



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
للترقية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

World Heritage

23 GA

WHC/21/23.GA/INF.11

Paris, 4 November 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

**Item 11 of the Provisional Agenda: Updating of the Policy Document on
climate action for World Heritage**

INF.11: Updated Policy Document on climate action for World Heritage

SUMMARY

This document presents the comments received from States Parties members of the World Heritage Committee and the response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies; as well as the subsequently updated Policy Document on climate action for World Heritage.

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its extended 44th session (Fuzhou/online, 2021) (Decision **44 COM 7C**), this document takes into account all the comments and inputs made by Committee members either during the extended 44th session of the Committee or submitted in writing by 15 September 2021, in track-changes for ease of reference.

This document is to be read in conjunction with WHC/21/23.GA/11.

I. General comments submitted by World Heritage Committee members

Note that World Heritage Committee members' comments may have been edited to correct typos only, and clarifications from the Secretariat have been added in [square brackets]. They have been grouped in different themes.

All concrete proposals submitted by Committee members to amend the text of the draft Policy Document have been consolidated and reflected in the following section of the present document, in track-changes, with indication of the submitting State Party.

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
Capacity building	<p>Brazil: While discussing this goal [i.e., Goal 1 on Climate Risk assessment], one must bear in mind that building capacity also depends on the provision of technical and financial support. Under the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement, this provision is an obligation of developed countries in relation to developing ones</p>	<p>Para.84 stresses that transfer and mobilisation of finance are among the necessary enabling conditions to promote climate action for World Heritage properties. It adds that adaptation needs have typically been supported by public sector sources such as national and subnational government budgets, and in developing countries together with support from development assistance, multilateral development banks. Para.90 also indicates that the implementation of climate actions related to Goal 4 (Knowledge, Capacity Building and Awareness) at the World Heritage Committee-level could be supported by identifying mechanisms to support needs and capacities of LDCs and SIDS to address climate change impacts. Reference is also made in Para.11 to the UNFCCC, while recognising that the UNFCCC is the UN instrument to address the rights and obligations of States deriving from this agreement. It is equally important to recall that many sites in more developed countries are not equipped to address climate change and also need capacity building – sometimes just from their own national authorities.</p> <p>The comments point to the importance of the issue of climate justice and ensuring a fair transition. This could also be accomplished via UNESCO's sixth Ethical Principle, 'Solidarity', which describes how at a global scale assistance should be given to those that are most vulnerable to climate change.</p> <p>Also see below regarding CBDR-RC</p>
Capacity building	<p>Norway: Regarding the third point proposed in the cover letter, we agree that there is a need for support and capacity-building assistance, as well as the encouragement of technology transfer and financing from developed to developing countries. We do not oppose strengthening of the Policy in this regard. However, as specified above, the CBDR-RC principle should not be brought up in this context</p>	

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
Climate risk assessment	Guatemala: Each World Heritage site should undertake the identification of all risks associated with climate change and prioritise them in order to take preventive measures. Standardised methodologies and data should be used for this purpose. Site management plans should reflect actions based on vulnerability assessment and resilience building	Assessing Climate Risks is addressed in Section D.1 and in Para.96 of the Policy Document. Climate risks management is also addressed in Annex II. The 2015 Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction is also mentioned as one of the international instruments to build synergies with in implementing this Policy Document (see Para.16). In addition, Para.17 states that the Policy Document “provides an outcome-oriented policy framework for the development of goals and targets at national and heritage site levels, updating of national heritage management tools and action plans, and facilitating regular monitoring of the implementation and subsequent review of this Policy Document.” The need for predictive climate models for World Heritage properties is addressed in Annex II (notably its Para.15, which indicates that “Managers of World Heritage properties must have access to relevant data and modelling, and the capacity to collect and process data so they can build climate risk models.” World Heritage properties can lead the way in demonstrating assessment methodologies and showing adaptation/management at local level. These comments will be taken in due consideration when elaborating proposals for possible changes to the Operational Guidelines, as well as when developing, subject to available resources, a Guidance Document to facilitate effective implementation of, and support for, the actions, goals and targets of this Policy Document. (Decision 44 COM 7C), following the adoption of the Policy Document.
Climate risk assessment	Guatemala: At the preventive level, each World Heritage site should have specific action plans for risk reduction and disaster management	
Climate risk assessment	Guatemala: Each site should carry out simulations or predictive climate models that generate future scenario maps, e.g., medium-term, on the state of forest cover and on the distribution of key species	
Danger listing	Australia: Clarify that the significant legal and interpretive questions raised by climate change with respect to the Convention (as per paragraph 36) must be resolved and clearly articulated in the Operational Guidelines. Further, it is our strong view that any decisions associated with these issues should be deferred until clarity and certainty can be provided to all States	A procedure is already in place for the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis of climatic factors (Para.179.b)vi. and Para.180.b)v. of the Operational Guidelines). These matters have been and are handled appropriately on a case-by-case basis, within the framework of the Operational Guidelines. Such

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
	Parties about how the inherent tensions between a site-based Convention and a global threat such as climate change that requires collective action, will be addressed	<p>deferral would also negatively impact the implementation of the Convention. Indeed, as action is needed without delays, it does not seem wise to suspend tools such as the Reactive Monitoring or In-danger listing pending global resolution of all issues. The content of decisions to be taken should be discussed by the World Heritage Committee, as a sovereign decision-making body. The Committee meets every year and can adapt its decisions as required, on an ongoing basis. It is therefore suggested not to retain the amendment proposed by Australia.</p> <p>This comment will be taken in due consideration when implementing Decision 44 COM 7C, and in particular, when preparing the mandate of the Expert Panel that should be organized before March 2022, and when elaborating proposals for possible changes to the Operational Guidelines.</p>
Danger listing	Guatemala: The Operational Guidelines should be taken into account with regard to the inclusion of sites on the Danger List for climatic causes	A procedure is indeed in place for the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis of climatic factors (Para.179.b)vi. and Para.180.b)v. of the Operational Guidelines). Para.181 of the Operational Guidelines go onto specify that “such threats must be those that are amenable to correction by human action”. It is considered that these matters are handled appropriately on a case-by-case basis, within the framework of the Operational Guidelines, and there is no basis for deferral of such decisions. Deferral would also negatively impact the implementation of the Convention. The content of decisions to be taken should be discussed by the Committee but the essential legal and interpretive position does not seem to be unclear.
Danger listing	Norway: The legal provisions of the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention are clear; any potential or ascertained danger to the OUV of a World Heritage property needs to be considered by the Committee in deciding whether a property should be listed as World Heritage in danger or delisted, and climate change should not be ruled out. We do not support any attempts to change or challenge the existing legal provisions regarding this	<p>These comments will be taken in due consideration when elaborating proposals for possible changes to the Operational Guidelines (Decision 44 COM 7C), following the adoption of the Policy Document.</p>

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
Ecosystem-based approaches (EbAs)	Brazil: This research [in paragraph 12] was not part of the IPCC and IPBES assessment and should not be highlighted since it is not an agreed data within the scientific community. One-third of all the mitigation needed is an overestimation that is not scientifically supported by any UN Panel. Moreover, EbAs and NbS [Nature-based solutions] are not globally taken as synonyms, inasmuch as the latter still does not have a multilaterally agreed definition	These are estimates, such as those provided in the referenced material, which includes an IUCN publication and peer review article. Given the recognised importance of fostering these approaches to addressing climate change, it would be better not to delete this sentence; but this deletion can be considered, the importance of natural sites to climate strategies being addressed in the paragraph in general terms.
Financing	Norway: Regarding the third point proposed in the cover letter, we agree that there is a need for support and capacity-building assistance, as well as the encouragement of technology transfer and financing from developed to developing countries. We do not oppose strengthening of the Policy in this regard. However, as specified above, the CBDR-RC principle should not be brought up in this context	A number of paragraphs in the Policy Document have been amended to strengthen this aspect. See below regarding CBDR-RC
General	Norway: We are happy with the draft as it now stands and we therefore do not wish to propose any changes	No specific comment
GHG emissions	Brazil: Deforestation is highlighted here [in Paragraph 3] but this sector does not represent one of the main sources of ghg emissions. We ask this part to be deleted please or to include all sources of emissions	See comment in Para.3 of the Policy Document.
Good practice	China: Adding "Good Practices" as ANNEX V or in ANNEX II, III, IV separately is recommended	Promoting and sharing good practice is indeed referred to under Section D.4 on knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness (Para.69), under Section III of the Policy Document, at various levels (Para.90, 91), as well as in Annex II (Para.9) and Annex IV (Para.5 and 6). In addition, Decision 44 COM 7C requested WHC and the Advisory Bodies to develop, subject to available resources, education and capacity-building initiatives and a Guidance Document to facilitate effective implementation of, and support for, the actions, goals and targets of this Policy Document. Those could include good practice examples. The Policy Document itself may not be the most suitable place to integrate concrete good practice examples as it needs to remain at a general level.

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
Good practice	Guatemala: Sites should serve to promote best practice in climate change measures, i.e., be an example of good practice	The exemplary role World Heritage properties can play in implementing integrated approaches that link heritage in climate action and demonstrate how transformative change can help in strengthening resilience and achieving sustainable development is mentioned in Para.13 of the Policy Document.
Good practice	Guatemala: World Heritage sites should be examples of good environmental practices and the use of new environmentally friendly and low-emission technologies. For example, in natural areas, the use of electric vehicles should be encouraged, encouraging short journeys by bicycle, hiking routes, etc. In addition, single-use plastics should be banned	World Heritage Climate Action Goal 3 relates to mitigation and calls for the implementation of comprehensive climate mitigation frameworks that encourage the reduction of net greenhouse gas emissions associated with World Heritage properties. Para.58 of the Policy Document also encourages States Parties to aim for a transition towards low-carbon alternatives for World Heritage properties management as soon as possible. Finally, Annex III frames some key areas for additional focus of GHG emissions reduction efforts in the context of management of World Heritage properties, including Built environment; Land use management; Life cycle assessment and Tourism management. Environmental sustainability is also addressed within the Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention.
Implementation	Oman: How will the efficiency of this Policy in adapting to climate change be measured on the World Heritage sites for the year 2030? Will there be specific indicators for each goal in addressing climate change?	Decision 44 COM 7C requested WHC and the Advisory Bodies to prepare, subject to available resources, a Guidance Document to facilitate effective implementation of this Policy Document, which could include indicators and benchmarking tools for measuring and reporting progress towards achieving the World Heritage Climate Action Goals; and to develop, subject to available resources, education and capacity-building initiatives and a Guidance Document to facilitate effective implementation of, and support for, the actions, goals and targets of this Policy Document. The issue of indicators is also raised in Para.87, which recognizes the need to consider amendments to the
Implementation	Oman: The Policy still needs some guidelines and clarification, especially with regard to how to protect and assess the climatic impacts on the population in these locations and the accompanying social and economic impacts?	
Implementation	Oman: For the Sultanate, coordination with the concerned authorities is necessary to ensure that a plan is drawn up to implement this Policy with regard to the declared sites	

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
Implementation	Oman: How is the situation for the [inscribed] sites that are currently under the influence of these climate changes?	<p>formats of World Heritage Periodic Reporting and state of conservation reporting by including indicators that identify the impact of climate change on World Heritage properties.</p> <p>The Policy Document recognizes the need for appropriate implementation mechanisms, including tools and methodologies.</p> <p>In a number of instances, the Policy Document highlights that governance is key to creating the conditions for implementing transformative change in the World Heritage context (see for example Para.82 of the Enabling Conditions).</p> <p>As for sites currently inscribed on the World Heritage List, they will be subject to the statutory Reactive Monitoring process, should they be threatened by climatic factors, as set out in Para.169 of the Operational Guidelines. States Parties should apply the provisions of this Policy Document to their properties in order to mitigate climate impacts, as well as well as subject to other initiatives such as the IUCN World Heritage Outlook.</p>
Inscription on the World Heritage List	Guatemala: Priority should be given to the inscription on the World Heritage List of new natural sites with large areas of undisturbed forest. And which contribute to climate change mitigation through ecosystem approaches, i.e., nature-based solutions	<p>It is up to the World Heritage Committee itself to define any priority to be given to any specific typology of heritage proposed for inscription on the World Heritage List.</p> <p>Nominations will be evaluated according to the Operational Guidelines, but it is agreed that large primary forest areas of Outstanding Universal Value are an appropriate priority for possible World Heritage listing. Many such areas are noted in IUCN thematic studies.</p>
Inscription on the World Heritage List	Oman: Is the Policy for the proposed sites to be [inscribed]?	<p>This Policy Document encourages the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to find ways to integrate climate risk management mechanisms, including assessment and monitoring of climate hazards and the factors that cause or exacerbate them, into existing World Heritage processes, including making the consideration of climate change a requirement</p>

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
		in the Nomination process. However, the format for the nomination of properties, as included in Annex 5 of the Operational Guidelines, refers to “ <i>environmental pressures</i> ” as factors affecting the property and lists, as an example, climate change (Section 4a(ii)).
Legal framework	Norway: All States Parties to the World Heritage Convention are equally responsible for the management and conservation of the World Heritage sites in their territories, and for the follow-up of policies adopted by the General Assembly. The rules in the Operational Guidelines are equal for all parties and should stay this way. We do therefore not wish to include references to CBDR-RC in the Policy	It is recalled that the Policy Document is intended to be embedded in the existing processes of the World Heritage Convention and does not impose any new legal obligations on States Parties (see Para.20). The Policy Document also recalls that the World Heritage Convention and the Operational Guidelines for its implementation provide the legal and administrative framework respectively within which it is to be applied (Para.28).
Legal framework	Oman: Climate change Policy must comply with the guidelines for World Heritage Sites	
Management	Guatemala: Management actions should be undertaken in the vicinity of World Heritage sites, outside of the World Heritage area and with the involvement of local communities, to prevent the potential effects of climate change from reaching the OUV. For example, forest fires associated with drought	It is agreed that a site's links with the surrounding landscape, as a natural World Heritage property, cannot be considered separately from the wider ecosystem. Para.14 of the Policy Document recognizes that World Heritage properties are part of physical and social processes and are strongly connected to surrounding areas, ecosystems, communities and societies, and that they cannot be safeguarded from climate change in isolation because climate change is a global problem, and that many properties have already demonstrated how management systems that engage with local communities can strengthen natural, cultural and social resilience and offer sustainable futures. This is supported by Para 12 of the Operational Guidelines, which states that “States Parties to the Convention are encouraged to ensure the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other interested parties and partners in the identification, nomination and protection of World Heritage properties.”
Management	Guatemala: Take the necessary measures to cover cultural property directly exposed to the actions of the climate, through the use of appropriate technologies and materials	
Management	Guatemala: In cultural heritage sites severely affected by tourism, carbon footprint reduction measures should be developed, such as the creation of more pedestrian spaces, recycling programmes, vehicle control and green belts, among others	

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
		The Policy Document also calls for the use of climate technologies to address climate change (such as, but not limited to, early warning systems and sea walls). It is also important to note that natural World Heritage properties are also affected by climate change and require specific management measures to be applied.
Monitoring	Guatemala: Member States are obliged to report on climate change-related threats and impacts to their sites related to climate change, identify the most susceptible sites and also the protection efforts they are undertaking	References to reporting obligations, notably on climate risks assessments, through World Heritage processes are included under Goal 1 as well as under Para.47. This comment will be taken in due consideration when elaborating proposals for possible changes to the Operational Guidelines (Decision 44 COM 7C).
Monitoring	Guatemala: Update site management plans to present a general approach to climate change, which can facilitate regular monitoring for the implementation and revision of the Policy Document	The World Heritage Convention Governing Bodies may wish to adopt decisions that will facilitate regular monitoring of the implementation and subsequent review of the Policy Document. The need for such review is recognized in Para.17.
Monitoring	Guatemala: Conduct a damage inventory as a baseline or current state of the effects associated with climate change to be compared over time	The Policy Document encourages undertaking climate vulnerability and risk assessments for World Heritage properties (see Section II.D.1 on D.1.on Assessing climate risks to World Heritage properties).
Monitoring	Guatemala: Conduct climate data monitoring programmes. For example, monthly documentation of temperature, precipitation, river flows for sites near the rivers, etc.	The importance of baseline data and information is addressed in part 3 of Annex II.
Objectives	Australia: Remove any ambiguities about the objective of the policy, which is to safeguard Outstanding Universal Value	The objectives of the Policy Document are explicitly stated in Section I.B. (Purpose and Scope), and include safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value, but extending also “to create coherence with, and take advantage of synergies between, the objectives and processes of the World Heritage Convention and those of the Paris Agreement and related multilateral agreements, processes and instruments”. Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention for example calls for the adoption of general policies, which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
		a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes. This is also highly relevant to climate action.
Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)	Guatemala: The phenomenon of climate change affects and will continue to affect the sites, so the Policy Document questions whether despite mitigation and it is possible to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of some natural sites intact That is, it may change or fluctuate in response to changes in current and future climatic conditions	This issue is addressed in Para.36 and will be subject to further dialogue among States Parties and other stakeholders. In addition, Para.166 of the Operational Guidelines outlines the procedure for modifying the criteria for a property inscribed on the World Heritage List.
Principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC)	Australia: Considers that any reference to CBDR in the Policy should be strictly limited to mitigation actions (NDCs) in the context of the Paris Agreement. It should not be referenced more broadly in relation to the UNFCCC, nor should it be connected to other matters such as adaptation or finance	The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the matter of the CBDR-RC should be interpreted in the context of the Paris Agreement, however while fully respecting the fundamental obligations that the States Parties already have under the World Heritage Convention, as stated in Para.28 of the Policy Document.
Principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC)	Guatemala: The problem of climate change must be understood as a " Global Problem " that requires collective action , i.e., it does not depend on a single country and/or actor. This problem cannot be isolated from all the factors and dynamics that intervene in it, such as social, economic, political and geographical factors, among others	In addition, by Decision 44 COM 7C , the Committee recommends that the "Policy Document on Climate Action for World Heritage" be interpreted in the context of the UNFCCC, the Paris Agreement (2015) and the United Nations 2030 Agenda for sustainable development, and in conjunction with the Policy Document for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (2015).
Principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC)	Guatemala: Each country must be responsible for complying with the commitments made in the various international agreements to reduce its own greenhouse gas emissions. However, the most industrialised and polluting countries should contribute with developing countries to the protection of their forests and protected areas	
Principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC)	Norway: Regarding the input provided during 44COM, which is also referred to in the cover letter (points 1 and 2), it is not correct that CBDR-RC is a basic pillar of the international environmental regime. This is a principle in the UNFCCC but it is not part of the Paris agreement. All States Parties to the World Heritage Convention are equally responsible for the management and conservation of the World Heritage sites in their territories, and for the follow-up of policies adopted by the	

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
	General Assembly. The rules in the Operational Guidelines are equal for all parties and should stay this way. We do therefore not wish to include references to CBDR-RC in the Policy	
Reference to the Paris Agreement	Brazil: Article 2 of the P[aris] A[greement] states that "This Agreement, in enhancing the implementation of the Convention, including its objective, aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, [...]". So, the last sentence of para 11 is not entirely correct. We suggest deleting this part	No specific comment
Reference to the Paris Agreement	Norway: The references to the Paris Agreement in the current draft are OK (i.e., recognition of the Paris Agreement as an independent legal agreement)	No specific comment
Revision of the Policy Document	Guatemala: There is a need for a periodic review and update of the Policy Document, based on the understanding that World Heritage sites are affected by social, political, economic dynamics, as well as the impacts of climate change	The need for such review is recognized in Para.17.
Scope	Australia: Ensure the Policy does not encroach on the mandate of other conventions (consistent with paragraph 20), by removing text that could be perceived as setting a quasi-benchmark for States Parties emissions reduction efforts	Climate science makes clear that GHG reductions and other pathways for holding global warming to 1.5 degrees are needed to safeguard Outstanding Universal Value. It is appropriate that all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention should be encouraged to take ambitious action to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions in a rapid and sustained manner across all sectors, in line with the latest scientific findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the goals agreed to by Parties under the Paris Agreement. The scope of the Policy Document should be considered in this context. It appears fully consistent with the mandates of the World Heritage Convention, and its own existing policies (which should continue to be respected), that the Policy Document would call for strong action on climate change in alignment with other international agreements, particularly the Paris Agreement, in order to deliver the national and international
Scope	Brazil: The Goal 2 [on Climate mitigation] exceeds UNESCO's mandate, asking countries to develop national adaptation framework. Brazil suggests adjusting the goal to cover only cultural and heritage sites	
Scope	Brazil: This [Paragraph 1 of Annex III] is out of the scope of UNESCO	
Scope	Guatemala: World Heritage sites should promote the United Nations Declaration of the Decade for Ecosystem Restoration (2021-2030) to prevent, halt and reverse the degradation of ecosystems worldwide	
Scope	Norway: The Policy must maintain its explicit focus on the role of World Heritage not only in managing the impacts of climate	
Scope		

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
	change on World Heritage but also in mitigating climate change (including through transformative change, climate action, nature-based solutions and the recognition of the significant contribution of natural world heritage as carbon sinks by protecting forests, preventing land use change etc.)	actions appropriate to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. In addition, the Policy Document fully recognises that the UNFCCC is the UN instrument to address the rights and obligations of states deriving from this agreement. States Parties may use the opportunities presented by the processes and efforts under the UNFCCC to address adaptation and mitigation strategies, in conjunction with their obligations under the World Heritage Convention.
Scope	Oman: The Policy on the impact of climate change on the World Heritage sites is very important, especially with the exposure of many sites to the effects of climate change, which negatively affects these sites	
Scope	Oman: The Policy identified the main offers in addressing climate change, but did not address a detailed plan on these lines, such as adaptation to climate change and managing climate change	
Scope	Guatemala: Natural and mixed sites can leverage the issue of climate change as a positive aspect for the development of scientific research and education activities, both in-house and remotely via digital media. The role of protected natural areas in adaptation, mitigation and resilience to the effects of climate change and the promotion of all the ecosystem services they provide can be highlighted	This comment is addressed in Para.11. The issue is also included in the Policy Document for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (2015).
Scope	Norway: it is important that the Policy Document on climate remains in line with the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy (2015), and in particular that the World Heritage properties' OUV must not be compromised when pursuing broader sustainable development objectives	Indeed, Para.13 of the Policy Document recognizes that in any case, the Outstanding Universal Value must be safeguarded, and climate action must be pursued. It also recognizes that impact assessments must be carried out as a pre-requisite for adaptation and mitigation responses within or around a World Heritage property to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value is not negatively impacted (Para.35). Furthermore, addressing climate change impacts in line with the 2015 Sustainable Development Policy is part of one of the Guiding Principles (see Section I.C) of the Policy Document.
Scope	Oman: This Policy must be aligned with international policies and frameworks concerned with heritage and natural sites, especially with regard to protecting these sites and increasing	The need for such an alignment is addressed in Para.9. This is also included in the Policy Document for the

Themes	World Heritage Committee members' comments	Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
	their area, for example (the post-2020 global framework of the International Convention on Biological Diversity, which one of its most important goals is to increase the areas of nature reserves and adapt to climate change)	integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (2015).
Scope	Oman: This Policy should be part of the national policies to address and adapt to climate changes to ensure its implementation with regard to heritage and cultural sites	The Policy Document recognises the need to anchor its implementation through national policies (see Para.18, 91, 93, 94 for example).
Technology transfer	Norway: Regarding the third point proposed in the cover letter, we agree that there is a need for support and capacity-building assistance, as well as the encouragement of technology transfer and financing from developed to developing countries. We do not oppose strengthening of the Policy in this regard. However, as specified above, the CBDR-RC principle should not be brought up in this context	See above regarding CBDR-RC.
Terminology	Australia: Remove undefined terminology not included in previous drafts of the policy (i.e., 'sustainable futures'), legalistic language where inappropriately used (i.e., 'instruments'), and specific climate related language/concepts that fall under the mandate of other conventions (i.e., climate-technology)	The UNESCO Stakeholders' survey for the updating of the 2007 Policy Document on climate change indicated that a top priority was to allow World Heritage site managers and others to connect to broader climate planning. This often becomes an issue of vocabulary. The current Policy Document begins to merge heritage and climate science vocabularies. To aid in this, it provides a glossary (see Annex I). Retreating from this approach and eliminating climate related language and concepts is therefore not recommended.
Traditional knowledge and Indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs)	Norway: The recognition of the important role that IPLCs have in biodiversity conservation and climate change adaptation and mitigation is important. Content relating to this must therefore be kept	Respecting the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities in conservation is clearly stated in the World Heritage Convention and it is important this be represented in this updated Policy Document.

II. Specific proposals to the text of the Policy Document submitted by World Heritage Committee members

All concrete proposals submitted by Committee members to amend the text of the draft Policy Document on Climate Action for World Heritage have been consolidated and reflected in this section of the present document, in track-changes, with indication of the submitting State Party.

When several States Parties were proposing modifications of a same sentence, the different options have been reflected separated by : // or //..... (such as for Paragraph 21).

A text box has been added following each modified paragraph, to present the response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies on the changes proposed.

Key:

- Blue bold** Additions proposed by Committee members
- ~~Red strikethrough~~ Deletions proposed by Committee members
- Yellow highlights** Amendments proposed by Committee members for which the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies have no specific comment
- Grey highlights** Amendments proposed by Committee members for which the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies have specific comments and/or suggestions



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



World
Heritage
Convention

UPDATING OF THE 2007 POLICY DOCUMENT ON THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

POLICY DOCUMENT
ON CLIMATE ACTION
FOR WORLD HERITAGE
(NOVEMBER 2021)

Table of Contents

- I. PREAMBLE16**
 - A. Overview16
 - B. Purpose and Scope.....22
 - C. Guiding Principles23
- II. THE POLICY FRAMEWORK.....25**
 - A. Long-term Vision25
 - B. World Heritage Climate Action Goals25
 - C. Legal framework.....27
 - D. Climate Action29
 - D.1. Assessing climate [Thailand] change risks to World Heritage properties30
 - D.2. Climate [Thailand] change Adaptation.....31
 - D.3. Climate [Thailand] change Mitigation34
 - D.4. Knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness.....35
 - D.5. Transformative Change37
- III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY DOCUMENT38**
 - A. Enabling conditions39
 - Governance.....39
 - Finance40
 - Technological innovation40
 - B. World Heritage Committee-level implementation.....40
 - C. National-level implementation43
 - D. World Heritage property-level implementation44
- ANNEXES.....47**
- ANNEX I - Glossary48**
- ANNEX II - Areas for further focus regarding Adaptation.....53**
- ANNEX III – Areas for further focus regarding Mitigation.....57**
- ANNEX IV - Areas for further focus regarding knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness60**

[Norway: keep original text]

I. PREAMBLE

A. Overview

1. Climate change has become one of the most significant threats to World Heritage, impacting the Outstanding Universal Values (OUV), including integrity and authenticity, of many properties, as well as the economic and social development and quality of life of communities connected with World Heritage properties.
2. The issue of the impacts of climate change on World Heritage was brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee in 2005 by a group of concerned organisations and individuals. Subsequently, UNESCO has been at the forefront of exploring and managing the impacts of climate change on World Heritage. [Brazil] **This work has been done in full recognition of the principles of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement and their centrality as the privileged fora to discuss climate-related international issues.** In 2006, under the guidance of the World Heritage Committee, and along with the Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN) to the World Heritage Committee and a broad working group of experts, a report on '[Predicting and Managing the effects of Climate Change on World Heritage](#)' as well as a '[Strategy to Assist States Parties to the Convention to Implement Appropriate Management Responses](#)' was prepared by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. This was followed by a compilation of case studies on climate change and World Heritage, prepared by UNESCO. This process led to the adoption in 2007 by the General Assembly of States Parties to the [1972 Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage](#) (hereinafter called the World Heritage Convention or the Convention) of a [Policy Document on the impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage properties](#) (hereinafter called the 2007 Policy Document).

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It seems to be factually incorrect to add such reference to the Paris Agreement here, as this Agreement had not yet been adopted at the time the issue of the impacts of climate change on World Heritage was brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee in 2005. This addition could be made in Para.16 below. Further reference to the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement is also already included in Para.11. Noting that climate change must also be discussed under the framework of the World Heritage Convention, we would suggest not to refer to the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement as "*privileged fora*".

3. Since the adoption of the 2007 Policy Document, science has continued to provide evidence of the magnitude of this threat, its causes and consequences. Unprecedented atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHG), resulting from human activities [Brazil] **such as mostly with the** burning of fossil fuels [Brazil] **and deforestation**, are estimated to have caused an increase in global warming by one (1) degree Celsius (°C) above pre-industrial times. This warming has caused and continues to cause long-term changes in the climate system with resulting changes in the dynamics of rain patterns, sea level rise, ocean warming and acidification; and also increased the risk of extreme events such as hurricanes, storms, bushfires, floods, and droughts. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), "*some impacts may be long-lasting or irreversible.*"¹

¹ IPCC, 2018: Summary for Policymakers. In: Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

In Article 5 of the Paris Agreement, related to action to be taken to conserve and enhance, as appropriate, sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases (...), including forest, the Parties are encouraged to take action to implement and support (...) the existing framework as set out in related guidance and decisions already agreed under the Convention for: policy approaches and positive incentives for activities relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. In the context of the World Heritage Convention, deforestation would be an important factor to mention due to the double risk: loss of carbon stored in natural World Heritage sites and the loss of natural heritage values. The wording in the Policy Document does not purport to be a comprehensive list of factors contributing the GHG emissions, and therefore, it is considered that the reference to deforestation is appropriate in this context as a significant contributor to climate change. Indeed, according to the 2019 IPCC Special Report on Climate Change and Land, *“Land is simultaneously a source and a sink of CO₂ due to both anthropogenic and natural drivers, making it hard to separate anthropogenic from natural fluxes (very high confidence). Global models estimate net CO₂ emissions of 5.2 ± 2.6 GtCO₂ yr⁻¹ (likely range) from land use and land-use change during 2007–2016. These net emissions are mostly due to deforestation, partly offset by afforestation/reforestation, and emissions and removals by other land use activities (very high confidence).”*

The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies would therefore recommend the following alternative wording: **“...resulting from human activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, but also deforestation and other forms of land use change, which in combination are estimated...”**

4. World Heritage is immersed in unprecedented global change: a rapidly changing climate and the progressive loss of global biodiversity are **[Russian Federation]** **perhaps examples of** the most prominent indicators of how rapidly humans are negatively transforming the planet. Climate change accelerates the destruction of ecosystems, while the loss and unsustainable use of nature are in turn, key drivers of climate change.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

5. By representing some of the world’s most outstanding natural ecosystems, natural World Heritage properties also serve as natural buffers against climate impacts and other disasters, providing space for floodwaters to disperse, stabilizing soil against landslides and blocking storm surges. They further contribute to healthy, resilient ecosystems that might withstand impacts of climate change and continue to provide the food, clean water, shelter and income communities rely upon for survival.
6. Cultural World Heritage properties represented by cultural landscapes, historic cities, archaeological sites and vernacular architecture also demonstrate various locally developed strategies for mitigation against climate change through energy efficient built form and sustainable use of local resources. Climate change may also affect Indigenous Peoples’ and local communities’ cultural heritage, landscapes and traditional practices

context of strengthening the global response to the threat of Climate Change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. In Press. [hereinafter, the ‘IPCC Report’].

due to changes in the distribution of flora and fauna. [Thailand] Moreover, resulting loss of livelihoods of communities living in and around the sites may also impact their [Thailand] livelihood, knowledge systems and their capacity to maintain the site. [Thailand] In addition, local knowledge and wisdom and traditional practice represent different knowledge system that are key source of information to inform mitigation and adaptation options needed to prepare communities for future climate risks.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

This paragraph relates to the impacts of climate change on culture and heritage and not to solutions. References to the use of the knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems to address climate change are already included in Para.23 as a Guiding Principle, in Para.54, in Para. 71 as well as the overview of Annex II. It is therefore suggested to retain the added text from Thailand in this instance, as respecting the rights and contributions of local communities to climate action is important to integrate into the Policy Document.

7. Our understanding of the impacts of climate change increased considerably since 2007, and so has knowledge related to climate adaptation and mitigation measures. As the globe continues to warm, the IPCC has projected that the impacts of climate change on biodiversity, ecosystems and a variety of human systems would be lower at 1.5°C of global warming compared to those at 2°C. [Thailand] The report highlights the need for a low GHG emission and climate resilient development pathways that will strengthen sustainable development and also poverty eradication, while addressing the threat of climate change through ambitious mitigation and adaptation. Analyses by the IPCC indicate that limiting global warming to 1.5°C (with no or limited overshoot) would require rapid and far-reaching transitions in energy, land use, urban areas, infrastructure (including transport and buildings) and industrial systems.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment, except that this addition to the text could be more appropriate in the below Paragraph.

8. This [Thailand] fair and equitable transition needed is unprecedented in breadth and scale, and requires significant greenhouse gas emissions reductions [Thailand] and climate-resilient building in all sectors, including manufacturing, transport, tourism, construction and infrastructure development, [Thailand] forestry, health, water management, and agriculture; a wide portfolio of mitigation and adaptation options; as well as a significant upscaling of investments in those options. Taken together, they invite a programme of climate action designed to bring about ‘transformative change’². In the context of the World Heritage Convention, transformative change would be exemplified by decisions that contribute towards making World Heritage properties carbon neutral, as much as possible, and more resilient and better adapted to a changing climate, while safeguarding their Outstanding Universal Value. By acting as exemplars of climate action, World Heritage properties may serve as catalysts for change in the wider policy, economic, environment and social sectors for the benefit of present and future generations. World Heritage properties can embrace transformative change to become demonstration cases of the change the world needs.

² Defined by the IPCC as a system-wide change that requires more than technological change through consideration of social and economic factors that, with technology, can bring about rapid change in the fundamental attributes of natural and human systems at scale.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is unclear what “climate-resilient building” refers to in this context.

9. World Heritage properties are part of physical and social processes and are strongly connected to surrounding areas, ecosystems, communities and societies. They are not isolated areas, their safeguard depends on the support of communities. For World Heritage stakeholders, it is therefore fundamental to increase the awareness of connectivity of climate change and interactions between decision makers, communities, and natural and cultural heritage to support transformative change. In the context of this Policy Document, transformative change should integrate cross-sectoral thinking and approaches that account for direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on World Heritage properties [\[Australia\]](#), ~~and offer opportunities to reconcile multiple interests.~~

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

In the context of promoting interactions with diverse stakeholders and “cross-sectoral thinking and approaches that account for multiple impacts”, as stated in this Paragraph, offering “opportunities to reconcile multiple interests” is appropriate, and should remain in the text.

10. Since the adoption of the 2007 Policy Document, an important number of reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties affected by climate change have been presented to the World Heritage Committee. Following the adoption of the [2030 UN Agenda for Sustainable Development](#), in 2015, outlining 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the World Heritage Committee in the same year adopted the ‘Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the *World Heritage Convention*’ (the ‘2015 Sustainable Development Policy’) with a view of ensuring policy coherence between the Convention and the SDGs [\[Australia\] to enhance safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties](#). The 2015 Sustainable Development Policy expressly recognises the linkages between climate change and sustainable development, noting that “[i]n the face of increasing disaster risks and the impact of climate change, States Parties should recognise that World Heritage represents both an asset to be protected and a resource to strengthen the ability of communities and their properties to resist, absorb, and recover”. In addressing climate governance challenges that are common to many sectors and policy domains and creating conditions for implementing transformative change, World Heritage can also contribute to the implementation of the SDGs in line with the 2015 Sustainable Development Policy.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is suggested to keep the original text. The text added by Australia could be considered too limited in conveying the mandate of the World Heritage Convention, noting Para.1 from the 2015 Sustainable Development Policy below:

“Recognising that the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage is an integral part of UNESCO’s overarching mandate to foster equitable sustainable development¹ and to promote peace and security , and with a view to ensuring policy coherence with the UN sustainable development agenda as enshrined in the document “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, existing international humanitarian standards and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), States Parties should “ensure an appropriate and equitable balance between conservation, sustainability and development, so that World Heritage properties can be protected

through appropriate activities contributing to the social and economic development and the quality of life of our communities.” (also quoting the Budapest Declaration)

11. In 2017, the World Heritage Committee stated that “*the growing evidence of climate impacts across World Heritage properties confirm that urgent and rapid action to reduce global warming is essential and the highest degree of ambition and leadership by all countries is needed to secure the full implementation of the [2015 Paris Agreement](#) adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).*” The Paris Agreement [Brazil] adopted under the UNFCCC, aims to strengthen the global response to climate change [Thailand] in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty and reflecting equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances. and Countries have committed to climate action through their [Australia] successive Nationally Determined Contributions [Australia] reflecting their highest possible ambition and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances. International action on climate change must be consistent with the Paris Agreement, [Thailand] including its principles, and responding to national climate policies and priorities for Parties to that Agreement. [Brazil] However, it must be recognised that the Paris Agreement is an independent legal agreement.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The addition proposed by Thailand is appropriate, as it is consistent with what has been agreed to by Parties under the Paris agreement. It is suggested to remove Australia’s proposal in order to avoid duplication with Thailand’s amendment, which may be better placed as it would then relates to the global response to climate change and would not be limited to NDCs.

12. The Paris Agreement noted the importance of ensuring the integrity of all ecosystems and the protection of biodiversity when taking action to address climate change (Preamble). Future scientific understanding led by the IPCC and IPBES (the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) has deepened knowledge on the role of nature, including natural heritage sites, in climate mitigation and adaptation. [Brazil] Research³ suggests that ecosystem based approaches, sometimes referred to as nature based solutions, could deliver more than one third of the climate mitigation needed by mid-century to keep warming below 2°C. Cultural World Heritage properties similarly may embody both past carbon investments and also traditional practices, knowledge, and experience handed down through time that must be part of the solution to climate change⁴.

³ IUCN French Committee (2019). Nature-based Solutions for climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. Paris, France.

Griscom, B. et al. We need both natural and energy solutions to stabilize our climate – Griscom – 2019 – Global Change Biology – Wiley Online Library. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/gcb.14612>.

⁴ The ICOMOS Report “The Future of Our Pasts: Engaging Cultural Heritage in Climate Action” (2019) identifies a variety of traditional practices with relevance to contemporary greenhouse gas mitigation strategies including the inherently sustainable, passive features of traditional architecture (e.g. eaves, verandas, shutters, shading devices); traditional urban land-use patterns (dense, walkable, mixed-use space); and the knowledge embedded in low carbon agricultural heritage systems. Many traditional cultural systems also epitomize circular economy models that emphasize stewardship, reuse and resource efficiency.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

These are estimates, such as those provided in the referenced material, which includes an IUCN publication and peer review article. Given the recognised importance of fostering these approaches to addressing climate change, it would be better not to delete this sentence; however, this deletion can be considered, the importance of natural sites to climate strategies being addressed in the paragraph in general terms.

13. Considering their stature and visibility, there is an enormous benefit to World Heritage properties sharing their experiences, tools, methodologies and approaches more broadly. For example, World Heritage properties can play an exemplary role in implementing integrated approaches that link both cultural and natural heritage in climate action and demonstrate how transformative change can help in strengthening resilience and achieving sustainable development. A two-pronged approach is therefore needed, recognising that World Heritage properties represent both an asset to be protected from climate impacts and a resource to strengthen the ability of communities to pursue transformative change [Australia]. ~~In any case, that will safeguard~~ Outstanding Universal Value [Australia] ~~must be safeguarded, and alongside~~ climate action [Australia] ~~must be pursued.~~

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

Linking this provision to Outstanding Universal Value would exclude work under Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention to adopt general policies which aim to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes – both of which have key roles in climate action. Furthermore, World Heritage properties themselves have other key roles, e.g., through presentation, as recognised in the Convention. As Outstanding Universal Value should be safeguarded through climate action, it is therefore recommended to keep the original text.

14. Ultimately, World Heritage properties cannot be safeguarded from climate change in isolation because climate change is a global problem. However, many properties have already demonstrated how management systems that engage with local communities can strengthen natural, cultural and social resilience [Australia] ~~and offer sustainable futures.~~ In order to better respond to climate change, these approaches should be expanded to ensure that [Australia] the management of all properties [Australia] ~~are linked to their wider territories and efforts are linked to~~ is aligned with wider national and international climate change [Australia] ~~processes efforts,~~ while protecting Outstanding Universal Value. Approaches and communities especially those living in or around the properties must be brought together through integrated, inclusive, informed and adaptive governance that will facilitate the transformative change needed for addressing climate change.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

“Sustainable futures” is used in Chapter 8 of the IPCC’s Special Report on Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation (SREX). In addition, connection to wider landscape should be retained. A site’s links with the surrounding landscape as a natural World Heritage property cannot be considered separately from the wider ecosystem. Therefore, it is strongly recommended to maintain the original draft text.

15. Over and above all of this, collective action is needed, as envisaged in the Convention, which sees the international community as a whole participating in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value, by the granting of collective assistance as an efficient complement to the actions of States Parties. In the face of climate change, this responsibility must be called upon in support, **[Thailand] in the form of finance, technology, and capacity-building, to enable of the necessary** transformative change needed to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

This addition would be in line with the Enabling conditions set out in Section III.A. It is therefore suggested to retain the added text while broadening the scope of support in this respect and changing ‘technology’ to ‘technological innovation’ to align with the rest of the Policy Document. The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies therefore recommend the following wording:

“..., this responsibility must be called upon to support the necessary transformative change needed to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties, through further international cooperation in areas such as finance, technological innovation, and capacity-building.”

B. Purpose and Scope

16. The purpose of this Policy Document is to provide high-level guidance on enhancing the protection and conservation of heritage of Outstanding Universal Value through comprehensive adoption of climate action measures, including climate adaptation, mitigation, resilience building, innovation and research, and in so doing, to create coherence with, and take advantage of synergies between, the objectives and processes of the World Heritage Convention and those of the **[Brazil] UNFCCC** Paris Agreement and related multilateral agreements, processes and instruments, including but not limited to the [2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development](#), the [2015 Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction](#), the [2016 New Urban Agenda](#), the [Small Island Developing States Accelerated Modalities of Action \(“Samoa Pathway”\)](#) **[Russian Federation: delete]** and the **Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework**.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

Indeed, the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) will only be adopted in May 2022. However, Decisions **44 COM 5A** and **44 COM 7.2** refer to GBF, so a reference should somehow be retained.

17. The Policy Document provides **[Brazil] a voluntary** outcome-oriented policy framework for the development of goals and targets at national and heritage site levels, updating of national heritage management tools and action plans, and facilitating regular monitoring of the implementation and subsequent review of this Policy Document.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

As set in Para.16 above, this Policy Document is meant to provide high-level guidance, and is not legally-binding. This is also supported in Para.20 below (it “*does not impose any new legal obligations on States Parties*”). It is therefore suggested to keep the original text.

18. This Policy Document aims to galvanise urgent action in support of transformative change by States Parties to the Convention, which can reflect its aims in their own national policies that guide the implementation of the Convention at the World Heritage property level. While this Policy Document is aimed primarily at States Parties to the Convention and managers of World Heritage properties, the implementation of its provisions will often require the contribution and support of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and other relevant bodies.
19. The Policy Document is also intended to be of relevance to all stakeholders and rights holders, including Indigenous Peoples and local communities, civil society, and the private sector. Moreover, while the Policy Document is specifically aimed at World Heritage properties, its principles are relevant to cultural and natural heritage in general, in the spirit of Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention.
20. The Policy Document is intended to be embedded in the existing processes of the World Heritage Convention and does not impose any new legal obligations on States Parties. It is intended to operate within the mandate of the World Heritage Convention and does not aim to duplicate the mandate of any other multilateral agreements, processes and instruments.

C. Guiding Principles

21. **Adopt a precautionary approach aimed at minimising the risks associated with climate change.** The risks associated with climate change depend, among other factors, on the magnitude and rate of warming, geographic location, levels of adaptive capacity that all together determine specific conditions of climate vulnerability. Moreover, for many natural and cultural systems, adaptation in the face of these risks is expected to be more challenging at 2°C of global warming than at 1.5°C, **[Brazil] especially in developing countries**. In view of this, the implementation by all States Parties of a precautionary approach...

[Australia]...~~that pursues pathways limiting global warming to 1.5°C, with no or limited overshoot,~~ **consistent with commitments to implement the Paris Agreement**,...

// or //

[Brazil] that pursues pathways limiting global warming to 1.5°C, with no or limited overshoot, **taking into account the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC)**, ...

.....is the most effective approach for the protection, conservation and management of the cultural and natural heritage. Uncertainty (i.e. lack of scientific certainty) should not be used as a reason for not implementing such a precautionary approach to address the causes and minimise the risks associated with climate change.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

In its Decision **41 COM 7**, the Committee already reiterated the importance of States Parties undertaking the most ambitious implementation of the Paris Agreement of the UNFCCC by holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and *by pursuing efforts to limit the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C*..... This is also referred to in Para.94 below.

It is therefore suggested to retain the sentence “*that pursues pathways limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C*...”, as well as the addition proposed by Australia, referring to the Paris Agreement, which encompasses Brazil’s suggestion.

22. **Anticipate, avoid and minimise harm to protect the heritage of Outstanding Universal Value.** Considering that climate change threatens both World Heritage properties and the future well-being of people through harmful and negative consequences, some of which are potentially irreversible, States Parties to the Convention and all World Heritage stakeholders and rights holders are urged to take appropriate measures, within their powers, to anticipate, avoid and minimise harm, consistent with their obligations under the World Heritage Convention **[Brazil] and environmental agreements** to protect the world's natural and cultural heritage considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

From the “agreements” perspective, this addition is not recommended. The World Heritage Convention sets the obligations to protect heritage of Outstanding Universal Value. Other agreements have other mandates.

23. **Use best available knowledge, generated through disciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary processes, including from scientists, researchers, site managers, Indigenous Peoples and local communities.** Proposed actions should be based on, and guided by, the best available disciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary knowledge, that is developed by researchers, practitioners and Indigenous Peoples and local communities, working together to address climate change as a persistent problem. The heritage management decision-making process should be informed by this ‘best available knowledge’ approach and the different types of knowledge generated. They also should meet the highest standards of research integrity and be rigorous and transparent in their analysis of the climate risks including estimates of uncertainty, and undertake rigorous impact assessments on potential threats to Outstanding Universal Value to provide decision-makers with insight into, and understanding of, the underlying risks as well as opportunities, and guidance for the formulation of long-term strategies.
24. **Integrate a Sustainable Development perspective.** Actions taken by States Parties to address climate change impacts can also contribute to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in line with the 2015 Sustainable Development Policy through adoption of mutually reinforcing, inclusive and adaptive approaches. Those approaches can help to reflect a wider range of heritage values and knowledge systems beyond Outstanding Universal Value, **[Russian Federation] and support equity**, including through equitable sharing of heritage-benefits arising from their use and rights-based approaches. Adaptive approaches, including learning from heritage experience, monitoring and feedback loops, contribute to preparing for and managing the inevitable uncertainties and complexities associated with climate change.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The issue of “equity” is further covered and defined in the 2015 Policy on World Heritage and Sustainable Development, which does make equity an aim. For example, section 18 of the 2015 Policy recognizes that the promotion of equity is a goal. It is therefore suggested to keep the original draft text, as supporting equity is an important provision to integrate a sustainable development perspective into the Policy Document.

25. **Promote global partnership, inclusion and solidarity, [China] emphasizing common but differentiated responsibilities and that developed countries provide necessary financial and technical support to developing countries.** In addressing climate change **[Australia] impacts on World Heritage properties**, and particularly in

the implementation of this Policy Document, relevant stakeholders and rights holders at all levels should work together in a spirit of global partnership, inclusion, and in solidarity with the poorest and most vulnerable people [Australia: delete until the end], who are in the front lines of climate change impacts [Thailand] and in accordance with the principle of principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances. Climate change does not stop at borders. It conjoins the safeguarding of World Heritage properties with larger sustainability challenges, spatial, social, economic and cultural ones in the surroundings of the properties. Solutions for the safeguarding of the properties can only be found if they are connected to spatial, social and cultural transformations beyond the site. Strategies need to be developed that provide solutions for sustainable development beyond the borders of the World Heritage property.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

This matter should be agreed and applied in a manner that is consistent with what has already been agreed to by Parties under the Paris agreement. It may, therefore, be redundant to include the proposals made by China and Thailand.

In addition, deleting the end of the paragraph would remove the important fact that the protection of World Heritage properties contributes both to addressing global challenges and to sustainable development. It is suggested to keep original text as this is factually correct, appropriate as an approach, and in line with the aim of the Policy Document to “*create coherence with, and take advantage of synergies between, the objectives and processes of the World Heritage Convention and those of the Paris Agreement and related multilateral agreements, processes and instruments.*”

II. THE POLICY FRAMEWORK

A. Long-Term Vision

26. The vision of the Policy Document is that each State Party understands the current and future potential impacts of climate change on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage properties situated on their territory, and undertakes climate action in an effective, ambitious, cooperative and active way. This is undertaken consistent with States Parties’ obligations under the World Heritage Convention [Brazil] and the environmental agreements to ensure the protection, conservation and management of their cultural and natural heritage to the utmost of its own capacities and resources and, where appropriate, with international assistance and co-operation.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

Same as for Para.22 above: From the “agreements” perspective, this addition would not be recommended. The World Heritage Convention sets the obligations to protect heritage of Outstanding Universal Value. Other agreements have other mandates.

B. World Heritage Climate Action Goals

27. The Policy Document establishes the following set of World Heritage Climate Action Goals towards 2030, to guide how World Heritage processes can effectively contribute to the transformative change needed to halt and reverse the negative trends associated

with climate change causes and effects, through enhanced and improved collaboration, and [Australia] ~~effective and synergistic implementation~~ **the alignment** of local, national and international climate [Australia] ~~policies~~ **instruments**. While the goals are targeted primarily at States Parties to the Convention, they require the contribution and support of the World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies, site managers and civil society. These goals should be viewed in light of national circumstances.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is suggested to keep the original text in accordance with one of the stated aims of the Policy Document, which is “to create coherence with, and take advantage of synergies between, the objectives and processes of the World Heritage Convention and those of the Paris Agreement and related multilateral agreements, processes and instruments.”

- **Goal 1 (Climate risk assessment):** By 2030, States Parties should develop [Brazil] **and share** tools and build capacity needed to assess climate risks and identify potential reversible or irreversible damage to attributes carrying the Outstanding Universal Value associated with current and projected impacts of climate hazards, and to report the resulting climate risks assessments through World Heritage processes such as Periodic Reporting and state of conservation reports (see Section D.1 below);

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

- **Goal 2 (Climate Adaptation):** By 2030, States Parties should [Brazil] ~~establish at the national and/or other appropriate levels, and implement at the site level,~~ **develop, as appropriate,** robust climate adaptation frameworks [Brazil] **for their cultural and natural heritage** that can demonstrate measurable progress on monitoring of climate hazards, assessing and reducing climate risks and vulnerabilities, and in doing so enhancing adaptive capacity and building climate resilience for all World Heritage properties (see Section D.2 below);

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The original text provides for States Parties to develop frameworks “*at national and/or other appropriate levels*”. This accounts for the concerns raised by Brazil here. The deletion of the element “*and implement at the site level*” is considered problematic. It is therefore suggested to keep the original text.

- **Goal 3 (Climate Mitigation):** By 2030, States Parties, [Brazil] **in accordance with their national commitments and taking into account the common but differentiated responsibilities,** should [Brazil] ~~implement at national and/or other appropriate levels, comprehensive climate mitigation frameworks that guide~~ **strengthen the capacity of** mitigation action [Brazil] ~~for of their~~ cultural, natural and mixed properties ~~that and~~ encourage the reduction of net greenhouse gas emissions associated with World Heritage properties, including, where appropriate, actions to safeguard natural ecosystems that are carbon sinks (see Section D.3 below);

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is recognized that the national mitigation targets are interpreted in the framework of the UNFCCC. The Policy Document aims at strengthening the contribution of World Heritage properties to climate change mitigation. The commitment to environmental sustainability by the States Parties has been included also in Policy Document for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (2015). It is therefore suggested to keep the original text but to include the following wording instead of the text proposed by Brazil: “By 2030, States Parties, **in accordance with nationally determined contributions, and in line with principles established under the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement, should...**”. However, it is suggested to retain Brazil’s proposal to change “*guide*” to “*strengthen the capacity of*”.

- **Goal 4 (Knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness):** By 2030, States Parties should have developed and implemented activities aimed at improving education, awareness raising, and human and institutional capacity in relation to the risks and responses related to climate change impacts on World Heritage properties, including programmes [Brazil] of knowledge-sharing and those designed to promote these properties as exemplars of climate action (see Section D.4 below).

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

C. Legal framework

28. The World Heritage Convention and the Operational Guidelines for its implementation provide the legal and administrative framework respectively within which this Policy Document is to be applied. Key duties and obligations of States Parties under the Convention are set out in Articles 4, 5 and 6.
29. Article 4 establishes the basis for States Parties to do all that they can to ensure the conservation, protection, presentation and transmission to future generations of World Heritage properties situated on their territories.
30. Climate change is recognised among the most significant threats to World Heritage properties and is growing. As per Article 5(d), to ensure that effective and active measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage situated on its territory, each State Party to the Convention shall endeavour, in so far as possible, and as appropriate for each country, to “*take the appropriate legal, scientific, technical, administrative and financial measures necessary for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of this heritage*”.
31. Under Article 6(1), “...*the States Parties to this Convention recognise that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate*”. Under Article 6(3), States Parties undertake “*not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage on the territory of other States Parties*”. Article 7 enables establishment of a system of international co-operation and assistance designed to support States Parties in their efforts to conserve heritage.
32. While the enumeration of “*serious and specific dangers*” under Article 11 (4) of the Convention concerning the inclusion of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

does not specifically refer to climate change (which was not under the same scrutiny in the early 1970s as it is now), the provision is clearly sufficiently broad to include ~~its~~ **[the] [Australia] effects impacts of climate change on Outstanding Universal Value**.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

Making this change would not be recommended. If more precision is required, perhaps the text could rather say: “...**to include the impacts of climate change as a serious and specific danger to properties**.”

33. The Operational Guidelines, in paragraphs 179 and 180, set out the criteria for placing cultural and natural properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger for both ascertained and potential dangers. Currently, only Paragraph 179 (b) and Paragraph 180 (b) refer to “*threatening impacts of climatic, geological or other environmental factors*” as a potential danger. Paragraph 181 provides that the “*factor or factors which are threatening the integrity of the property must be those which are amenable to correction by human action*”.
34. It is also recommended that climate change be considered in the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List. Each nominated property should have a management plan or other documented management system (Paragraph 108 of the Operational Guidelines). The nomination dossier (Paragraph 132(4)) should address the state of conservation and a description of the factors affecting the property, including threats. The format for the nomination of properties is included in Annex 5 of the Operational Guidelines and refers to “*environmental pressures*” as factors affecting the property and lists, as an example, climate change (Section 4a(ii) of the format).
35. Current management and protection requirements (paragraphs 111, 118, 118bis) address climate change impacts and identify the assessment of vulnerabilities of the nominated site to actual and potential social, economic, environmental and other pressures and changes, including climate change, as a common element any effective management system could include. Impact assessments must also be carried out as a pre-requisite for adaptation and mitigation responses within or around a World Heritage property to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value is not negatively impacted.
36. This Policy Document foresees that over the coming decade and beyond, climate change will negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties and also the potential Outstanding Universal Value of many places proposed for inscription on the World Heritage List. This **[Australia] may call for the establishment of a dialogue, will call for ongoing dialogue (which in and of itself would not be legally binding)**, inclusive of States Parties, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, and civil society, to address significant legal and interpretative questions raised by climate change with respect to the Convention, based on the line of questioning first proposed in Annex 2 of the 2007 Policy Document, as follows:

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

This point, related to the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger on account of climate change, was discussed at length during the Technical Advisory Group meetings (April-September 2021). Members of the Group were of the view that this may call for the establishment of a dialogue, inclusive of States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and civil society. The overall status of this Policy Document does not need to be interpreted paragraph by paragraph, so it is suggested to delete the bracketed text proposed by Australia.

- Whether a property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List while knowing that its potential Outstanding Universal Value may disappear due to climate change impacts;
- Whether a property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger or deleted from the World Heritage List due to impacts beyond the sole control of the concerned State Party (i.e. threats and/or the detrimental impacts on the integrity of World Heritage properties associated with the global impacts of warming from anthropogenic GHG emissions);
- The reality that for some natural and cultural properties, it will be impossible to maintain the “original” Outstanding Universal Value for which they were originally inscribed on the World Heritage List, even if effective adaptation and mitigation strategies are applied, and this may require an “evolving” assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.

[Australia] Resolving the above issues and having procedures that deal with them implemented in the Operational Guidelines, are critical and necessary steps to underpin decisions relating to the global effects of climate-change on specific World Heritage sites. Such decisions should be deferred until these procedures are in place, so they are made with clarity and certainty as to how to manage the inherent tensions between a site-based Convention and a global threat to World Heritage requiring collective action.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

A procedure is already in place in the Operational Guidelines for the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis of climatic factors (Para.179.b)vi. and Para.180.b)v. of the Operational Guidelines). These matters have been and are handled appropriately on a case-by-case basis, within the framework of the Operational Guidelines. Such deferral would also negatively impact the implementation of the Convention. Indeed, as action is needed without delays, it does not seem wise to suspend tools such as the Reactive Monitoring or In-danger listing pending global resolution of all issues. The content of decisions to be taken should be discussed by the World Heritage Committee, as a sovereign decision-making body. The Committee meets every year and can adapt its decisions as required, on an ongoing basis. It is therefore suggested not to retain the amendment proposed by Australia.

