1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

• Germany

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

532ter

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1990, 1992, 1999

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin	52.4 / 13.033	2064	0	2064	1990
Total (ha)		2064	0	2064	

Comment

Size of Buffer zone: overall 6632 ha (5308 ha Bufferzone in Potsdam, 1324 ha Buffer zone in Berlin)

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin	20/12/2005	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

 Birgitta Ringbeck Auswärtiges Amt National World Heritage Focal Point Referat 603-9 Multilaterale Kultur- und Medienpolitik

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

• Uwe Koch

Monument Protection Division of the Ministry of Science, Research and Culture of Land Brandenburg (Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kultur des Landes Brandenburg, Referat für Denkmalschutz)

• Stefan Mieth

Comment

Ministry of Science, Research and Culture of Land Brandenburg (Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kultur des Landes Brandenburg, Referat für Denkmalschutz) Uwe Koch Dortustr. 36 14476 Potsdam; Prussian Palaces and Gardens Foundation Berlin-Brandenburg (Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (SPSG) Generaldirektion Gabriele Horn Postfach 60 14 62 14471 Potsdam; Potsdam City Administration (Landeshauptstadt Potsdam) Ramona Dornbusch Hegelallee 6-10 14467 Potsdam

Section II-Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- 1. <u>View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage</u> <u>collection</u>
- 2. <u>Schlösser und Parks von Potsdam-Sanssouci und</u> <u>Berlin (Glienicke und Pfaueninsel) (Deutsche</u> <u>UNESCO-Kommission - german only)</u>
- 3. Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin
- 4. <u>Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin</u> (Cartographic Information System on European Affairs) (EUROCIS)
- 5. Die offiziellen Seiten der Stadtverwaltung Potsdam
- 6. <u>UNESCO Commission of Germany</u>

Comment

Nr. 5 Die offiziellen Seiten der Stadtverwaltung Potsdam: http://www.potsdam.de/cms/beitrag/10000075/33994/; Nr. 7 Prussian Palaces and Gardens Foundation Berlin-Brandenburg: http://www.spsg.de

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed (i)(ii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name					Impa	act		0	rigin
3.1	Buildings and Dev	velopment								
3.1.5	Interpretative and v	visitation facilities				\odot		9	4	
3.7	Local conditions	affecting physical fabric	;							•
3.7.8	Micro-organisms						0		9	9
3.8	Social/cultural us	es of heritage				•				
3.8.2	Society's valuing o	f heritage				\odot		9	4	
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism	/ visitor / recreation				\odot		9	4	
3.10	Climate change a	nd severe weather even	ts							•
3.10.1	Storms								9	
3.12	Invasive/alien spe	ecies or hyper-abundant	species			•				
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terre	estrial species					0		9	. 3
3.13	Management and	institutional factors				•				
3.13.1	Low impact resear	ch / monitoring activities				\odot		9	4	
3.13.2	High impact resear	rch / monitoring activities				\odot		9	6) (S
3.13.3	Management activi	ities				\odot		9	4	
Legend	Current	Potential	Regative	Positive	Inside		C	Outs	ide	

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

No factor is both current and negative.

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

The extension of the UNESCO-WHS should include further Prussian palaces with their adjoining buildings, parks, and surroundings in the German Länder Berlin and Brandenburg. All palaces and parks are property of the Prussian Palaces and Gardens Foundation Berlin-Brandenburg (Berlin, Königs Wusterhausen, Caputh, Rheinsberg, Paretz, Potsdam-Stern, Steam Engine House "so-called Mosque" in Potsdam). They are strongly connected with the art-history, building-history, and garden-history of Prussia.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: <u>Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006)</u> Submitted on Tuesday, October 18, 2005

Question 6.02
Planning autonomy is exercised with development

planning instruments. The legal basis is provided first and foremost by the Federal Building Code (Baugesetzbuch) of the Federal Republic of Germany and the zoning ordinance (Baunutzungsverordnung).

Land Use Plan (Flächennutzungsplan) This plan regulates the planned land requirements for individual uses (for example, residential, labour, transport). The requirements of protecting the World Heritage site in Potsdam are taken into account.

Local Plan (Bebauungsplan)

This plan establishes the type and scope of building, the pieces of land which can be built on, as well as traffic space. The requirements of protecting the World Heritage site in Potsdam are taken into account.

