

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

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

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация Объединенных Наций по вопросам образования, науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、科学及文化组织

World Heritage

23 GA

WHC/21/23.GA/9 Paris, 27 October 2021 Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters November 2021

<u>Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda:</u> Future of the *World Heritage Convention*: Outcomes and Progress including final implementation report of the Strategic Action Plan 2012-2022 and 50th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 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 progress achieved towards the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan was presented and welcomed by the General Assembly (Resolution **22 GA 9** (UNESCO, 2019)).

This document is a report to the General Assembly, in accordance with Resolution **22 GA 9**, on the progress of the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan as well as a status on the preparation of the 50th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2022.

Draft Resolution: 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 widely disseminated.

II. Implementation 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 36th 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, 20th and 21st sessions, by its Resolutions **19 GA 10**, **20 GA 12**, **21 GA 9**, and **22 GA 9** 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 22nd session.
- 5. This progress report consists of the updated table specifying the implementation status, since the 21st 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.

III. Preparation of the 50th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention

- 6. On 16 November 2022 the World Heritage Convention will be 50 years old. With near universal ratification by 194 States Parties, the Convention is now one of the most ratified international conventions in history.
- 7. The celebration of this important anniversary will present an opportunity for all concerned stakeholders to not only take stock of the achievements of the Convention to date, but to also reflect on the conservation challenges and to envisage sustainable and innovative strategies for the future. Accordingly, the overall theme of the anniversary proposed would be "The Next 50: World Heritage as a source of resilience, humanity and innovation for future generations". The following key themes may be explored, among others, through diverse modalities including events, communications, advocacy, and research: Climate change and heritage conservation, representative, balanced and credible list, sustainable tourism, digital transformation, and post-COVID-19 recovery.
- 8. The invitation of the government of Italy and the City of Florence to host a celebration for the 50th Anniversary in November 2022 in partnership with UNESCO, is gratefully acknowledged.
- 9. A dedicated website has been developed for the 50th Anniversary in order to give visibility to the vast diversity of World Heritage properties, key moments in the timeline of the Convention, and provide a platform to connect across various events and activities

- throughout the year leading up to November 2022. The website will indeed include visual material on several properties, as well as links to activities and events organized by States Parties and other organizations in the framework of the 50th Anniversary. A series of communication and outreach components are being developed by UNESCO to promote the anniversary year and to assist States Parties in their celebratory activities.
- 10. Recognizing the enormous changes in the world since the creation of the Convention, and with a view to soliciting views for reflection on the adaptation of the Convention in the face of prevailing challenges, and also in order to gather views and proposals for themes and plans to mark the 50th Anniversary, a Survey Questionnaire on the 50th Anniversary was launched on 25 June 2021 to all States Parties, site managers, Advisory Bodies, Field Office Culture Specialists, Category 2 Centres, and World Heritage Centre staff. The deadline was 25 July 2021 and later extended to 6 August 2021.
- A total of 243 survey responses were received, including from 111 States Parties' representatives. The respondents believed that the most valuable contribution of the World Heritage Convention has been to identify and safeguard cultural and natural heritage through inscription on the World Heritage List, to enhance capacities at the local and national levels for conservation and management, and for promoting laws, policies. and guidance, for the conservation and management of different types of heritage. The respondents believed that the greatest impediments to more fully implementing the World Heritage Convention was the lack of financial and human resources. The responses saw the impacts of climate change, including climate-related disasters, as the key global challenge facing cultural and natural heritage today, followed by ill-conceived economic and infrastructure development projects and urban development initiatives. The respondents saw the greatest opportunity to more fully implement the World Heritage Convention by integrating heritage into strategies for sustainable development. The full analysis of the survey will be made available online on the website of 50th Anniversary. The Survey Questionnaire returns will be reported through a presentation to the General Assembly in November 2021 and included in the documents of the 45th session of the World Heritage Committee in Kazan 2022.
- 12. As requested by the World Heritage Committee in view of the anniversary, an analysis of the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced, and Credible World Heritage List (1994-2020) has been carried out and was introduced to the World Heritage Committee at its extended 44th session, which welcomed its conclusions. The analysis of the Global Strategy over the past 25 years found that the focus on the World Heritage List has had an impact on the number of World Heritage properties but not necessarily on under-represented categories or on improving the conservation or promoting international cooperation which are key elements of the World Heritage Convention. 86% of States Parties and all regions are represented on the List and previously under-represented categories are now present on both the World Heritage List and the Tentative Lists of States Parties. However, the imbalance between categories' representation persists. The study also found that the protection and management regimes need to be strengthened in a number of cases, including before submitting nominations (full report available at https://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/187906).

IV. 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. This 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
 - o Decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention
 - o 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			
	WORLD HERITAGE GOAL 1: 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. 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 each session of the Committee since 2014.		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 commencem ent of third cycle of periodic reporting	Examination by the Advisory Bodies: US\$ 555 per SOUVTranslati on 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 57 rSOUV remain to be adopted by the Committee as well as 18 Provisional SOUVs of			

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		A.1.1.3 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value are included on web.	KPI 1.1.3 From 37 COM onwards Statements of	World Heritage Centre	On-going		which 16 are from 44 COM. The SOUVs are regularly uploaded on the
1.2	Focus monitoring	A.1.2.1 Define monitoring indicators	Outstanding Universal Value are the basis for decision making on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. KPI 1.2.1 Agreed monitoring				webpage for each site, in the two working languages;
Monitoring Mechanism s	mechanism and resources on critical conservation issues while allowing States Parties time to implement recommendations	(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.	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/en/soc (see Decision 37 COM 7C) A new compulsory format
	Focus monitoring mechanism and resources on critical conservation issues while allowing States Parties time to implement recommendations						for submission of States Parties' state of conservation reports approved by 39 COM to allow improved monitoring. A system of monitoring indicators developed in the framework of the revision of the PR questionnaire, to be applied from the 3rd cycle of PR.(Decisions 41 COM 10A and 41 COM 11).

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							The Committee systematically requests the establishment of DSOCR, with respective monitoring indicators, when it decides to inscribe properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. (Operational Guidelines paragraphs 183 and 184)
		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. The Decision on General Item 7 at every Committee session highlights good practices in certain areas; these are also highlighted in Document 5A presenting the Secretariat's Report on its activities; a special issue of the World Heritage Review focused on success stories http://whc.unesco.org/en/review/90/ in 2019; the publication, Culture for the 2030 Agenda

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							launched by the Culture Sector during the High Level Political Forum in New York included examples of initiatives related to heritage conservation that contributed to Goals and Targets of the 2030 Agenda; World Heritage Canopy has been established as a digital platform to showcase innovative practices for heritage -based solutions for sustainable development(http://whc.unesco.org/en/canopy); World Heritage Cities Programme showcases innovative and positive heritage management practices with a view to enhance capacity building and problem solving for other World Heritage cities (http://whc.unesco.org/en/cities); An independent Evaluation of the World Heritage Reactive

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							Monitoring process, funded by Switzerland, conducted at the request of the Committee (Decision 40 COM 7) and presented at the 43rd session of the Committee, includes a section on Case studies of positive examples of the use of the Reactive Monitoring processhttps://whc.unesco.org/document/174948
		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 is communicated to States Parties before the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							session. Following discussions at 42 COM, the Secretariat proposed only a reduced number of SOCs to be opened according to clear criteria (also see Decision 43 COM 7.1 para.12-14). Overall 29 reports were opened and debated by the Committee. During 44 COM overall 21 reports were debated by the Committee out of 255 state of conservation reports examined; a matrix structure was developed by the World Heritage Committee in consultation with the Advisory Bodies to provide a clear framework for reporting back to the Committee on the implementation of priority recommendations.
		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	World Heritage Committee	Reports of the working groups at 37 COM (2013)	Workshop US \$200,000 Extrabudgetar y funding required	No funding for workshop received. Pro-active monitoring system to be continued as much as possible within the financial and HR constraints

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
			Plan of Management for each inscribed property. Advisory Bodies also encouraged to develop local monitoring networks.				Proactive monitoring by 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, WHC is in contact with ESA and HIST in developing a project aimed at preserving the UNESCO-designated sites from Space.; Satellite and drone surveys have been carried out in the context of emergencies and post-conflict situations such as in Syria,(UNESCO-UNITAR publication on Aleppo and another on all of Syria that is currently under preparation for print). Drone surveys have also been carried out in Mosul in Iraq and spatial surveys in Beirut, Lebanon. Efforts are

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							ongoing to seek funding partnership for projects to establish digital spatial monitoring; a GIS-based monitoring mechanism is being developed supported by the Government of the Flanders while digital and spatial analysis. Urban Atlas for World Heritage cities is being developed with support from the City of Nanjing, China towards raising awareness and monitoring of urban heritage; the Urban Heritage Climate Observatory has been established in partnership with the Group on Earth Observation (GEO) and the Greek GEO office to apply space observation tools to monitor and document impacts of climate change on World Heritage cities
		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	States Parties Local/regional UICN/ ICOMOS committees	On-going	Additional funding necessary	Dialogue enhanced and should be further strengthened. In a number of cases, funding for Advisory missions

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
			issues arising; state of conservation monitoring mechanisms used by Advisory Bodies defined and understood by States Parties.				was allocated from the World Heritage Fund (Decision 38 COM 12). By Decision 42 COM 5B, the Committee requested an item on the issue of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties to be included in its 43rd session. In its Decision 43 COM 5E the Committee invites the Advisory Bodies to engage in effective and constructive dialogue with States Parties (Tentative Lists, nomination process, and post inscription including monitoring missions); the World Heritage Committee adopted Decision 44 COM 11 on a reformed nomination process with the Preliminary Assessment as the first phase with a view to enhance dialogue between States Parties and Advisory Bodies from an early stage; a revision of the format of the Reactive Monitoring Mission

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							Report has also been carried out to making the monitoring reports clearer for the States Parties to follow up with regard to the Recommendations
		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 PR, more than 30 workshops dedicated to PR took place.Further to the Reflection Period (2015-2017) and the recommendations for the 3rd cycle, the PR exercise is becoming a State-Party driven exercise, with overall coordination and guidance provided by WHC.; The 3rd Cycle of PR starting with the Arab States Region was effectively supported. Capacity building activities were led by the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage; the African Region is being similarly supported by the African World Heritage Fund; More than 30 workshops and capacity-building activities were

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							organized in the framework of the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Africa and Arab States regions with key stakeholders to develop collaboratively 1 Action Plan for each region which were adopted by the Committee at its 44th session (Decisions 44 COM 10A and 44 COM 10B respectively).16 Capacity building workshops were organized for all site managers and national focal points in the APA region by the World Heritage Centre and 2 by WHITRAP
		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) Opportunitie s 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 by the World Heritage Centre. Reactive monitoring mission reports are shared with States Parties before being

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							made public, with a 2- week deadline to provide feedback about possible inaccuracies. Information received from 3rd parties is included in all SOCs reports, after having been shared with SPs. The 1 December deadline for submission of SOC reports by SPs allows for ample time for exchange and dialogue with SPs. A trend emerged that SPs send SOC-related information at a very late stage before a Committee session, which does not facilitate the processing of the information and decision- making. Decision 35 COM 12B para.16, requesting States Parties to refrain from submitting such delayed information after the statutory deadlines, was recalled during the 43rd and 44th sessions.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							The World Heritage Committee decided in some instances, on the recommendation of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, to inscribe a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger without a Reactive Monitoring mission or an Advisory mission having taken place immediately prior to this inscription (e.g., Decisions 34 COM 7B.2 on the Rainforests of Atsinanana (Madagascar), 36 COM 7B.102 on the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) or 41 COM 7B.42 on the Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria))

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)		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.); necessary changes in the review cycles were made to accommodate the changes in schedule of the 44 COM session as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the difficulty of carrying out some missions.
1.3 Conservatio n requirement s	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	Establishedb y 37 COM (2013)	US \$100,000 extrabudgetary funds required	No funding providedLimited human resources at WHC.
Conservatio n		A.1.3.2. Develop a database of existing guidance on key factors negatively impacting on the Outstanding Universal	KPI.1.3.2 Database updated annually including provision for States Parties and Advisory Bodies to contribute	World Heritage Centre	Database established	Advisory Bodies contracts, WHF (or may	State of conservation Information System established and regularly updated

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
requirement	Requirements for conservation of Outstanding Universal Value are implemented transparently and consistently.	Value of World Heritage properties and tools for best management practice.	new advice as it arises. Awards provided to States Parties for best practice management at each Committee meeting.	Advisory Bodies States Parties	Recognition on-going	need extrabudgetary funds) Staff time	http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc); with practical guidance and manuals. This Information System has received over more than 1. millions pageviews as of 01/082021 Extrabudgetary funding sought for further updating the Information System. Analysis of threats produced 1978-2013; the analysis of threats database is regularly updated; the Government of France has provided financial support in 2021 to make further improvements in this portal
		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	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.	States Parties Consultant World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Gaps identified by 37 COM (2013) Guidance development as funds	Seek extra- budgetary funding to secure resources and technical support	Decision 39 COM 7 highlighted importance of EIAs and HIAs and called on the States Parties to fund the further reflection and development of further guidance tools. Webpage on HIA/EIA

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		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)	Guidance provided on the website.		permit	Source donor	established https://whc.unesco.org/e n/activities/907/ Resource manuals, as well as the SOC system and Document 7 include guidance on global conservation issues; WHC and Advisory Bodies are developing an Impact Assessment framework for both cultural and natural heritage. strengthens capacity building in this regard. At its 43rd session, the Committee added a paragraph in the OGs (para.118bis) highlighting that "States Parties shall ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments, Heritage Impact Assessments, and/or Strategic Environmental Assessments be carried out as a prerequisite for development projects and activities that are planned for implementation within or

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							around a World Heritage property; new guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessment was developed through a collaboration between World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The World Heritage Committee decided that future impact assessments should be carried out in line with the new guidance (44 COM 7.2); a Mentorship Programme has been established in the Africa region to train and involve in World Heritage activities experts from the region; 74 experts from 37 countries were included in a training workshop for experts on World Heritage and the 2011 HUL Recommendation;
		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.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		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)		The major part of 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 3rd 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 culture/nature links. The revised PR questionnaire also draws the attention of SPs to the management effectiveness assessment. Since the 41st session in 2017, a WH Site Managers Forum is organized in conjunction with each Committee session to gather site managers from all regions, as a capacity-

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							understanding the concept of the Convention and its Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting processes, requirements for site management, tools for management effectiveness assessments, including disaster risk preparedness.; The World Heritage Cities Programme regularly organizes workshops for site managers to provide guidance and build capacities regarding the management of urban heritage properties; guidance has been developed specifically in the Fukuoka Outcomes (2020) and the outcomes of the World Heritage City Lab as well as the 10 th Anniversary of the HUL Recommendation (https://whc.unesco.org/en/cities) the publication, Connecting Practice, Phase III, was published by ICOMOS and IUCN reflecting 10 years of work on conservation

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							practice and drawing lessons from the experience of a number of World Heritage sites.
		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 of factors identified in the Periodic Report and any additional threats identified in the reporting process.	KPI.1.3.7 Thematic report produced on key threats on an agreed regular basis.	Advisory Bodies World Heritage Centre	Thematic report presented at 39 COM (2015)	Seek extra- budgetary funding to secure resources and technical support Source donor	Thanks to funding by the Flemish 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 Information System.
		A.1.3.8 Develop a four-year cycle for revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> .	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)		4-year cycle put in place, with some exceptions (Decision 35 COM 12B, Paragraph 11). Last major revision took place at 39 COM in 2015. A further revision of the Operational Guidelines during 43 COM in 2019; the World Heritage Committee adopted the revisions to the Operational Guidelines

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							proposed by the Ad-hoc Working Group prepared on the basis of an online survey of States Parties and other stakeholders as well as the recommendations of the reflection meeting of experts (Tunis, 2019), and including modifications related to the reform to the nomination process and the Preliminary Assessment (44 COM 12)
1.4 Training and research	Capacity needs of communities and agencies to address conservation are met, including those identified through Periodic Reporting	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 support such as at 43 COM, which requested in Decision 43 COM 6 the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM to submit an in-depth report on the implementation of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy at its 44th session in 2020; the State Party of Saudi Arabia announced (Decision 44 COM 14)

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							financial support to an independent evaluation of the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy and the development of a new World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy
		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 implementatio n 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 especially in the 3 rd cycle of PR such as the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH) and the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF).
		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 and for World Heritage Cities). Regional associations

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							under way; a facebook page for site managers has been launched and a Twitter account established for World Heritage site managers.
							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 are site managers. A Site Managers Forum is
							organized since 2017 in the margins of the session of the Committee. ² The fourth edition of the Site Managers Forum was organized in the
							framework of the 44 COM collaboratively by ICCROM and IUCN with the World Heritage Centre. An extra- budgetary project was prepared and funding is actively sought for the creation of a global site managers network,

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							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 <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (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 efforts made to showcase the benefits of Danger Listing to SPs, including at Orientation sessions.
							An extrabudgetary project to improve the perception of the List of World Heritage in Danger, funded by Norway, is currently being carried out (see also 44 COM 7.1).
							(An independent Evaluation of the World Heritage Reactive Monitoring process, funded by Switzerland and conducted at the request of the Committee (Decision 40 COM 7) and

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							presented at the 43rd session of the Committee, reviewed the inscription of a property on the List of WH in Danger, and noted the need to better communicate aspects relating to the List of WH in Danger, including the identification and promotion of positive examples of where the Danger Listing of WH properties has led to significant and positive action to improve the conservation status of properties. https://whc.unesco.org/document/174948
		A.1.5.2 Draft decisions for inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger include a costed programme 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 <i>Convention</i>) 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;	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 on 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

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
			States Parties meet funding gaps.				14). The Committee at its 43rd session reaffirmed the need to promote a better understanding of the List of World Heritage in Danger, and welcomed the proposal of a workshop focusing on the List of World Heritage in Danger, including exchange of good practice, including Costed Action Plans (43 COM 7.1); An online survey and guided interviews with regard to the perception of the List of World Heritage in Danger is being carried out; a trend was observed in 44 COM where the World Heritage Committee decided not to inscribe any properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger contrary to 7 properties recommended by the Advisory Bodies based on the State of Conservation reports

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
		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			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 (37 COM 7A.40). Draft Decisions for removal of properties from the List of WH in Danger based on precise scientific and technical evidence; additional efforts have been made to support sites to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger; the removal of Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of Congo) was a major success story in this regard at 44 COM
		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

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibilities	Timing	Financial implications (other than the Secretariat's time)	Implementation Status
							(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 implicatio ns	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 representativ e, 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.	monitoring indicators developed through States Parties	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 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; from 2018-to 2021 13 African States Parties submitted 17 nomination dossiers; the World		

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
							Heritage Centre has launched two new project targeting 15 States Parties in Africa of which 12 have no properties inscribed on the list supported by the governments of Oman and Japan; International Assistance requests for 20 requests for preparatory assistance for nominations in Africa have been granted over the last 10 years. An independent study to analyse the impact of the Global Strategy on the World Heritage List has been carried out. The findings of the independent study are available at https://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/187906.
		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 dissemination.	KPI 2.1.2 Thematic studies identified, produced and fully funded on priority topics.	Advisory Bodies	Thematic Studies priorities identified for consideration at 39 COM (2015)	USD 60,000 per thematic study	A thematic study on interpretation of memory sites and another one on criterion (vi) were produced. In Decision 42 COM 8 the Committee decided that the evaluation of "sites associated with recent conflicts" shall be undertaken once a comprehensive

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session reviewed this matter; modern heritage is identified as an under represented category and the African continent has only two sites distinctly identified as modern, hence a thematic study of Modern Heritage in Africa has been launched with the African World Heritage Fund, the Getty Conservation Institute, and other partners with the objective of identifying and preparing potential sites in Africa.
		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 trend has been observed where States Parties with numerous World Heritage sites continue to have more sites inscribed each year (44 COM)
		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 (2016 WH Paper series publication on World Heritage in High Seas, December 2018 workshop on the topic);

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
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 and modalities agreed by COM; Committee approved revised definition of the Upstream Process (document WHC/18/42.COM/12A) for integration into OGs; a significant increase in the number of State Parties requesting guidance for preparation of Tentative Lists has been observed; The Guidance on developing and revising World Heritage Tentative Lists was developed and published collaboratively by the Advisory Bodies with the World Heritage Centre in 2020 (https://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/184566)
2.2 Nominations (cont)	Inscriptions on the World Heritage List fully meet requirements set out in the Operational Guidelines (cont)	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 <i>Operational Guidelines</i> , 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 experiences with preliminary review of nominations, an increasing number of nominations (about. 80-85%) are submitted for preliminary review; for 44 COM, 68.8 % of 45 nomination dossiers

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
							submitted to the Advisory Bodies for evaluation were submitted for completeness check
		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; the Ad hoc Working Group for World Heritage proposed a preliminary assessment as a tool to assess the potential justification of the OUV prior to preparing a full nomination dossier; the World Heritage Committee decided to adopt the recommendation of the Ad-hoc Working Group for the reform of the nomination process to include a two phase nomination process with the first phase as the Preliminary Assessment with a view to encouraging higher quality dossiers with increased dialogue with Advisory Bodies (44 COM 11)

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
		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	Database fully operational; 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 nominations 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 published online http://whc.unesco.org/en/recognition-of-best-practices/; the Guidance on developing and revising World Heritage Tentative Lists was developed and published collaboratively by the Advisory Bodies with the World Heritage Centre in 2020 (https://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/184566)
		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

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
							Cultural Conventions Liaison Group - CCLG);as well as other programmes (Biosphere Reserves, Geoparks, Ramsar sites); web- page on synergies produced https://whc.unesco.org/en/synergies with regular updates.

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicati ons	Implementation Status	
WORL	WORLD HERITAGE GOAL 3: Heritage protection and conservation considers present and future environmental, societal and economic needs							
3.1 Sustainable developme nt	Increased consideration of sustainable development through connecting conservation to communities	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 and after inscription.	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 preconditions for potential economic and social value of inscription and conservation for communities.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies	Methodolog y considered at 37 COM (2013)	\$30,000	The World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy adopted in 2015, was widely disseminated and consistently being mainstreamed by WHC in policies and activities. States Parties are encouraged to mainstream in their respective policies and frameworks, and in management of WH sites;	

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicati ons	Implementation Status
							At its 43 COM, the Committee adopted revised version of the OGs, which mainstreamed Sustainable development into all relevant paragraphs (decision 43 COM 11A)
							Further work on indicators advanced following Decision 41 COM 5C point 6; the UNESCO Culture 2030 Indicators includes a checklist to measure sustainable management of heritage as well as other indicators for measuring the benefits of heritage for social, environmental, and economic benefits in the framework of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; the revised questionnaire
							for the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting also includes several questions related to sustainable development and the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicati ons	Implementation Status
							implementation of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy including at the site level
		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 World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy was adopted in 2015 and web-page updated https://whc.unesco.or g/en/sustainabledevel opment/; Funds are necessary to support national and local policies for sustainable development and for their adoption;
		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 Urban took place 2017-2019 as well as workshops on World Heritage and sustainable development in Africa (e. g. Arusha, Tanzania 2016, Africa-China Forum on Sustainable

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicati ons	Implementation Status
							Development at UNESCO, 2019); two draft tools have been developed by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies: the World Heritage Sustainable Development Health-Check and the World Heritage Project Sustainability Check as online self-evaluation tools to support decision making in favor of sustainable development; visual guidance on the implementation of the 2011 HUL Recommendation for the management of urban heritage has also been developed including for sustainable urban development

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
	WORLD	HERITAGE GOAL 4: World	Heritage maintains or enha	ances its brand qu	ality		
Awareness is reconstraining reconstraining the	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 38 GC in 2015, in view of awareness-raising on the conservation of heritage and successfully implemented in 2016-2019; African World Heritage Day celebrations were organized jointly by the World Heritage Centre and the African World Heritage Fund in 2020 and 2021;
		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 specific issue of the World Heritage Review was produced on the 50th anniversary of the Nubian Campaign and success stories http://whc.unesco.org/en/review/90/ in 2019. WHC participated in a film on the Nubian campaign in 2019 and in the production of a new film in 2011 on Philae.
		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	Ongoing: Best practice dissemination enhanced through: best practice recognition at Kyoto -40th anniversary event 2012; Online publishing of best practices; Focus in WH Review Nr 67 (May 2013) and 90 (January 2019) and publication "World Heritage Beyond Borders" (UNESCO/Cambridge University Press). Also regularly featured in articles in the quarterly magazine WH Review; the monthly e-newsletter of the World Heritage Cities Programme, <i>Urban Notebooks</i> , showcases innovative practices with regard to the management of urban heritage (http://whc.unesco.org/en/cities); a digital platform <i>World Heritage Canopy</i>

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							(http://whc.unesco.org/en/canopy)showcases heritage-based solutions for sustainable development integrating heritage conservation with some dimension of sustainable development
		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 central services (including external relations and partnerships coordination) and outside partners on licensing WH brand. Legal counsel is sought. Joint branding strategy for UNESCO's multiple brands across all programmes discussed; UNESCO wide Strategic Transformation is ongoing and looking into aspects of branding and communication using World Heritage as a pilot case.
		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; ongoing monitoring of media reports including statistical analysis; media briefing by DIR/WHC provided prior to World Heritage Committee meeting. Furthermore, at each Committee session a press conference is organized.
		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 implicatio ns	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	Completed: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 presented at 42 COM; World Heritage Policy Compendium has been adopted at 43 COM thanks to funds from the Government of Australia; an online tool was developed to create a searchable database of policy guidance, thanks to funds from the Republic of Korea;				
		A.5.1.2 Develop 'Policy Guidelines' (similar format to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>) by drawing on policy database and separating out the policy elements of <i>Operational Guidelines</i> into new structure.	KPI 5.1.2 Policy guidelines developed and policy elements removed from <i>Operational Guidelines</i> .	Consultant Operational/Policy Guidelines working group	Revisions to Operational Guidelines/po licy guidelines considered at 39 COM (2015)	\$80,000	Completed extrabudgetary funding received from Australia and the Republic of Korea; as noted above				
		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 40, 42 and 44 COM. Thematic programmes				

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
							streamlined and some phased out as objectives achieved; web-pages regularly updated; thematic programmes on World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme, and on Astronomy and World Heritage were phased out by the World Heritage Committee (44 COM 5A)
		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 43 COM two consultative bodies established; Budget and Operational Guidelines as well as intersessional ad hoc group which continues, at 44 COM budget group);
		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	KPI.5.1.6 Funds are found to hold three regular sessions of the Committee each biennium.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	WHF/Regu lar Programm e/ Host country	Not feasible due to financial constraints;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
		immediately after the General Assembly.				Cost estimate	
		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 international instruments	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 national capacity building.	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); The Committee at 43 COM recommended that consideration is given to using the opportunity of the 50th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2022 to undertake a reflection on the Global Strategy; An analysis of the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced, and Credible World Heritage List (1994-2020) has been done, as requested by the Committee In view of the 50th anniversary by two consultants familiar with the Global Strategy and the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implicatio ns	Implementation Status
							Convention and examined by 44 COM
		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, 42,43 and 44 COM 5A). SPs encouraged (including through PR questionnaire) to enhance collaboration between cultural and natural heritage institutions; For the 1st time, in September 2018, a meetings was organized between the Secretariats of all UNESCO Culture conventions and all Biodiversity-related conventions and programmes.

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; enhanced awareness-raising for Committee members at Orientation sessions; 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2019 requested review of referral procedure and its application to be included for examination in the framework of the ongoing reflection on the revision of the nomination process; a reflection of the referral procedure was included in the work of Ad-hoc Working Group on the reform of the nomination process and their recommendations were adopted in the revisions to the Operational Guidelines in 44 COM		

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: Orientation Sessions for Committee members held annually in addition to Information sessions;
		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 <i>Convention</i> issues and implementation.	KPI.6.1.5 Trend up on consistency of decisions.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Standard drafting available and used; A "drafting guide" with standard language for state of conservation-related decisions has been prepared by WHC in 2009 and is regularly updated, as needed.
		A.6.1.6 Develop a procedure enabling consultation of secretariat and Advisory Bodies on technical or Operational Guidelines	KPI.6.1.6 Decisions are consistent with Operational Guidelines.	World Heritage Committee	Revisions to Rules of Procedures considered at	Staff time	No such procedure was integrated in the Rules of Procedure. However, the

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		implications of amendments to draft decisions.			37 COM (2013)		current practice enables the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to provide comments on technical or Operational Guidelines implications of 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 the regular updating of the State of Conservation Information System at http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc
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;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		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 review of possible harmonization of the Rules of Procedures of the GA of CLT Conventions have been completed
		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 2021 and foreseen for 45 COM (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 systematically in Secretariat's 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 implementatio n status considered at 37 COM (2013)	Staff time	Done

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		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 sources of funding and funding reflects agreed priorities	A.6.4.1 Develop cost modules for key activities and cost decisions and assess workload implications of decisions prior to adoption.	KPI.6.4.1 Key decisions are costed before adoption.	World Heritage Centre Advisory Bodies Standing Budget Consultative committee	On-going	Staff time	On-going (e.g. monitoring 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 committee established and operating. 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	KPI.6.4.5 Statutory functions fully funded by regular budget.	UNESCO	On-going	Staff time	Not fully funded due to financial

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
		all statutory functions are fully funded by the regular budget.		World Heritage Centre			constraints at UNESCO;
		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 40 COM and reviewed at 41, 42 and 43 COM; Sustainability of Fund included in 44 COM 14
							Marketplace launched in 2017
							The Partnerships for Conservation fund-raising strategy (adopted at 36 COM) to be further developed; 43 COM took note with appreciation of the two-year Resource Mobilization and Communication (RMC) Plan developed by the Secretariat; Further welcomed by 44 COM 14.
		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	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	On-going reporting;

Priority	Outcome	Activities	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Allocation of responsibility	Timing	Financial implications	Implementation Status
			Heritage Centre to World Heritage Committee and General Assembly.				
6.5 Implementation Plan	Actions under the Strategic Action Plan are linked to priorities and	A.6.5.1 Outcomes under Strategic Action plan are reported to General Assembly of States Parties.	KPI 6.5.1 Actions associated with priority policy issues are implemented.	World Heritage Centre	On-going	Staff time	Done
	available budget and outcomes monitored and reviewed	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 implementatio n considered at 38 COM (2014)	\$50,000	No funding received

V. Draft Resolution

Draft Resolution: 23 GA 9

The General Assembly,

- 1. Having examined Document WHC/21/23.GA/9,
- 2. Recalling Resolutions 17 GA 9, 18 GA 11, 19 GA 10, 20 GA 12, 21 GA 9, and 22 GA 9 adopted during the 17th (UNESCO, 2009), 18th (UNESCO, 2011), 19th (UNESCO, 2013), 20th (UNESCO, 2015),21st (UNESCO, 2017) and 22nd (UNESCO, 2019) 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. <u>Welcomes</u> the continuous progress in the performance of the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan;
- 4. <u>Takes note</u> of the reflection undertaken on the Global Strategy using the opportunity of the 50th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2022;
- 5. <u>Takes note</u> of the status of preparation of the celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention and <u>invites</u> States Parties to mark this anniversary in collaboration with UNESCO and use this opportunity to enhance the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage recognizing its enduring and irreplaceable value for furthering sustainable development and for biological and cultural diversity worldwide;
- 6. <u>Acknowledges with thanks</u> the invitation of the government of Italy and the City of Florence to host a celebration for the 50th Anniversary in November 2022 in partnership with UNESCO;
- 7. <u>Concludes</u> that the Strategic Action Plan has led to positive outcomes and <u>encourages</u> the World Heritage Centre, with the support of the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies, to continue, within the available resources, activities that were launched as a result of the Strategic Action Plan.