UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
14- 15 November 2017

<u>**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda:**</u> **Future of the *World Heritage Convention*: Outcomes and Progress in the Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan 2012-2022**

9. Future of the *World Heritage Convention*: Outcomes and Progress in the Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan 2012-2022

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 **209 GA 12**, on the progress of the Implementation Plan of the Strategic Action Plan.

<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.   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, at its 19th and 20th sessions, by its Resolution **19 GA 10** and **20 GA 12** welcomed the progress in the performance of the implementation plan of the Strategic Action Plan and requested the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, and with the support of interested States Parties, to 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 20th session, of the six goals and 17 priorities and key outcomes defined in the implementation plan (Item III) and the summary table 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.

6.   A draft Resolution is presented in point V.

III. UP-TO-DATE ACTION PLAN

<div align="center">

STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF

THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION* 2012-2022

</div>

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 (hereinafter referred as 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	The major part of pending retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (hereinafter referred as rSOUVs) adopted further to the Second Cycle of PR (hereinafter refered to as PR). Overall, only 119 rSOUV remain to be adopted by the Committee..

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 regularly uploaded on the webpage for each site, in the two working languages;
1.2 Monitoring Mechanisms	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 (), (see Decision **37 COM 7C**) The Committee systematically requests the establishment of DSOC,with respective monitoring indicators, when it decides to inscribe properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger..
	Focus monitoring mechanism and resources on critical conservation issues while allowing States Parties time to implement recommendations	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	Information about good practices and success stories regularly published on the website, in addition to the specific page on recognition of good practices, (e.g. http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/1557 on the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							restoration of sacred gate of Sidi Yahia in Timbuktu). In addition, the Decision on Item 7 at every Committee session highlights good practices in certain areas, e.g. the links between culture and natural heritage in Decision 41COM 7.
		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 are reviewed annually by the Committee. The system of prioritization and criteria for selection of State of Conservation (hereinafter referred as SOCs) on properties is explained in the introduction of Document 7. Since 2016 the list of SOCs to be reviewed by the Committee are communicated to the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							States Parties at an early stage, approximately 3 months before the session.
		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 and the current situation, in terms of financial and human resources constraints does not allow to envisage the development of a pro-active monitoring system . Proactive monitoring by the States Parties is encouraged. In response to a number of Committee decisions regarding satellite monitoring of World Heritage properties, and to strengthen States parties (Hereinafter referred as SPs') capacity to proactively detect threats, the WHC works with ESA and HIST in developing a project aimed at preserving the UNESCO-designated sites from

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							Space. A side event on this project was organized during the 41st session of the Committee in Krakow. ;
		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 (. A new deadline for submission of SOC reports (1 December) allows for more time for exchange and dialogue with the States Parties. Also, Advisory and Reactive monitoring missions allow for an enhanced dialogue on specific SOC issues. In some cases, funding advisory missions may be allocated from the World Heritage Fund (Decision **38 COM 12**).
		A.1.2.6 National governments encouraged involving ICOMOS and IUCN, including their regional structures, in process of preparing response to periodic reporting.	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	States Parties World Heritage	On-going	Additional funding necessary	During the 2nd cycle of PR, more than 30 workshops dedicated to PR took place

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		Involvement includes Periodic Reporting training and information provision.	Parties and Advisory Bodies.	Centre Local/regional UICN/ ICOMOS committees Category 2 centres			Further to the Reflection Period (2015-2017) and the recommendations for the Third cycle, the PR exercise should become a State-Party driven exercise, with only overall coordination and general guidance provided or produced by WHC. (see document WHC-17/41.COM/10A)
		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 concerning the state of conservation of a property, by the Committee or the World Heritage Centre. Reactive monitoring mission reports are shared with States Parties before being made public, with a 2-weeks deadline to provide feedback about possible inaccuracies. No information received from 3rd

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							parties is included in the SOC reports, before being shared with the SP.

The 1 December deadline for submission of SOC reports by SP allows for a more ample time for exchange and dialogue with SPs.

A trend is noted that SP send SOC-related information at a very late stage , sometimes a few days before a COM session, which does not facilitate the processing of the information and decision-making by COM.

T |

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 since 2011 (Decision **35 COM 12B**) (except for sites on the List of WH in Danger, urgent cases and potential danger listing). A certain tendency of increasing percentage of sites reverting to a 1-year cycle is noted (due to emergencies etc.);
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 provided
		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 established and regularly updated http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc); with practical guidance and manuals. Analysis of threats produced 1978-2013. Extrabudgetary funding sought for further update of the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							analysis.
	Requirements for conservation of Outstanding Universal Value are implemented transparently and consistently.	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	Decision 39 COM 7 highlighted importance of EIA and HIA and called on the States Parties to fund the further reflection and development of further guidance tools. Webpage on HIA/EIA on the WHC established Resource manuals, as well as the SOC system and Document 7 include guidance on global conservation issues .
		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**), hence no property can be inscribed without a management plan.
		A.1.3.5 Provide an inventory on the	KPI.1.3.5 Details of missing	World	Inventory		The major part of

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		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.	attributes/element of Outstanding Universal Value are voluntarily submitted by States Parties for consideration of remedial actions.	Heritage Centre	linked to indicators established for 38 COM (2014)		Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (including rSOUV) include attributes of outstanding universal value. A special focus on attributes is included in the revised PR questionnaire for the Third cycle.
		A.1.3.6 Develop and disseminate widely global standards for site management and tools for management effectiveness assessments, including risk and catastrophe planning for vulnerable sites.	KPI.1.3.6 Workshop/ consultancy undertaken to develop global management standards and tools; standards agreed by States Parties, subsequent voluntary submissions by States Parties and others, with best practice management recognised.	Consultant States Parties World Heritage Centre	Global standards adopted at 38 COM (2014)	Seek extra-budgetary funding to secure resources and technical support Source donor	Manuals on management of World Heritage cultural and natural properties prepared and published, and a joint one is under preparation, highlighting the links culture/nature. The revised PR questionnaire also draws the attention of SP to the management effectiveness assessment.
		A.1.3.7 Prepare a thematic report on significant global and regional factors negatively impacting the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties, grouped according to the five categories	KPI.1.3.7 Thematic report produced on key threats on an agreed regular basis.	Advisory Bodies World Heritage	Thematic report presented at 39 COM	Seek extra-budgetary funding to secure resources and	Thanks to the extrabudgetary funding of the Flemish

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		of factors identified in the Periodic Report and any additional threats identified in the reporting process.		Centre	(2015)	technical support Source donor	government a statistical analysis of factors having a negative impact on World Heritage Properties for the period 1979 – 2013 was undertaken (available online in the Information System on the SOC (http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc).Fund-raising efforts are currently made to obtain funding to update the analysis for the period following 2013.
		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 some exceptions (Decision **35 COM 12B,** Paragraph 11). Last major revision took place at 39COM.
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	Progress reports on the activities of Category 2 Centres including capacity building, are presented to each COM session in Document 6. Many Category 2 Centre are actively involved in capacity-building and further encouraged to do so by the Committee.;.
		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	Several networks are already operational (e.g.network of site managers of marine World Heritage properties). Regional associations under way; . Extra-budgetary funding provided by Norway for a 5-year World Heritage Leadership project (implemented by ICCROM and IUCN in collaboration with ICOMOS and WHC) the target audience of which is primarily site

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							managers. A first global Site Managers Forum was organised by Poland in the margins of the 41 session of the Committee). An extra-budgetary project was prepared and funding is actively sought for the creation of a global site managers network, through the Marketplace for World Heritage, http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/914/ .
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**) The Rules of Procedure amended at 39 COM. Focused effots made to showcase the benefits of Danger Listing to SP, including at Orientation sessions. An extrabudgetary project in this regard

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							is on the Marketplace (http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/912)/
		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; Recognized by the ad hoc working group and Committee (hereinafter referred as COM) and is now part of the Roadmap for sustainability endorsed by 41 COM. (41 COM 14)
		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	World Heritage Committee			Guidance Note on "The Desired State of Conservation" for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger adopted at the 37th Session (Decision **37**

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
			Universal Value.				**COM 7A.40**). Draft Decisions for removal of properties from the List of WH in Danger based on precise scientific and technical evidence.
		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. Guidance and advisory notes available on the website and the Advisory Bodies websites. The Information System on the State of Conservation (http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc) is a crucial tool in this regard.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
World Heritage Goal 2: The World Heritage List is a credible, selection of the world's most outstanding cultural and natural heritage							
2.1 Strategy for representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List	Activities under the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List reflect agreed priorities and are consistent with the *Convention*	A.2.1.1 Define and disseminate widely the objectives for the Global Strategy consistent with the objectives of the *World Heritage Convention* and based on evaluation of successes and continuing challenges of 1994 Global Strategy - Establish criteria and monitoring indicators for the Global Strategy to assess nature and causes of major gaps -Establish effective analytical frameworks and statistics to allow understanding of how sub-regions might contribute to the Global Strategy.	KPI 2.1.1 Objectives, criteria and monitoring indicators developed through States Parties submissions for consideration by Committee; World Heritage Centre reporting on implementation of the Global Strategy through criteria and monitoring indicators; reporting on effectiveness sub-region in meeting the Global Strategy through the analytical frameworks and statistics.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Objectives, criteria and indicators considered at 38 COM (2014) Reporting framework considered at the 39 COM (2015)	USD 100,000	No specific funding received. As foreseen in the Operational Guidelines (hereinafter refered to as OGs), the review of Suzhou-Cairns Decision (para 61 of OGs) took place in 2015 and 2016 and a decision to reduce the maximum nominations per year to 35 as well as to reduce the maximum by country to 1, was adopted unanimously in 2016; ;
		A.2.1.2 Establish priorities for thematic studies and initiatives linked to the Global Strategy and identify additional resources for their completion, publication and	KPI 2.1.2 Thematic studies identified, produced and fully funded on priority topics.	Advisory Bodies	Thematic Studies priorities identified for consideratio	USD 60,000 per thematic study	A thematic study on interpretation of memory sites and another on criterion

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		dissemination.			n at 39 COM (2015)		VI are under way.;
		A.2.1.3 Encourage States Parties whose heritage is already well represented on the World Heritage List to consider supporting a nomination with one presented by a State Party whose heritage is unrepresented or under-represented, as foreseen in paragraph 59c of the *Operational Guidelines*.	KPI 2.1.3 Increased number of linked nominations between well and less represented States Parties.	States Parties	On-going	Various	On-going;
		A.2.1.4 Develop options for means to preserve sites that are outside of the sovereignty of States Parties responding to the conditions of Outstanding Universal Value.	KPI 2.1.4 Submissions received and paper prepared for discussion by Committee on options for protecting sites outside the sovereignty of States Parties.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Options considered by 38 COM (2014)	Seek extra-budgetary funding	On-going (.the 2016 WH Paper series publication on World Heritage in High Seas);
2.2 Nominations	Inscriptions on the World Heritage List fully meet requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines*	A.2.2.1 Complete and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the 'upstream processes' pilot projects, with a view to continuing and expanding the program of work; consider the development of guidance to assist and encourage States Parties to formulate, and prioritise tentative lists through community engagement, and harmonise lists in sub-regions.	KPI 2.2.1 Assessment of upstream pilot projects completed and used to inform possible extension of the program; Guidance on tentative lists published on web; States Parties and others encouraged to submit case studies, with best recognised by Committee; Submissions received on tentative list prioritisation and options published on web.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Assessment of pilot Upstream projects considered at 40 COM (2016), with Tentative List revisions considered at 42 COM (2018)	Seek extra-budgetary funding	On-going. Consultation of States Parties in 2016/2017 and new modalities agreed by COM; y;
		A.2.2.2 Disseminate widely the benefits of States Parties undergoing the 30 September preliminary advice stage (before year 1) and the requirements to pass the technical/completeness check stage before nominations proceed to Advisory Bodies for assessment.	KPI 2.2.2 Reduction in nominations that do not meet all requirements of *Operational Guidelines*, proceeding to evaluation by Committee. States Parties expect that the nomination process will take 2.5 years, not 1.5.	World Heritage Centre Operational Guidelines working group	Revisions to *Operational Guidelines* considered at 38 COM (2014)	Staff time	Due to positive experience with preliminary review if nominations, an increasing number of nominations (appr. 80-85%) are submitted for

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							preliminary review, .
2.2 Nominations (cont)	Inscriptions on the World Heritage List fully meet requirements set out in the Operational Guidelines (cont)	A.2.2.3 Upgrade registration process (between 1 Feb and 1 March year 1) to include both technical check for completeness and to indicate whether prima facie all elements of justification of Outstanding Universal Value are met, including those where judgement is required E.g. check list to indicate whether nomination compares each claim to Outstanding Universal Value against all sites on World Heritage List, Tentative Lists and other obvious sites; that all elements of protection and management are articulated. Nominations that do not meet all elements not permitted to proceed further.	KPI 2.2.3 All inscribed properties demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value in line with criteria for inscription and comply with integrity/authenticity, protection and management requirements, as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*.	World Heritage Centre Operational Guidelines working group	Revisions to *Operational Guidelines* considered at 38 COM (2014)	Staff time	Enhanced review of draft nominations, in terms of completeness and justification of OUV contributing to better prepared and complete nominations;
		A.2.2.4 Develop a web database of sites on World Heritage and Tentative List searchable by theme, place, size, time on in danger lists and other characteristics to assist States Parties in development of Tentative Lists and nominations	KPI 2.2.4 Searchable database of World Heritage and Tentative List sites available on web.	World Heritage Centre	Database operational by December 2015	Staff time	On-going improvements for "advanced search" function;
		A.2.2.5 Develop and disseminate widely guidance on comparative analysis, conservation and management, integrity and authenticity, including through publication of best practice examples.	KPI 2.2.5 Guidance on preparation of nomination developed and published on web; States Parties use nomination advice.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Guidance on nominations considered at 38 COM (2014)	Seek extra-budgetary funding	Resource Manual for the preparation of World Heritage nominations published and online http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/643/ and best practices received from States Parties

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							published online http://whc.unesco.org/en/recognition-of-best-practices/
		A.2.2.6 Publicise alternative options for recognition and preservation of sites that may not meet the standards of Outstanding Universal Value at the regional level or by themes.	KPI 2.2.6 State Parties aware of options for recognition beyond World Heritage.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	On-going (including cooperation with other Conventions and programmes through Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) and Cultural Conventions Liaison **Group** CCLG);

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
WORLD HERITAGE GOAL 3: Heritage protection and conservation considers present and future environmental, societal and economic needs							
3.1 Sustainable development	Increased consideration of sustainable development through connecting	A.3.1.1 Develop methodology for assessing and evaluating social and economic impact of inscription on World Heritage List and strategies for sustainable development investment for communities before	KPI 3.1.1 State Parties undertaking studies on World Heritage impact and publish on web. Cost, benefit analysis undertaken to provide greater understanding of the pre-	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Methodology considered at 37 COM	$30,000	The World Heritage Sustainable Development policy adopted in 2015, widely disseminated and consistently

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
	conservation to communities	and after inscription.	conditions for potential economic and social value of inscription and conservation for communities.		(2013)		being mainstreamed by WHC in policies and activities. States Parties encouraged to mainstream in their respective policies and frameworks, and in management of WH sites;
		A.3.1.2 Develop clear policy, including standards on conservation and sustainable development, drawing on Rio+20 outcomes.	KPI 3.1.2 Individual States Parties have policies on conservation and sustainable development which are shared through World Heritage website; standards defined, evaluated and adopted.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Policy considered at 37 COM (2013)	$30,000	The WH _SD Policy adopted and the Policy Guidelines (which will include all SD aspects) currently in preparation;
		A.3.1.3 Develop tools to guide States Parties in integrating heritage protection into planning processes and on effective community engagement, especially in World Heritage sites where there is traditional land ownership and management.	KPI 3.1.3 Submissions sought on tools in use by State Parties on heritage and planning and community engagement. Consultant engaged to develop tools in specific priority areas, particularly those vulnerable to threats from unregulated development.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Tools considered at 37 COM (2013)	$30,000	No specific funding received; but several workshops on 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urbanhave taken place as well as the workshop on World Heritage and sustainable development in Africa (Arusha, 2016 Tanzania) ;;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
WORLD HERITAGE GOAL 4: World Heritage maintains or enhances its brand quality							
4.1 Awareness raising	World Heritage is widely recognised as the highest standard of heritage and conservation	A.4.1.1 Consider further the implications of and possible timing for an International World Heritage Day for raising awareness on World Heritage.	KPI 4.1.1 Submissions received on options for International World Heritage Day.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Options considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	Consultations on-going. African World Heritage Day (5 May), approved by the 38GC in 2015, in view of awareness-raising on the conservation of heritage
		A.4.1.2 Subject to funds, organise exhibitions celebrating World Heritage successes e.g. a tribute to Egyptologist Christiane Desroche-Noblecourt and her role in saving the Nubian Temples in 1959.	KPI 4.1.2 World Heritage successes identified and funds found to hold exhibitions.	States Parties	On-going	Seek extra-budgetary funding	No funding received, but exhibitions regularly organized in cooperation with States Parties and in the framework of WH partnerships;
		A.4.1.3 Publicise best practice examples of heritage protection, showcasing World Heritage properties as best practice for heritage protection.	KPI 4.1.3 Submissions sought from State Parties and others, with annual recognition of best practice heritage protection examples by Committee; information received remains on web.	World Heritage Centre States Parties	On-going	Staff time Seek extra-budgetary funding	Best practice dissemination enhanced through: (1) best practice recognition at Kyoto - 40th anniversary event 2012; (2) Online publishing of best practices; (3) Focus in WH Review Nr 67 (May 2013) and (4) publication "World Heritage Beyond Borders" (UNESCO/Cambridge University Press). Also regularly featured in the quarterly magazine WH Review;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		A.4.1.4 Develop systems to identify and assist the adoption of World Heritage insights and experiences.	KPI 4.1.4 As above.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Seek extra-budgetary funding	On-going, no specific funding received;
r	World Heritage value, credibility and quality widely known and understood	A.4.2.1 Develop a clear brand strategy for World Heritage, including the use of the World Heritage Emblem, based on an audit of public perceptions of World Heritage and linked to PACT.	KPI 4.2.1 Encourage individual State Parties to undertake audit of public perceptions of World Heritage to enable brand focussed approach at national level; develop Brand Strategy to enable capture of value from global value of brand.	World Heritage Centre Brand consultant States Parties	Brand Strategy considered at 37 COM (2013)	$100,000	No funding. Discussions initiated with ERI and ouside partners on licensing WH brand. Legal counsel to be sought. Joint branding strategy for UNESCO's multiple brands across all programmes discussed
		A.4.2.2 Media briefing by Chair on World Heritage objectives and achievements prior to statutory sessions and capacity building sessions held for journalists on World Heritage.	KPI 4.2.2 Increased and accurate media reporting on World Heritage – via a media portal. Media monitoring undertaken, and responses made when appropriate.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Briefing for Chair provided and media information organized; on-going monitoring of media reports including statistical analysis;
		A.4.2.3 Develop, support and carry out activities to promote the 40th anniversary.	KPI 4.2.3 States Parties report on activities to World Heritage Centre and published on web.	States Parties	By December 2012	Various	Done

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
**WORLD HERITAGE GOAL 5:** The Committee can address policy and strategic issues	
5.1 Inclusive and systematic policy development	Time is allowed to address strategic and policy issues in a consultative and systematic manner	A.5.1.1 Collect all policy recommendations from Committee or General Assembly together on web in searchable format and identify gaps.	KPI 5.1.1 Initial collection of policy guidance searchable on web.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Existing policy guidance on web by end 2014	Staff time	Document on Policy Guidelines presented to 37 COM; see Decision **37 COM 13;** A scoping study on feasibility of Policy Guidelines presented at 40 COM, first draft of assembled policies to be presented at 42 COM;
		A.5.1.2 Develop 'Policy Guidelines' (similar format to the *Operational Guidelines*) by drawing on policy database and separating out the policy elements of *Operational Guidelines* into new structure.	KPI 5.1.2 Policy guidelines developed and policy elements removed from *Operational Guidelines*.	Consultant Operational/Policy Guidelines working group	Revisions to *Operational Guidelines*/policy guidelines considered at 39 COM (2015)	$80,000	In process, extrabudgetary funding received from Australia;;
		A.5.1.3 Streamline thematic programs in accordance with needs identified in Periodic Reporting.	KPI. 5.1.3 Fewer thematic programmes focus on agreed priorities and are effective and sustained.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Report on thematic programmes presented at 40COM and another foreseen for 42 COM. Thematic programmes streamlined and some phased out as objectives achieved ;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		A.5.1.4 Consider options for the greater use of Consultative Groups during Committee sessions or the recognition of requests for interventions from non-members of the Committee on policy agenda items, at the discretion of the Chair.	KPI.5.1.4 Committee considers options for greater consultation on policy issues.	World Heritage Committee	On-going	Staff time	On-going (at 37 COM two consultative bodies established; Budget and Operational Guidelines as well as intersessional group created)
		A.5.1.5 Consider options for Advisory Body and Observer interventions in policy debates at the Committee and General Assembly.	KPI. 5.1.5 Advisory Body and Observer interventions are reflected in decision documents.	World Heritage Committee	On-going	Staff time	On-going
		A.5.1.6 Subject to funds, hold three regular (not extended) sessions of the Committee each biennium, including each odd year at UNESCO Headquarters immediately after the General Assembly.	KPI.5.1.6 Funds are found to hold three regular sessions of the Committee each biennium.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	WHF/Regular Programme/ Host country Cost estimate	Not feasible due to financial constraints ;
		A.5.1.7 Clarify rules of membership, terms of reference and the status of reports of expert working groups.	KPI.5.1.7 Rules and status of expert working groups clarified.	Operational Guidelines working group	Operational Guidelines revisions considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	All expert groups reported in Secretariat's report at each session; no revisions to Operational Guidelines on this item;
5.2 Coordination with related instruments	Increased synergy with UNESCO's broader objectives and programmes and other relevant	A.5.2.1 States Parties submit examples of heritage based development for publication on the web to illustrate linkages between heritage and the larger context of	KPI 5.2.1 Recognition of best practice heritage based development at each session of the Committee.	States Parties	On-going	Staff time	Recognition of best practice at Kyoto event (November 2012);

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
	international instruments	national capacity building.					
		A.5.2.2 Establish and promote cooperation and understanding between cultural and natural heritage institutions, including those responsible for UNESCO programme implementation, economy, finance, regional development/planning, tourism and social welfare.	KPI 5.2.2 Secretariat report under item 5B continues to report cooperation between national heritage and other institutions.	UNESCO World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	On-going cooperation and enhanced synergies with other Conventions and programmes (reported to each COM session under Secretariat report see Decision 41 COM 5A). States Parties encouraged (including through PR questionnaire) to enhance collaboration between cultural and natural institutions;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
WORLD HERITAGE GOAL 6: Decisions of statutory meetings are informed and effectively implemented							
6.1 Decision making	Decisions are informed, consistent and implemented	A.6.1.1 Develop and disseminate clear and consistent criteria for decisions on inscriptions/ referrals/ deferrals and right of reply.	KPI.6.1.1 Trend up on consistency of decisions.	Operational Guidelines working group	*Operational Guidelines* revisions considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	Referral/Deferral options reported to 36 and 37 COM; no revisions to OG; enhanced awareness-raising for Committee members at Orientation sessions;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		A.6.1.2 Develop further the induction programme for Committee members.	KPI.6.1. 2 Committee members are better informed of processes and procedures.	Advisory Bodies	On-going	Staff time	Since 2013: at least two Orientation Sessions for Committee members held annually;
		A.6.1.3 Develop a searchable database of decisions and test it for ease of use.	KPI.6.1.3 Database search tool developed and a trend up on use of database. Targeted user testing undertaking in all regions and subregions.	World Heritage Centre	Database tested by December 2014	Staff time	On-going database improvements;
		A.6.1.4 Develop a manual explaining key procedures e.g. nominations, state of conservation, voting, provision of documents.	KPI.6.1.4 Committee members are better informed of processes and procedures.	World Heritage Centre	Manual considered at 37 COM (2013)	$30,000	No funding received but done through Orientation Sessions;
		A.6.1.5 Develop and use standard, concise text in draft decisions, focused on priority *Convention* issues and implementation.	KPI.6.1.5 Trend up on consistency of decisions.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Standard drafting available;
		A.6.1.6 Develop a procedure enabling consultation of secretariat and Advisory Bodies on technical or *Operational Guidelines* implications of amendments to draft decisions.	KPI.6.1.6 Decisions are consistent with *Operational Guidelines.*	World Heritage Committee	Revisions to *Rules of Procedures* considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	No such procedure was integrated in the *Rules of Procedure*. However, the current practice enables the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to provide comments on technical or Operational Guidelines implications of

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							amendments to draft decisions.
		A.6.1.7 Develop and distribute to members an inventory of actions arising from Committee meetings and the costs associated with implementation.	KPI.6.1.7 Implementation of decisions is monitored and budget implications considered.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	On-going implementation (e.g. for all monitoring missions) and follow-up on Decisions reported in Secretariat's report;
		A.6.1.8 Link state of conservation reports to an integrated online database compiling all relevant background information concerning the property necessary for well-informed decision-making	KPI.6.1.8 Decisions are consistent and well informed.	World Heritage Centre	Database established by December 2016	Staff time	On-going implementation through State of Conservation Information System
6.2 Workload	Reduced workload while maintaining quality	A.6.2.1 Consider options to enhance the role of the Bureau (without assuming a decision-making role or increasing meeting time).	KPI 6.2.1 Committee work facilitated by Bureau.	World Heritage Centre	Options for Bureau considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	On-going: Bureau meets regularly every day at COM sessions to facilitate work;
		A.6.2.2 Review working methods of other conventions and explore options to manage workloads, including prioritisation, secret ballots and sub-committees.	KPI 6.2.2 Submissions on working methods of other conventions.	World Heritage Centre	Working methods considered at 38 COM (2014)	Staff time	On-going; a comparative study undertaken concerning certain aspects of work by other conventions and programmes (namely advisory services related to nominations, international assistance etc.)

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		A.6.2.3 Re-examine the Suzhou Decision.	KPI. 6.2.3 Paper to Committee on purpose and evolution of the Suzhou decision.	World Heritage Centre	Suzhou paper considered at 38 COM (2014)	Staff time	Review and revision of the Operational Guidelines in 2016 (further to Paragraph 61);
		A.6.2.4 Report on actions arising from the Committee includes allocation of responsibility between World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in accordance with roles outlined in the *Operational Guidelines.*	KPI.6.2.4 Greater consistency with *Operational Guidelines* of roles and responsibilities between World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	On-going	Staff time	On-going and regularly reported to the COM.;
		A.6.2.5 Develop and distribute widely a consolidated annual list of proposed meetings to assess priorities and available human and financial resources.	KPI.6.2.5 Non-statutory meetings prioritised.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Done in Secretariat report (Annex) since 36 COM;
6.3 Secretariat support	Strengthened secretariat support to the Committee	A.6.3.1 Review implementation status of Audit Report on operations of World Heritage Centre	KPI.6.3.1 Audit Report recommendations fully implemented.	World Heritage Centre	Audit implementation status considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	Done
		A.6.3.2 Develop and publish an annual calendar of activities and deadlines for the implementation of the Convention, resolving any anomalies.	KPI 6.3.2 Annual calendar published.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	On-going	Staff time	Annual calendar reviewed at Advisory Body meetings; List of events included in Annex to Secretariat's report;
6.4 Budget	Decisions are costed, reporting considers all	A.6.4.1 Develop cost modules for key activities and cost decisions and assess workload implications	KPI.6.4.1 Key decisions are costed before adoption.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	On-going (e.g. monitoring

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
	sources of funding and funding reflects agreed priorities	of decisions prior to adoption.		Advisory Bodies Standing Budget Consultative committee			missions)
		A.6.4.2 Consider means to improve the allocation of International Assistance to identified needs.	KPI.6.4.2 International Assistance targets identified needs (trend up) through supporting conservation priorities identified through state of conservation reporting and Periodic Reporting cycles. States Parties assisted in application process if necessary.	World Heritage Centre	International Assistance approach/ priorities considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	Priorities established and adopted for Operational Guidelines (see Decision 36 COM 13.I);
		A.6.4.3 Establish a standing consultative body for review of the Committee's biennial budget.	KPI.6.4.3 Standing Budget consultative committee established and operating.	World Heritage Committee	On-going	Staff time	Done
		A.6.4.4 Review budgetary allocations and analyse resource and expenditure patterns.	KPI.6.4.4 Reporting on finance considers the full picture of funding the work of the Convention from all sources.	World Heritage Centre Standing Budget consultative committee	On-going	Staff time	On-going and reported in budget document at each COM session;
		A.6.4.5 Link Committee and UNESCO budget cycles to ensure all statutory functions are fully funded by the regular budget.	KPI.6.4.5 Statutory functions fully funded by regular budget.	UNESCO World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Not fully funded due to financial constraints;
		A.6.4.6 Explore ways to increase contributions to the WHF and develop a fundraising strategy which considers means to link extra-budgetary contributions to Committee priorities.	KPI.6.4.6 Increased contribution of private sponsorship to target priorities.	Consultant	Fundraising strategy considered at 38 COM (2014)	$50,000	Options considered and a roadmap for improving the sustainability of the Fund adopted at 40CO;; Markeplace launched in 2017

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							The Partnerships for Conservation fund-raising strategy (adopted at 36 COM) to be further developed.;;
		A.6.4.7 Establish an annual report on the extra-budgetary funds benefiting World Heritage properties.	KPI. 6.4.7 Reports on extra-budgetary funds benefitting World Heritage included in budget materials supplied by World Heritage Centre to World Heritage Committee and General Assembly.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	On-going reporting;
6.5 Implementation Plan	Actions under the Strategic Action Plan are linked to priorities and available budget and outcomes monitored and reviewed	A.6.5.1 Outcomes under Strategic Action plan are reported to General Assembly State Parties.	KPI 6.5.1 Actions associated with priority policy issues are implemented.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Done
		A.6.5.2 World Heritage Centre annual report to Committee reflects priorities of the Strategic Action Plan and reports against outcomes/results rather than activities.	KPI 6.5.2 World Heritage Centre annual report focuses on results.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Done
		A.6.5.3 Present a study on options for oversight and monitoring mechanisms for the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention.	KPI 6.5.3 Actions associated with priority policy issues are implemented.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Options for monitoring of implementation considered at 38 COM (2014)	$50,000	No funding received

V.   DRAFT RESOLUTION

Draft Resolution: 21 GA 9

The General Assembly,

1.   *Having examined document WHC-17/21.GA/9,*

2.   *Recalling Resolutions **17 GA 9**, **18 GA 11, 19 GA 10 and 20 GA 12** adopted during the 17th (UNESCO, 2009), 18th (UNESCO, 2011),19th (UNESCO, 2013) and 20th   (UNESCO, 2015) sessions 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,*

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 22nd ᵗsession;*