Green Regulation Plan (Grünordnungsplan) This is landscape planning's contribution to the Local Plan. The objectives of landscape planning are laid down at the level of binding development planning. The requirements of protecting the

World Heritage site in Potsdam are taken into account. Law on the Protection of Monuments (Denkmalschutzgesetz) In 1996, a Statute on Conservation Areas to protect the World Heritage in Potsdam was issued

(Denkmalbereichssatzung). This Statute was based on the Brandenburg Law on the Protection of Monuments (Brandenburgisches Denkmalschutzgesetz) and is a legal instrument for authorizing or denying changes to buildings within the Statute area in line with legislation on monuments.

See Annex 4: EU Directive on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora; Landscape protection area: Düppeler Forest.

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2 Source: <u>Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006)</u> Submitted on Tuesday, October 18, 2005

Question 5.04 Plans in place to set up a "steering group: While working on this Periodic Reporting, it was agreed to set up a Steering Group for both Berlin and Brandenburg to meet regularly and bring together the stakeholders (Monument Protection Division of the Ministry of Science, Research and Culture of Land Brandenburg, as the Supreme Authority for the Conservation of Monuments, Berlin Senate Department for Urban Development as the Supreme Authority for the Conservation of Monuments). In December 1999, the Land capital Potsdam and the Berlin-Brandenburg Foundation of Prussian Palaces and Gardens agreed on close cooperation in the following fields: 1. Projects and/or problems relating to urban development in areas surrounding the World Heritage site with a direct or indirect impact on the site; 2. Transport planning; 3. Recreation close to the World Heritage site; 4. Issues relating to monument protection in the area of the World Heritage site; 5. Implementing order and security in and around the Foundation properties; 6. Attracting investors and sponsors for the restoration of buildings; 7. Using properties and buildings for public cultural events; 8. Organizing cultural events radiating beyond the region; 9. Promoting tourism and improving the necessary infrastructure; 10. Preparing and organizing receptions and prestigious events in line with the Foundation's regulations on allocation and on the occasion of visits of guests of honour; 11. City marketing.

• Question 5.05

Overall management system of the site

- Management under protective legislation
- Management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party
- Other effective management system

Aforementioned agreement between the City of Potsdam and the Berlin-Brandenburg Foundation of Prussian Palaces and Gardens

Comment

Supplement: The "Town Planning Situation/Planning Intentions" paragraphs of the nomination lay considerable emphasis on the plans for Potsdam's environmental planning (Leitplanung für die städtebauliche Entwicklung der Umgebungsbereiche der Welterbestätte Potsdam, so-called Leitplanung) which was drawn up in 1998/1999. The final environmental planning plans (Leitplanung) were passed by city councillor in 2005 and are subject of continuous improvement, at least in 2012. A contract about the buffer zone for the World Heritage Site on the territory of the town of Potsdam was signed on January 26 in 2011 by the federal state of Brandenburg, the City of Potsdam, the State Office of preservation of historical monuments and the Prussian Palaces and Gardens Foundation Berlin-Brandenburg to ensure the lasting protection and sustained preservation of the visual and structural integrity of the property and its immediate surroundings. A declaration in respect of the buffer zone for the World Heritage Site on the territory of the federal capital Berlin was signed on 24 November 2004.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ? The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented? The management system is being **fully** implemented and

monitored

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Non-existent
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Fair

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property,

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0,5%
Governmental (National / Federal)	25%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	40%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	2%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	7%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	15%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	2%
Other grants	9%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
International summer training course: "Conservation and Management of the World Heritage sites" (Palaces and Parks of Potsdam)	1994	20000.00	Ð
Total		20000	

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the mediumterm and planning is underway to secure funding in the longterm

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are adequate equipment and facilities

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained? Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	80%
Part-time	20%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	80%
Seasonal	20%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	80%
Volunteer	20%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

Human resources are adequate for management needs

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

Section II-Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or

recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive**, integrated programme of **research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property? In many locations and easily visible to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Adequate
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected, and makes **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive**, **integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Excellent
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Average
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is complete

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below) Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

No factor is both current and negative.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Bo	4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones				
		Actions		Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	As a result of the Periodic reporting, the proposal for a modification of the boundaries of the World heritage property could be submitted in 2016/2017.	2016/2017	Federal State of Brandenburg	none

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is intact

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Very positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property		
S	Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff	

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable? ves 6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

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

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very good

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

All required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value			
The property's Outstanding Universal Value			
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity			
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity			
Monitoring and reporting			

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Excellent
Site Managers	Excellent
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

 Geographic Information Table Reason for update: Size of Buffer zone: overall 6632 ha (5308 ha Bufferzone in Potsdam, 1324 ha Buffer zone in Berlin)

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise