UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
18- 20 November 2015

<u>**Item 12 of the Provisional Agenda:**</u> **Future of the *World Heritage Convention*: Outcomes and Progress in the Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan**

12. Future of the *World Heritage Convention*: Outcomes and Progress in the Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan

---

SUMMARY

The Strategic Action Plan and Vision to guide the implementation of the World Heritage Convention over the decade 2012-2022 was adopted by Resolution **18 GA 11** (UNESCO 2011) and a follow-up report on the implementation plan of the Strategic Action Plan presented and adopted by Resolution **19 GA 10** (UNESCO, 2013).

This document is a report to the General Assembly, in accordance with Resolution **19 GA 10**, on the progress of the Implementation Plan of the Strategic Action Plan. In addition, it presents, in accordance with Decision **36 COM 12A** of the World Heritage Committee (Saint Petersburg, 2012) a table of links between the Strategic Action Plan and the recommendations of UNESCO's independent External Auditor's evaluation.

<u>Draft resolution</u>: See point V.

I. BACKGROUND

1.   The Vision of the Future of the World Heritage Convention and the Strategic Action Plan were adopted during the 18th General Assembly (UNESCO, 2011) by Resolution **18 GA 11**. The World Heritage Centre then ensured that it was disseminated widely.

II. IMPLENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP PLAN

2.   With The Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) noted the need to develop an Implementation Plan to operationalize the priorities detailed in the Draft Strategic Action Plan and Vision. By its decision **35 COM 12A**, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to work with the Advisory Bodies to develop a draft Implementation Plan, including potential sources of funding for actions included within it. The Strategic Action Plan set six World Heritage Goals to assist in structuring the work of the Convention over the next ten years, with 17 priorities and key outcomes to be achieved.

3.The Draft Implementation Plan was presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 36 session (document WHC-12/36.COM/12A) which welcomed progress made in drafting the Implementation Plan by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies including appropriate roles, responsibilities and accountabilities, an implementation schedule and a list of priority actions. The Committee also requested that the results and progress of the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan be submitted for examination to the General Assembly during its 19th session in 2013.

4.   The General Assembly's 19th session, by its Resolution **19 GA 10**, welcomed the progress in the performance of the implementation plan of the Strategic Action Plan, including the close links between the Draft Implementation Plan and the work of the Open-ended Working Group established by Resolution **18 GA 8** of the General Assembly of States Parties, upon the recommendation of the independent assessment of the UNESCO External auditors. Thus, the General Assembly requested the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, and with the support of interested States Parties, pursue the efforts undertaken and that a progress report on the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan be submitted to its 20th session.

5.   This progress report consists of the up-to-date table specifying the implementation status, since the 19th session, of the six goals and 17 priorities and key outcomes defined in the implementation plan (Item III) and the summary table, also up-to-date, of the links between the two implementation plans, i.e. the implementation plan of the Strategic Action Plan and the implementation plan of the recommendations of the independent assessment (Item IV).

6.   A draft resolution is presented in point V.

III.   UP-TO-DATE ACTION PLAN

STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION* 2012-2022

Resolution **19 GA 11** requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to develop a draft Implementation Plan for the Strategic Action Plan which was presented to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, drawing upon, *inter alia*:

- The Independent Evaluation by the UNESCO External Auditor on the Implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List and the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT)

- The World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy

- The Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy

- The Policy on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage sites

- The recommendations of expert group meetings held on:
  - Global state of conservation challenges for World Heritage properties
  - Decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention
  - The relationship between the *World Heritage Convention*, conservation and sustainable development

