region North America,

- 31 properties, including two transboundary sites, were requested to prepare draft retrospective Statements of OUV;
- Both States Parties were requested to answer Section I and 37 properties in the two States Parties were requested to answer Section II for the Periodic Reporting online questionnaire; and
- 20 properties, including one transboundary site, were requested to submit cartographic information for the Retrospective Inventory.

## **c. Implementation strategy**

The Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise was coordinated by the World Heritage Centre/Europe and North America Unit in close cooperation with national Focal Points and the Advisory Bodies: the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). In order to facilitate the implementation of Periodic Reporting, both North American States Parties were invited to designate their national Focal Point responsible for coordinating the exercise on a national level before launching the exercise.

The roles and responsibilities of the key actors were as follows:

- **National Focal Points:** coordination of process for site managers; consolidation of national responses to the Periodic Reporting questionnaire; responding to Section I of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire; submission of Sections I and II of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire; coordination with the corresponding national Focal Point in the North American sub-region.

- **Site managers:** preparation or review of draft retrospective Statements of OUV of the properties; responding to Section II of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire; preparation of requested cartographic information for the Retrospective Inventory.

- **Advisory Bodies:** review of draft retrospective Statements of OUV after official submission by States Parties.

- **UNESCO World Heritage Centre:** provision of technical support and guidance to States Parties in drafting retrospective Statements of OUV, and preparing cartographic information for Retrospective Inventory; coordination between the States Parties and Periodic Reporting Focal Points by giving permissions and access to the database; completeness check of draft retrospective Statements of OUV submitted by States Parties; coordination between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies for the finalization of the draft retrospective Statements of OUV; compilation of the Periodic Report; creation of an internet platform for the implementation of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise; and publication of Short Summaries of the Section I and II reports on the World Heritage Centre's website in 2014.

#### **d. Outcomes**

The States Parties of North America completed the following:

- Submission of 31 retrospective Statements of OUV to the World Heritage Centre by the States Parties, which then each underwent a review by the Advisory Bodies. As of the date of the completion of this report, some have been finalised and will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at the 38th session, while others are in progress.

- Submission of cartographic information including maps, clarification of area in hectares, or serial property details in response to a request for information under the Retrospective Inventory project for 18 of the 20 properties identified. Due to the early inscription dates and lack of records concerning boundary delimitation for the two remaining properties, the cartographic work to be done will take additional time to complete with accuracy. Information was also submitted for one further Canadian property and one further U.S. property.

#### **e. Activities and North American Collaboration**

In the framework of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, the two States Parties organized meetings for their respective site managers (December 2011 in Ottawa, Canada and a November 2012 conference call in the United States of America) to discuss the process of Periodic Reporting, the development of draft retrospective Statements of OUV as well as of maps for the clarification of boundaries. The World Heritage Centre assisted the Focal Points and other staff involved in World Heritage by assessing their progress.

To conclude the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, the national Focal Points and other staff involved in the Periodic Reporting activities collaborated on the development of this report summarizing the process and results of this cycle in North America.

### **OVERVIEW OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES IN NORTH AMERICA**

The World Heritage List is a list of properties representing global cultural and natural heritage, considered by the World Heritage Committee as having Outstanding Universal Value. At the time of the implementation of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in North

America in 2013, there were 981 properties on the World Heritage List, 37 (3.7%) of which are located in North America<sup>1</sup>. When broken down by percentage, these 37 properties consist of 15 cultural (approximately 40%), 21 natural (57%) and 1 mixed (3%) properties. It is important to note in general that statistical analyses for only two States Parties and 37 properties often do not provide useful information. Details on these 37 World Heritage properties are given in the table below.

**Table 1: Inscribed World Heritage properties in North America, 1978-2012**

World Heritage Property	State Party	Year of inscription	Criteria used
L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site	Canada	1978	(vi)
Nahanni National Park	Canada	1978	(vii), (viii)
Dinosaur Provincial Park	Canada	1979 (ext. 1992)	(vii), (viii)
Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump	Canada	1981	(vi)
SGang Gwaay	Canada	1981	(iii)
Wood Buffalo National Park	Canada	1983	(vii), (ix), (x)
Canadian Rocky Mountains Parks	Canada	1984 (ext. 1990)	(vii), (viii)
Historic District of Old Québec	Canada	1985	(iv), (vi)
Gros Morne National Park	Canada	1987	(vii), (viii)
Old Town Lunenburg	Canada	1995	(iv), (v)
Miguasha National Park	Canada	1999	(viii)
Rideau Canal	Canada	2007	(i), (iv)
Joggins Fossil Cliffs	Canada	2008	(viii)
Landscape of Grand Pré	Canada	2012	(v), (vi)
Yellowstone National Park	United States of America	1978	(vii), (viii), (ix), (x)
Mesa Verde National Park	United States of America	1978	(iii)
Grand Canyon National Park	United States of America	1979	(vii), (viii), (ix), (x)

<sup>1</sup> Note: as of writing this report, Canada has 17 World Heritage properties - Red Bay Basque Whaling Station was inscribed after the Second Cycle Periodic Reporting exercise was launched.

Everglades National Park	United States of America	1979	(viii), (ix), (x)
Independence Hall	United States of America	1979	(vi)
Redwood National and State Parks	United States of America	1980	(vii), (ix)
Mammoth Cave National Park	United States of America	1981	(vii), (viii), (x)
Olympic National Park	United States of America	1981	(vii), (ix)
Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site	United States of America	1982	(iii), (iv)
Great Smoky Mountains National Park	United States of America	1983	(vii), (viii), (ix), (x)
La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site in Puerto Rico	United States of America	1983	(vi)
Statue of Liberty	United States of America	1984	(i), (vi)
Yosemite National Park	United States of America	1984	(vii), (viii)
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville	United States of America	1987	(i), (iv), (vi)
Chaco Culture	United States of America	1987	(iii)
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park	United States of America	1987	(viii)
Taos Pueblo	United States of America	1992	(iv)
Carlsbad Caverns National Park	United States of America	1995	(vii), (viii)
Papahānaumokuākea	United States of America	2010	(iii), (vi), (viii), (ix), (x)
Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park	Canada and United States of America	1995	(vii), (ix)
Kluane / Wrangell-St Elias / Glacier Bay / Tatshenshini-Alsek	Canada and United States of America	1979 (ext. 1992, 1994)	(vii), (viii), (ix), (x)



Since the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, 5 properties in North America have been added to the World Heritage List, 4 of which are Canadian and 1 American. These include 1 natural site, 3 cultural sites and 1 mixed site.

**Table 2: World Heritage inscriptions since the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting in North America**

<b>World Heritage Property</b>	<b>State Party</b>	<b>Year of inscription</b>	<b>Criteria used</b>	<b>For more information</b>
<b>Rideau Canal</b>	Canada	2007	(i), (iv)	<a href="http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/lhn-nhs/on/rideau/index.aspx">http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/lhn-nhs/on/rideau/index.aspx</a>
<b>Joggins Fossil Cliffs</b>	Canada	2008	(viii)	<a href="http://jogginsfossilcliffs.net">http://jogginsfossilcliffs.net</a>
<b>Papahānaumokuākea</b>	United States of America	2010	(iii), (vi), (viii), (ix), (x)	<a href="http://www.papahanaumokuakea.gov">http://www.papahanaumokuakea.gov</a>
<b>Landscape of Grand Pré</b>	Canada	2012	(v), (vi)	<a href="http://www.landscapeofgrandpre.ca">http://www.landscapeofgrandpre.ca</a>
<b>Red Bay Basque Whaling Station</b>	Canada	2013	(iii), (iv)	<a href="http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/lhn-nhs/nl/redbay/natcul/unesco.aspx">http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/lhn-nhs/nl/redbay/natcul/unesco.aspx</a>

#### **a. Outstanding Universal Value**

##### **Criteria used for Inscription**

The World Heritage Committee considers a property as having Outstanding Universal Value if it meets one or more of the criteria listed in paragraph 77 of the *Operational Guidelines*. These criteria have been applied as follows for properties in North America:

**Table 3: Breakdown of Criteria as applied to World Heritage properties in North America**

Criterion	United States	Canada	Transboundary	Total
(i) a masterpiece of human creative genius	2	1	-	3
(ii) important interchange of human values	-	-	-	0
(iii) testimony to a cultural tradition	4 <sup>*2</sup>	1	-	5
(iv) outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape	3	3	-	6
(v) traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture	-	2	-	2
(vi) associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs	5 <sup>*</sup>	4	-	9
(vii) superlative natural phenomena or exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance	8	5	2	15
(viii) major stages of earth's history	10 <sup>*</sup>	6	1	17
(ix) significant on-going ecological and biological processes	7	1	2	10
(x) important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity	6 <sup>*</sup>	1	1	8

<sup>2</sup> \*includes one mixed site (*Papahānaumokuākea, United States*)

## Other Observations

Although it is not within the scope of this report to conduct a similar analysis for European World Heritage properties, some differences between North America and Europe can clearly be seen from the data presented above.

In comparison with the statistics for European World Heritage properties, the percentage of natural sites in North America is nearly 60%, meaning that cultural World Heritage sites are a minority in this sub-region. A large number of North America's natural World Heritage properties are also high profile, iconic *national* parks. While this creates high public awareness of these parks, it can also serve to overshadow their status as World Heritage properties.

Beyond the most obvious fact that there is a much larger proportion of natural sites inscribed in North America, many of the cultural sites also exhibit characteristics that are specific to North America:

- Many cultural sites reflect the heritage of aboriginal populations (i.e. Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Taos Pueblo, Papahānaumokuākea);
- Cultural properties that reflect the European colonial experience share themes and attributes with properties in the Latin America and the Caribbean Region (i.e. La Fortaleza and San Juan National Historic Site in Puerto Rico, Historic District of Old Quebec).

Some general observations about all North American World Heritage sites, both cultural and natural, include:

- A comparatively small number of inscribed properties is spread across a very large geographic area in a wide variety of climates, geography, and cultural influences (37 World Heritage properties on the continent);
- It appears that there is considerable scope for future nominations from North America to better reflect its diversity and both cultural and natural heritage resources and to address key gaps identified in the *Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List*.

It might prove valuable to develop a comparable summary of the application of the World Heritage criteria for inscribed properties in Europe, to deepen this analysis.

### b. State of Conservation

There is currently one property in North America inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger – Everglades National Park (USA). In the time since the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, this site was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007 and subsequently re-inscribed on the list at the request of the State Party in 2010, primarily due to the challenges associated with an altered hydrological regime, urban and agricultural growth just outside the property's boundaries, and the degradation of Florida Bay. With the support of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a comprehensive Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger has

been developed, including 13 indicators and numerous benchmarks. In the last year, important milestones have been achieved, including projects which allow increased water flow into the park.

Otherwise, World Heritage properties in North America are generally in a good state of conservation. The challenges faced by some of these properties and related management issues are discussed in the next section of this report.

Details on reactive monitoring activities since the First Periodic Report are given in the table below.

**Table 4: Reactive Monitoring of World Heritage Sites in North America (2005-2012)**

<b>World Heritage property</b>	<b>Year(s) of Reactive Monitoring Report</b>	<b>Main Issue(s)</b>
Miguasha National Park	2005	Potential impact of waste incinerator in vicinity of park and exploratory drilling for oil in buffer zone
Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks	2005, 2006	(2005) Concerns over impacts of mountain pine beetle infestation (2005, 2006) Concerns about the Cheviot mine project in the vicinity of Jasper National Park
Nahanni National Park	2006	Potential industrial activities (mining projects) in the vicinity of the park
Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park	2009/2010	Potential mining development in Flathead Valley area of British Columbia
Everglades National Park	2011	Altered hydrological regime, adjacent urban and agricultural growth, protection of Florida Bay, other issues
Yellowstone National Park	2011	Protection and management of bison, lake trout, grizzly bears, and gray wolves; integration of site into surrounding landscape

## THE PERIODIC REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

The Periodic Reporting questionnaire consists of two sections: Section I on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* on a national level; and Section II on the state of conservation of each World Heritage property. Each Section is structured as follows:

<b>Section I</b>	<b>Section II</b>
1. Introduction	1. World Heritage Property Data
2. Inventories/Lists/Registers for Cultural and Natural heritage	2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
3. Tentative List	3. Factors affecting the Property
4. Nominations	4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property
5. General Policy Development	5. Summary and Conclusions
6. Status of Services for Protection, Conservation and Presentation	6. Conclusions of the Periodic Reporting Exercise
7. Scientific and Technical Studies and Research	
8. Financial Status and Human Resources	
9. Training	
10. International Cooperation	
11. Education, Information and Awareness Building	
12. Conclusions and Recommended Actions	
13. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise	

### **Main Conclusions of Section I of the questionnaire.**

The implementation of the World Heritage Convention on a national level in the two States Parties in North America exhibits some common characteristics. In both countries, the responsibility for implementation of the World Heritage Convention rests with a national park agency that is responsible for both cultural and natural protected areas. In both countries, a framework for the identification and protection of properties is set by national law, but protection is also provided by state, provincial, territorial or local governments or by the voluntary actions of individuals; the inventories themselves are maintained by the national governments.

The major issues and opportunities that affect the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in North America include:

- Limited awareness and understanding of the World Heritage Convention;

- External development pressures on World Heritage properties, especially in areas where the national government does not have direct jurisdiction;
- Public and stakeholder interest in the revision of Tentative Lists;
- Opportunities for international cooperation;
- The potential effects of climate change;
- How best to reflect indigenous peoples' worldviews and understanding of heritage in the context of the World Heritage Convention; and
- promotional opportunities for World Heritage in North America.

### **Main Conclusions of Section II of the Questionnaire**

Section II of the Periodic Report examines factors affecting the individual properties and their protection, management and monitoring. The questionnaire listed 76 potential factors that could affect World Heritage properties, in 13 different categories, and also asked about the adequacy of protection, management and monitoring in the form of multiple-choice questions. Given the relatively small number of inscribed properties in North America (37), it is not possible to draw meaningful conclusions from statistical summaries of the results of these questionnaires. However, some common issues related to factors affecting properties and management needs in North America are evident. The factors and issues below were among the most frequently cited by the site managers in their responses to the questionnaire:

- Climate change and extreme weather events affect both cultural and natural sites, causing stresses that were not present in past years. Proactive management can address this factor to some extent;
- Non-native invasive species and translocated species;
- Development and energy / transportation corridors;
- Illegal activities, specifically vandalism, in both natural and cultural properties;
- Financial constraints; and
- Water and air pollution.

In general, these issues are not severe enough to threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of properties, but they continue to present challenges.

### **Issues and Opportunities for Sub-regional Cooperation**

The two States Parties in North America have a long history of communication and cooperation. The Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting provided an opportunity for reinforced and more frequent communication, which has proved fruitful in other areas as well. Some of the areas for continuing cooperation include:

#### **1. Future Tentative Lists**

The United States of America has announced its intention to revise its Tentative List by 2016. Cooperation between the two State Parties in identifying North American themes will be a key part of this process. The same type of consultation with Mexico and other Latin American and Caribbean State Parties would be equally valuable, given the many common types of natural and cultural resources in this geographic area. One such topic might include the initiative regarding the Slave Route / African Heritage planned by the Latin America and Caribbean Region; a number of suggestions for potential properties related to this topic have

been made for the United States' Tentative List. In both the United States and Canada, there is a great deal of public and stakeholder interest in the revision of the two Tentative Lists: managing expectations and communicating clearly regarding the process and purpose of such work is a priority for both State Parties.

## 2. Strategies for public information and outreach about World Heritage

In both countries, a large number of World Heritage properties are well-known national parks or other areas that already had a high public profile before inscription. Nonetheless, their status as World Heritage sites and the *World Heritage Convention* itself is not widely known or understood. Collaboration for more effective public outreach about World Heritage might help to increase public knowledge.

## 3. Development of strategies to increase communication and cooperation between World Heritage site managers through the whole North American sub-region.

## 4. International assistance to World Heritage properties

The United States, through the National Park Service, offers Fellowships to World Heritage site managers from developing countries to allow them to travel to and receive training at American World Heritage sites. The United States and Canada could explore possible opportunities to provide joint training to future Fellows, including at transboundary sites.