The Implementation Plan is to be updated biennially, with outcomes against the Strategic Action Plan to be reported to the General Assembly of States Parties.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
Goal 1 of world heritage: the outstanding universal value of world heritage sites is maintained							
1.1 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value	Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are the basis for protection and management	A.1.1.1 Reconfirm the primacy of Outstanding Universal Value within the *Convention* and its purpose to protect and conserve places of Outstanding Universal Value that require the assistance of the international community.	KPI 1.1.1 World Heritage nominations focus on the most outstanding properties and for others not meeting the threshold, develop new tools for recognition and preservation.	World Heritage Committee States Parties	Statement of confirmation of primacy of Outstanding Universal Value made at the 38th and 39 COM (2014 & 2015)		Adoption of nominations and Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV).
		A1.1.2 Complete statements Outstanding Universal Value retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value for all World Heritage properties.	KPI 1.1.2 100% of properties on the World Heritage List have approved statements of Outstanding Universal Value.	States Parties Advisory Bodies World Heritage Centre	Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) approved by Committee prior to commencement of third cycle of periodic	Examination by the Advisory Bodies: US$ 555 per SOUVTranslation into the two working languages Requires extrabudgetary funds	SOUVs adopted at 38 COM and 39 COM SOUVs of new nominated properties: 38 Provisional SOUVs, the Committee notes: 18 Retrospective SOUVs: 208 Additional funding required.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
					reporting		
		A.1.1.3 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are included on web.	KPI 1.1.3 From 37 COM onwards Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are the basis for decision making on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.	World Heritage Centre	On-going		The SOUVs are online on the webpage for each site(www.unesco.org)
1.2 Monitoring Mechanisms	Focus monitoring mechanism and resources on critical conservation issues while allowing States Parties time to implement recommendations Focus monitoring mechanism and resources on critical conservation issues while allowing States Parties time to implement recommendations	A.1.2.1 Define monitoring indicators (related to the Outstanding Universal Value) for all properties that are the subject of state of conservation reports, including review of other standard setting exercises and lessons drawn from Periodic reporting.	KPI 1.2.1 Agreed monitoring indicators used by States Parties and Advisory Bodies that give accurate snapshot of state of conservation of a property in relation to the attributes of its Outstanding Universal Value.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Monitoring indicators examined during 37 COM (2013)	Advisory Bodies agreement (WH Fund) Cost estimates	State of conservation Information System established (http://whc.unesco.org /fr/soc/), using PR indicators for threats (see Decision **37COM 7C**) An increasing number of World Heritage Properties in Danger now have a precise "Desired State of Conservation" (with monitoring indicators, verification method and timing)for the purpose of removing them from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The request for such a "Desired State of Conservation" is systematic during the inscription of a property on the List of

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							World Heritage in Danger.
							Finally, at its 39th session (Decision 39 COM 7), the World Heritage Committee adopted an obligatory format for the submission of States Parties' reports on the state of conservation of their properties allowing a better monitoring of the implementation of corrective measures and decisions previously adopted by the Committee for its properties.
		A.1.2.2 Create tools to recognise excellence (i.e. shift focus of Committee from sole focus on problems in SOC context) as reported by external bodies.	KPI 1.2.2 Increased media reporting of state of conservation successes (e.g., recent monitoring mission, local or regional Advisory Bodies committees); Used as showcase models for capacity building and training by the centre and Advisory Bodies.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies Category 2 centres	On-going	Set up Advisory Bodies contracts (WHF) Cost estimates	Two specific pages exist on World Heritage Centre website Danger-sites:http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/ andhttp://whc.unesco.org/en/danger/For example, recent widespread communication on the success in reconstructing mausoleums in Timbuktu, Mali on the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							Danger List; as well as the conservation of the Great Barrier coral reef in Australia.
		A.1.2.3 Develop and disseminate widely a system to prioritise and systematically select properties for state of conservation reports (e.g. for properties on or proposed for in danger listing, then those who had missions, then routine reports).	KPI 1.2.3 Prioritisation system for examination of state of conservation reports established and on website; critical sites reported on via website and Committee meetings.	World Heritage Committee World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Operational Guidelines revisions during 39 COM (2015)		In accordance with Paragraph 190 of the *Operational Guidelines*, all properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger must be reviewed annually by the Committee. Other properties which are the subject of a report on the state of conservation are those for which the Committee has made the request during its previous sessions and those for which emergency conservation measures must be taken.The list of all properties which are the subject of such a report will be published 6 weeks prior to the beginning of the session during which they will be examined.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		A.1.2.4 Strengthen monitoring of properties; hold a workshop to discuss establishment of a system of proactive monitoring without waiting for the occurrence of serious problems.	KPI 1.2.4 Relevant tools developed for States Parties to establish a system of proactive monitoring at national level; States Parties have a system of proactive monitoring incorporated into Plan of Management for each inscribed property. Advisory Bodies also encouraged to develop local monitoring networks.	World Heritage Committee	Reports of the working groups at 37 COM (2013)	Workshop US $200,000 Extrabudgetary funding required	No funding for workshop received, but additional information is available on the state of conservation (http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/); proactive monitoring by the States Parties; pro-active monitoring State Party driven;
		A.1.2.5 National governments encouraged to have regular dialogue with ICOMOS and IUCN about state of conservation of properties	KPI 1.2.5 Fewer irreversible impacts recorded by the World Heritage Committee; ICOMOS, IUCN and Centre record fewer unexpected issues arising; state of conservation monitoring mechanisms used by Advisory Bodies defined and understood by States Parties.	States Parties Local/regional UICN/ ICOMOS committees	On-going	Additional funding necessary	Dialogue enhanced and should be further strengthened (see also document WHC-13/19.GA/12) Upstream support to the States Parties, especially through advisory missions, which requires additional work and therefore requires additional funding (see document WHC-15/39.COM/11). In some specific cases, funding may be allocated from the World Heritage Fund (Decision **38 COM**

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							12).
		A.1.2.6 National governments encouraged involving ICOMOS and IUCN, including their regional structures, in process of preparing response to periodic reporting. Involvement includes Periodic Reporting training and information provision.	KPI 1.2.6 Periodic Report training undertaken including local or regional structures of ICOMOS and IUCN; IUCN and ICOMOS demonstrating; active engagement between States Parties and Advisory Bodies.	States Parties World Heritage Centre Local/regional UICN/ ICOMOS committees Category 2 centres	On-going	Additional funding necessary	During the 2nd cycle of Periodic Reporting, more than 30 workshops dedicated to Periodic Reporting took place Additional funding dedicated to the reflection period on Periodic Reporting from all regions will be necessary for the continuation of the exercise by the Centre (see documents WHC-15/39.COM/10A et WHC-15/39.COM/10B)
		A.1.2.7 Formally notify States Parties of the state of conservation reports on World Heritage properties in their territory which will be the subject of examination by the Committee at the session indicated; to enable dialogue, consider options for providing concerned State Party comment on state of conservation reports and/or State party right of reply (similar to nomination process).	KPI 1.2.7 States Parties notified of upcoming state of conservation report by Centre 2 months before Committee meeting and States Parties fully prepared to respond; reduction in provision of last minute information by States Parties (trend line down).	States Parties World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies Category 2 Centres	Notification since 37 COM (2013) Opportunities foreseen 37 COM (2013)		States Parties are informed promptly, when information is requested from the concerning the state of conservation of a property, by the Committee or the World Heritage Centre. Consultation meetings are organised regularly

Future of the World Heritage Convention, outcomes and progress
in the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							with the States Parties to raise their awareness of the Committee's agenda items. In addition, to enhance conditions of dialogue among the various stakeholders, the Committee has adopted a new timetable regarding the submission of reports by the States Parties (Decision **38 COM 7**) giving more time between the submission date and the drafting of the working document (7B) in order to provide the best conditions for dialogue with the States Parties.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		A.1.2.8 Decisions to default to a minimum two-year cycle for the examination of state of conservation reports for individual properties on the World Heritage List, and for the discussion of those inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, except for cases of utmost urgency; World Heritage Fund to assist developing countries with state of conservation reporting and monitoring.	KPI 1.2.8 Increased compliance with remedial actions and reduced reports of little progress (trend line down); trend graphs show fewer properties on annual SOC reporting cycle; two year cycle implemented; increased on-going dialogue between States Parties and the Centre between Committee sessions.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Established by 37 COM (2013)	A.7.	2-year minimum cycle in place in 2011 (Decision **35 COM 12B**) (except for urgent cases and potential danger listing);
1.3 Conservation requirements *1.3 Conservation requirements*	Requirements for conservation of Outstanding Universal Value are implemented transparently and consistently	A. 1.3.1 Develop a global conservation strategy that includes but is not limited to points below (these activities could be transferred to the conservation strategy once established)	KPI. 1.3.1 Global conservation strategy developed and fully funded for implementation	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Established	US $100,000 extrabudgetary funds required	No funding
		A.1.3.2. Develop a database of existing guidance on key factors negatively impacting on the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties and tools for best management practice.	KPI.1.3.2 Database updated annually including provision for States Parties and Advisory Bodies to contribute new advice as it arises. Awards provided to States Parties for best practice management at each Committee meeting.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies States Parties	Database established Recognition non-going	Advisory Bodies contracts, WHF (or may need extrabudgetary funds) Staff time	State of conservation Information System establishedhttp://whc.unesco.org/fr/soc); updated annually and regularly enriched with practical guides and directives for better conservation of World Heritage properties, dissemination of best practices enhanced by: (1) Best practice recognition at Kyoto – 2012 ;(2)

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
	Requirements for conservation of Outstanding Universal Value are implemented transparently and consistently.						Online publication of best practices including for marine sites;(3) Accent in the WH Review (No. 67, May 2013) and (4) Publication of "World Heritage Beyond Frontiers" (UNESCO/Cambridge University Press).
		A.1.3.3 Develop guidance to fill gaps in existing guidance, including: a) the need for EIAs/HIAs of potential developments' impact on Outstanding Universal Value, the range of proposed activities with a likely impact on Outstanding Universal Value to be reported on and the documentation required by the World Heritage Centre, b) the uses, limits and documentation requirements for traditional management systems and c) protection mechanisms for setting (beyond and including buffer zones)	KPI.1.3.3 Submissions/ Consultancy undertaken to identify gaps and develop guidance on conservation requirements and practices; States Parties widely consulted on tools currently in use addressing gaps. Guidance provided on the website.	States Parties Consultant World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Gaps identified by 37 COM (2013) Guidance development as funds permit	Seek extra-budgetary funding to secure resources and technical support Source donor	No funding for gap analysis received; Decision 39 COM 7 underlines the importance of EIA and HIA and calls on the States Parties to fund the reflection on their implementation. Recommendations on EIA/HIA are available: (http://openarchive.icomos.org/266/). Work on traditional management systems and protection mechanisms on-going Directives and advisory notes prepared by the Advisory Bodies

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							concerning Environmental and/or Heritage Impact Studies and applying to Worldwide Heritage are available online in the Information System on the state of conservation (http://whc.unesco.org /en/soc/) to ensure their widest dissemination.
		A.1.3.4 Confirm the degree to which management systems and legal frameworks need to be in place before inscription (paragraph 115 of the *Operational Guidelines*).	KPI 1.3.4 Para 115 of *Operational Guidelines* revised and provides greater clarity to States Parties.	World Heritage Committee	Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* at 39 COM (2015)		Paragraph 115 was deleted (Decision **39 COM 11**).
		A.1.3.5 Provide an inventory on the website, based on retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and linked to indicators, of World Heritage properties which have all attributes /elements of Outstanding Universal Value in place, and which do not.	KPI.1.3.5 Details of missing attributes/element of Outstanding Universal Value are voluntarily submitted by States Parties for consideration of remedial actions.	World Heritage Centre	Inventory linked to indicators established for 38 COM (2014)		Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value include attributes of outstanding universal value.
		A.1.3.6 Develop and disseminate widely global standards for site management	KPI.1.3.6 Workshop/ consultancy undertaken to develop global	Consultan	Global standards	Seek extra-budgetary	No funding received. Nevertheless, two

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		and tools for management effectiveness assessments, including risk and catastrophe planning for vulnerable sites.	management standards and tools; standards agreed by States Parties, subsequent voluntary submissions by States Parties and others, with best practice management recognised.	t States Parties World Heritage Centre	adopted at 38 COM (2014)	funding to secure resources and technical support Source donor	manuals on management of World Heritage cultural and natural properties have been prepared by the AB, published and presented to the Committee. In addition, directives and advisory notes prepared by the Advisory Bodies concerning Environmental and/or Heritage Impact Studies and applying to Worldwide Heritage to allow States Parties to identify in advance potential threats of certain projects to the Outstanding Universal Value of their properties are already available online in the Information System on the state of conservation (http://whc.unesco.org /enr/soc) to ensure their widest dissemination
		A.1.3.7 Prepare a thematic report on significant global and regional factors negatively impacting the Outstanding	KPI.1.3.7 Thematic report produced on key threats on an agreed regular	Advisory Bodies	Thematic report	Seek extra-budgetary funding to secure	No funds received. Flemish government

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		Universal Value of the properties, grouped according to the five categories of factors identified in the Periodic Report and any additional threats identified in the reporting process.	basis.	World Heritage Centre	presented at 39 COM (2015)	resources and technical support Source donor	funding has nevertheless permitted, within the framework of an extra-budgetary project, a statistical analysis of factors identified during the reactive monitoring as having a negative impact on World Heritage Properties during 1979 – 2013 (available online in the Information System on the State of Conservation (http://whc.unesco.org/enr/soc).
		A.1.3.8 Develop a four-year cycle for revisions to the *Operational Guidelines.*	KPI.1.3.8 Clarity provided regarding process and timelines for revisions to the *Operational Guidelines.*	World Heritage Committee	Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* during 39 COM (2015)		Four-year cycle put in place, with exceptions (Decision **35 COM 12B,** Paragraph 11)
1.4 Training and research	Capacity needs of communities and agencies to address conservation are met, including those identified through	A.1.4.1 Use the Global Strategy for Capacity Building as a base to develop capacity building sub-strategies by region and sub-region, incorporating needs identified through periodic reporting.	KPI 1.4.1 The Global Strategy of Capacity Building is funded and implemented and fewer capacity needs identified in future Periodic Reporting.	Advisory Bodies	On-going	Seek extra-budgetary funding	On-going implementation of the overall capacity building programme enhancements with extra-budgetary

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
	Periodic Reporting						support.
		A1.4.2 Explore opportunities presented by Category 2 regional centres and new regional funds for capacity building on conservation methods and outcomes.	KPI 1.4.3 As above.	Advisory Bodies World Heritage Centre Category 2 centres	On-going	Additional funding and support necessary with a view to implementation of the World Heritage Programme for capacity building and activities	39 COM requested the Centre and ICCROM to prepare a progress report on the implementation of the World Heritage Strategy for capacity building and activities of Category 2 centres for the 40th Session of the Committee in 2016. (Decision **39 COM 6)**
		A.1.4.3 Consider establishment of a Site Management Network to facilitate exchange and sharing of information on best practice heritage management.	KPI 1.4.3 As above.	Advisory Bodies	On-going	Seek extra-budgetary funding	Benchmarks set for the creation of a network for property management. Several networks are already operational (for example, network of managers of world and/or regional heritage maritime properties developed or enhanced during the 2nd cycle of the Periodic Reporting.)

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
1.5 Mitigation of serious threat	Requirements for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger or World Heritage List are clear and applied consistently	A.1.5.1 The In-Danger listing mechanism is used in conformity with the provision of the *Operational Guidelines* (both for inscription and removal).	KPI 1.5.1 Working group established at the 36 COM; Rules of Procedure revised to forbid a State Party serving on the Committee to take part in the decision following debates on state of conservation reports concerning a property located in its territory.	World Heritage Committee	In place for 37 COM (2013)		Recommendation for the "Desired State of Conservation" adopted (see Decision **37 COM 7A.40**) Revisions of the Rules of Procedure adopted at the 39th COM Session (see Decision **39 COM 5E** concerning the amendment of Article 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure as follows: *"Representatives of a State Party, whether or not a member of the Committee, may be invited by the Chairperson to present their views once the Advisory Bodies have presented their evaluation of the site proposed by the State for inscription. The presentation shall be limited to a clarification or an update on the proposed site. After this permitted time, the State Party may*

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							be allowed to take the floor again, but only in order to answer questions, within a limited time, that have been asked. This provision also applies to other observers mentioned in Rule 8.")
		A.1.5.2 Draft decisions for inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger include a costed program of operations needed, based on the agreed Corrective Measures needed to achieve the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the Danger List (article 11.4 of the *Convention)* and encourage the use of international assistance in meeting these needs.	KPI.1.5.2 Draft decisions on Danger Listing incorporate costed programme of remedial actions for removal from the Danger List; States Parties have clear set of expectations about remedial actions required; programme of remedial actions remains constant; follow up reporting on meeting funding goals; States Parties meet funding gaps.	World Heritage Centre

Advisory Bodies | In place for 37 COM (2013) | Advisory Bodies contracts (WH Funds)

Cost estimates | On-going; requires inclusion into TOR for monitoring missions to properties under threat and in-Danger List; |
| | | A.1.5.3 Clarify criteria/thresholds for in danger listing and for delisting properties in relation to Outstanding Universal Value. | KPI.1.5.3 Decisions to inscribe on the Danger List or remove from World Heritage List are consistent across all States Parties World Heritage sites and clearly documented in relation to threats to Outstanding Universal Value or loss of Outstanding Universal Value. | World Heritage Committee | | | The Committee adopted a Guidance Note on "The Desired State of Conservation" for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger during its 37th Session (Decision **37 COM 7A.40**). |

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		A.1.5.4 Analyse inscribed properties to identify key risks and publish a list of existing guidance on, risk assessment and threat management.	KPI.1.5.4 States Parties are assisted to develop (and use) a list of key risks associated with their properties and guidance to manage serious threats; all existing guidance material distributed through website and other communication channels.	Advisory Bodies World Heritage Centre Category 2 centres	Implemented 38 COM (2014)	Advisory Bodies contracts (WH Fund) Cost estimates	Resource Manuals published and made available on-line including on risks. Directives and advisory notes prepared by the Advisory Bodies concerning Environmental and/or Heritage Impact Studies and applying to Worldwide Heritage are available online in the Information System on the State of Conservation (http://whc.unesco.org/enr/soc) to ensure their widest dissemination.

IV. LINKS BETWEEN THE STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR REPORT	
Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2012-2022	**Summary of activities planned in:** • **Implementation Plan for the Strategic Action Plan (A)** • **Recommendations of the independent audit on the Global Strategy (GS)** **(see documents WHC-15/20 GA/9 and WHC-15/20 GA/12)**
Goal 1: The Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage sites is maintained	
Outcome 1.1 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) are the basis for protection and management:	**A1.1.1:**Reconfirm the primacy of OUV **A1.1.2:**Complete Statements or retrospective statements of OUV for all WH properties **A1.1.3:**Post statements of OUV to the web
Outcome 1.2: Focus monitoring mechanisms and resources on critical conservation issues while allowing States Parties time to implement recommendations	**GS 18/ A1.2.1:** Define monitoring indicators for state of conservation reports, review standard setting exercises and lessons from periodic reporting **A1.2.2:** Create tools to recognise conservation excellence **A1.2.3:** Develop a system to prioritise and select properties for state of conservation reporting **GS 18/ A1.2.4:** Establish a system of proactive monitoring **A1.2.5:** Encourage regular dialogue between States Parties and advisory bodies **GS 18/ A1.2.6:** Encourage advisory body involvement in periodic reporting **A1.2.7:** Enable States Parties reply on upcoming state of conservation reports **A1.2.8:** Implement a 2 year cycle for state of conservation reports **GS 18:** Actively promote best practice exchanges for conservation.
Outcome 1.3: Requirements for conservation of Outstanding Universal Value are implemented transparently and consistently	**GS 15/ A1.3.1:** Develop a global conservation strategy **A1.3.2:** Develop a database of known factors with negative impacts on OUV and existing tools for management **A1.3.3:** Develop guidance on implementation of OG para 172, traditional management and protection mechanisms for setting **A1.3.4:** Confirm degree management systems and legal frameworks need to be in place prior to inscription **A1.3.5:** Inventory listed properties meeting OUV and those that do not **A1.3.6:** Develop standards for site management and tools for

	assessing management effectiveness
	A1.3.7: Prepare a thematic report on major categories of threats identified in the periodic report
	A1.3.8: Develop a 4 year cycle of changes to the Operational Guidelines
Outcome 1.4: Capacity needs of communities and agencies to address conservation are met, including those identified through Periodic Reporting (training and research)	**A1.4.1:** Use the Global Strategy for Capacity Building to develop sub-regional strategies
	A1.4.2: Explore opportunities from Category 2 Centres and regional funds for capacity building
	A1.4.3: Establish a site management network
	GS 16: Prioritise assistance for conservation and management and reinforce training in the field of management and conservation
Outcome 1.5: Requirements for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger or World Heritage List are clear and applied consistently (Mitigation of serious threats)	**GS 20/ A1.5.1:** Use the In Danger List
	A1.5.2: When inscribing on the In Danger List, cost corrective measures and encourage access to international assistance
	A1.5.3: Clarify thresholds for in danger listing and delisting
	A1.5.4: Identify threats to properties and publish guidance on risk assessment and threat management
	GS 13: Delete from the List properties that have irremediably lost their outstanding universal value
	GS 19: Establish a rapid reaction fund for threatened cultural properties
	GS 20: Forbid a Committee member taking part in the decision on state of conservation reports concerning a property located in its territory
Goal 2: The World Heritage List is a credible selection of the most outstanding world's cultural and natural heritage	
Outcome 2.1: Activities under the Global Strategy for representative, balanced, and credible world heritage list reflect agreed priorities and are consistent with the Convention	**GS 1/GS2/GS3/ A2.1.1:** Define the objectives, criteria and monitoring indicators for the Global Strategy and consider the role of sub-regions in achieving the objectives
	A2.1.2: Establish priorities for thematic studies linked to the Global Strategy and identify funding
	A2.1.3: Implement paragraph 59c of the Operational Guidelines
	A2.1.4: Develop approach to sites of OUV beyond state party sovereignty
	GS 9: Continue to diversify Advisory Body experts and fund their travel costs
Outcome 2.2: Inscriptions on the WH List fully meet requirements set out in Operational Guidelines	**GS8/ A2.2.1:** Complete and assess the upstream process pilot projects; develop guidance on tentative lists
	A2.2.2: Encourage States to seek 30 September preliminary advice

	A2.2.3: Registration process to include technical check for completion and check list to indicate whether nomination might meet OUV
	A2.2.4: Develop searchable database of WH and tentative listed sites
	A2.2.5: Develop guidance on comparative analysis, conservation and management, integrity and authenticity
	GS7/A2.2.6: Publicise alternative options for recognition and preservation of sites
	GS 8: Encourage States Parties to update and harmonise tentative lists; consider regional or thematic tentative lists; link Preparatory Assistance for tentative lists to gaps on the WH List; assist States Parties to maintain the values, integrity and authenticity of tentative listed properties with likely OUV.
	GS 17: Review para 115 OGs to oblige a management system for public use; review para 116 of the OGs to make obligatory corrective measures; require a risk and catastrophe management plan.

Goal 3: Heritage protection and conservation considers present and future environmental, societal and economic needs	
Outcome 3.1: Increased consideration of sustainable development through connecting conservation to communities	A3.1.1: Develop methodology for assessing social and economic impact of inscription and strategies for sustainable development investment
	A3.1.2: Develop policy and standards on conservation and sustainable development
	A3.1.3: Develop tools to assist integrate heritage protection into planning processes and on community engagement
	GS 24: Strengthen cooperation between the Convention and UN mechanisms on sustainable development and culture and the environment

Goal 4: World Heritage maintains or enhances its "brand" quality	
Outcome 4.1: World Heritage is widely recognised as the highest standard of heritage and conservation	A4.1.1: Consider an International World Heritage Day
	A4.1.2: Celebrate WH successes
	GS25/ A4.1.3: Publicise best practice examples of heritage protection
	A4.1.4: Develop systems to identify WH insights and experiences
	GS 25: Develop tools to implement Articles 4 to 6 of the Convention; envisage an additional protocol or new thematic conventions
Outcome 4.2: World Heritage value, credibility and quality widely known and understood	A4.2.1: Develop a clear WH brand strategy based on an audit of public perceptions
	A4.2.2: Educate the media on WH objectives and achievements
	A4.2.3: implement activities to promote the 40th anniversary

Goal 5: The Committee can address policy and strategic issues	
Outcome 5.1: Time is allowed to address strategic and policy issues in a consultative and systematic	A5.1.1: Develop searchable database of policy recommendations

manner	**A5.1.2:** Develop "Policy Guidelines"
	A5.1.3: Streamline thematic programs
	A5.1.4: Consider options for greater consultation on policy agenda items
	A5.1.5: Consider advisory body and observer interventions in policy debates
	A5.1.6: Hold 3 regular sessions of the Committee per biennium
	A5.1.7: Clarify rules for membership, terms of reference and status of expert working groups
	GS 4: Strengthen the representation of natural scientific experts within the World Heritage Centre and synergies with other international mechanisms for environmental protection
	GS 5: Consider how to preserve sites of OUV outside of the sovereignty of States
Outcome 5.2: Increased synergy with UNESCO's broader objectives and programmes and other relevant international instruments	**A5.2.1:** Publish examples of heritage based development
	A5.2.2: Promote cooperation between cultural and natural heritage institutions
	GS 23: Establish a convention between UNESCO and other UN institutions to cooperate on World Heritage properties
Goal 6: Decisions of statutory meetings are informed and effectively implemented	
Outcome 6.1: Decisions are informed, consistent and implemented	**A6.1.1:** Develop criteria on decisions for inscription/referral/deferral/right of reply
	A6.1.2: Develop the induction program for Committee members
	A6.1.3: Develop a searchable database of decisions
	A6.1.4: Develop a simple WH procedures manual for Committee members
	A6.1.5: Use standardised text in draft decisions
	A6.1.6: Develop a consultation procedure for technical amendments to decisions
	A6.1.7: Develop an inventory of actions arising from decisions and costs
	A6.1.8: Link state of conservation reports to a searchable database on the property
	GS 11: Ensure experts have a central role in delegations to the Committee, or revise the Convention to clearly recognize its evolving geopolitical nature
	GS 12: Revise the Committee Rules of Procedure to forbid a State Party presenting a nomination during its mandate and taking part in the decision on state of conservation reports of its properties; forbid

	the presentation of signed amendments before the opening of the debate on the nomination of the site; publicise debates and prohibit nominations that do not fulfil the conditions set out in the Operational Guidelines
Outcome 6.2: Reduced workload while maintaining quality	**A6.2.1:** Consider enhancing the role of the Bureau
	A6.2.2: Explore options to manage workloads
	GS6/ A6.2.3: Re-examine the Suzhou decision
	GS10/ A6.2.4: Report on allocation of responsibility between the Centre and the advisory bodies
	A6.2.5: Develop a consolidated annual list of proposed meetings
	GS 14: Limit the period for new nominations after consultation with the Advisory Bodies
Outcome 6.3: Strengthened secretariat support to the Committee :	**A6.3.1:** Review implementation of Audit report on Centre operations
	A6.3.2: Develop an annual calendar of activities and deadlines
Outcome 6.4: Decisions are costed, reporting considers all sources of funding and funding reflects agreed priorities	**A6.4.1:** Develop cost modules for key activities and cost decisions prior to adoption
	A6.4.2: Improve allocation of International Assistance to identified needs
	A6.4.3: Establish a standing budget consultative body
	A6.4.4: Review budgetary allocations and analyse resource and expenditure
	A6.4.5: Link Committee and UNESCO budget cycles
	A6.4.6: Explore ways to increase contributions to the WH Fund and link extra budgetary contributions to Committee priorities
	GS22/A6.4.7: Establish an annual report on extra budgetary contributions to WH properties
	GS 21: Allocate a part of accumulated funds to conservation; estimate the funding needs for the safeguarding of properties in danger; develop a conservation programme for properties requiring assistance from the international community; consider collecting ad hoc resources for conservation through public campaigns.
Outcome 6.5: Actions under the Strategic Action Plan are linked to priorities and available budget and outcomes monitored and reviewed :	**A6.5.1:** Outcomes of the Strategic Action Plan are reported to the GA
	A6.5.2: Centre report to Committee reflects priorities of Strategic Action Plan and is outcomes focused
	A6.5.3: Consider options for oversight and monitoring of Committee and GA

V. DRAFT RESOLUTION

Draft Resolution: **20 GA 12**

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined document WHC-15/20.GA/12,*

2. *Recalling Resolutions **17 GA 9, 18 GA 11** and **19 GA 10** adopted during the 17th (UNESCO, 2009), 18th (UNESCO, 2011) and 19th Sessions (UNESCO, 2013) of the General Assembly of States Parties respectively, concerning the adoption of the Strategic Action Plan and Vision and the monitoring of the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan, including the links between the draft Implementation Plan and monitoring of the implementation plan for the recommendations of the independent evaluation,*

3. *Welcomes the continuous progress in the performance of the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan;*

4. *Requests the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and the support of the States Parties, to pursue efforts undertaken in the implementation;*

5. *Also requests that a progress report on the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan be submitted to the General Assembly for consideration at its 21st session;*