D. Climate action

37. Climate actions include **[Brazil] *inter alia*** responses within the framework of the World Heritage Convention to the threat of climate change, based on the most recent scientific and political developments. Key categories of climate action with respect to World Heritage properties are: (i) Assessing climate **[Thailand: English only] change** risks (ii) Climate **[Thailand: English only] change** adaptation (iii) Climate **[Thailand: English only] change** mitigation and (iv) Knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness. These responses take advantage of better coordination and effective implementation of the local, subnational, national and international developments since the adoption of the Paris Agreement.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

38. Latest scientific findings, especially those documented in IPCC reports, indicate that both mitigation and adaptation options are specific to national contexts, and if carefully selected together with enabling conditions [Brazil] and means of implementation, can be mutually reinforcing. However, mitigation and adaptation can also have adverse impacts on Outstanding Universal Value, if these are poorly designed or implemented. Even with best efforts, real and perceived tensions may develop between proposed climate action pathways and the obligations of States Parties under the Convention to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties, including the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is suggested to keep the original text. 'Means of implementation' is encompassed within the 'Enabling conditions', as outlined in Section III A. of the Policy Document.

39. Climate-related risks to World Heritage properties depend on the rate, peak and duration of global warming. Risks are generally higher for warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels than at present, but lower than at 2°C. Adaptation is correspondingly expected to be more challenging for some World Heritage properties at 2°C of global warming than for 1.5°C, [Brazil] especially in developing countries. This underscores the importance of considering both adaptation and mitigation approaches. In addition, adaptation options that also mitigate GHG emissions can provide synergies and cost savings.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

This is supported by the IPCC 1.5 Special Report, which says: "Some vulnerable regions, including small islands and Least Developed Countries."

D.1. Assessing climate [Thailand: English only] change risks to World Heritage properties

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

40. Improving capacity to assess climate change risks is the objective of World Heritage Climate Action Goal 1 (see Section II.B. above). This goal asks States Parties, in light of the national circumstances, to develop, by 2030, tools and build capacity needed to identify potential reversible or irreversible loss of attributes of Outstanding Universal Value associated with current and projected climate hazards including those that may exceed the adaptive capacity of relevant human or natural systems. Climate risk assessments are crucial for understanding and anticipating negative impacts and potential loss of Outstanding Universal Value and provide critical information to help determine how to manage them. It also asks States Parties to report the results thereof through World Heritage processes.
41. To design effective climate actions, including mitigation and adaptation strategies, the heritage community needs to have a good understanding of the climate risks involved. Correspondingly, there is a need for methodologies and mechanisms to systematically assess such risks. These methodologies should promote improved measurability of impacts and potential loss of heritage values and improved understanding of the economic, social, health, education, and environmental cost of such losses (including effects on ecosystem and cultural services). Defining or clarifying risks to Outstanding

Universal Value and other measurable, non-monetary values that support a given World Heritage property can also aid in determining the adaptation limits of that resource or system, including the acceptability or non-acceptability of levels of change and consequent perceptions of loss and irreplaceability. Although climate actions will often result in adjustments that are within a given heritage system's adaptive limits, completely preventing all projected impacts of climate change on every World Heritage property will not be possible with the result being damage to or loss of attributes of Outstanding Universal Value.

42. There exists a range of approaches and instruments to undertake risk assessments associated with the impacts of climate change. The challenge is to identify the more appropriate methodologies, not only to the type of hazard but also to the social, environmental, economic, geographical, landscape and institutional context of the properties for which the Outstanding Universal Value may be at risk of being irretrievably damaged or lost. Special consideration should also be included for populations at disproportionately higher risk of adverse consequences, for example disadvantaged and vulnerable populations, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities.
43. Managers of World Heritage properties require a clear understanding of the climate risks to which their properties are vulnerable, the capacity needed to prepare for and respond to those risks, and the residual risks afterwards. Within this context, the Policy Document encourages States Parties to the Convention to aim to integrate climate risk management for World Heritage properties within wider national approaches and frameworks for climate adaptation. As noted in this Policy Document, further dialogue is needed on how the impacts of climate change on Outstanding Universal Value are dealt with by the World Heritage system.
44. Sharing experiences of methods and results to assess climate hazards, vulnerabilities and risks across World Heritage properties can also help to build adaptive capacity and resilience. Cross-property actions such as promoting the development of climate risk assessment tools for regions, ecosystems or heritage typologies is encouraged. Transboundary and transnational properties also present an important case where shared responses to common climate risks should be encouraged.
45. This Policy Document encourages the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to find ways to integrate climate risk management mechanisms, including assessment and monitoring of climate hazards and the factors that cause or exacerbate them, into existing World Heritage processes. Mechanisms could include, but not limited to, making the consideration of climate change a requirement in the nomination process, Periodic Reporting, Reactive Monitoring, protective measures, and management systems, including management plans. Climate change considerations should similarly be incorporated into related World Heritage doctrines, policies and resource manuals. New tools might be needed to assess climate change impact on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, as well as to identify factors that can become threats and that could ultimately impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of properties.
46. Further technical considerations in developing a climate risk management assessment and management strategies are presented in Annex II of this Policy Document.

D.2. Climate [Thailand: English only] change Adaptation

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

47. World Heritage Climate Action Goal 2 (see Section II.B above) refers to the necessary climate [Thailand: English only] change adaptation actions to avoid and minimise climate impacts on heritage values, consistent with the obligations of States Parties under the Convention to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of properties. According to IPCC, “in human systems, climate adaptation is the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects, in order to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In natural systems, it is the process of adjustment to actual climate and its effects; human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects”.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

48. Climate [Thailand: English only] change adaptation should relate to all hazards that are directly and indirectly attributed to climate change, exposure of various components of the World Heritage properties to these hazards and related vulnerability factors (physical, social, economic, institutional, etc.) This reflects not only the importance of addressing all components of climate risks (hazards, exposure, vulnerability), but also makes clear that climate change adaptation cannot be seen in isolation from other risk factors.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

49. Climate change is a risk multiplier that can exacerbate current hazards, exposures and vulnerabilities including poverty, urbanisation, pollution[Russian Federation], ~~and insecurity, with potential implications for social conflict~~. World Heritage properties may also be impacted by improper adaptation or mitigation responses to climate change (i.e. maladaptation).

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

Social conflict and human insecurity are referred to as an impact of climate change the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report (WGII AR5: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability, Chapter 12). The IPCC’s Special Report: Global Warming of 1.5°C also recognizes that “Climate-related risks to health, livelihoods, food security, water supply, human security, and economic growth are projected to increase with global warming of 1.5°C and increase further with 2°C.” It is therefore suggested to keep the original text.

50. Climate change may have positive impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of some World Heritage properties. Therefore, climate [Thailand: English only] change adaptation strategies should consider whether there are opportunities to exploit these positive impacts, while also reducing the risks of the negative impacts of climate change. A lost opportunity may be as harmful as a negative impact.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

51. The importance of addressing non-climate threats and pressures, in particular to natural and mixed World Heritage properties, is emphasised because doing so effectively can

help build their resilience to climate change and improve their adaptive capacity. In circumstances where the impacts of climate are intensifying and increasing in frequency, action on other pressures will become increasingly important to sustaining the resilience of World Heritage properties and protecting their Outstanding Universal Value.

52. The impacts of climate change can also exacerbate the many drivers of human mobility (migration, planned relocation and displacement). Communities associated with some World Heritage properties are already experiencing climate change impacts that could ultimately induce migration and/or displacement of people and impact Outstanding Universal Value, particularly for those properties for which Outstanding Universal Value depends on cultural continuity. This Policy Document emphasises that adequate support be given to States Parties who face not only the potential loss of World Heritage properties, but the displacement of communities associated with them. Clear guidance needs to be developed on how such eventualities will be considered and evaluated by the World Heritage Committee and on how implementation strategies might be framed. A useful starting point would be to create methodologies for identifying World Heritage properties associated with communities at greater risk for displacement.
53. The Policy Document also recognises that adaptation is a global challenge faced at local, subnational, national, regional and international levels. World Heritage properties can support wider adaptation efforts at all levels. World Heritage properties and the values they embody have the potential to contribute to social resilience and the recovery from climate change losses by providing a common framework for identifying potential loss and by supporting a sense of place, continuity and identity. World Heritage properties can also serve an educational and communication function by highlighting the links between nature and culture, and the sustainability of many historic, traditional and indigenous practices. Heritage values can support social cohesion, which is an important element of adaptive capacity, which in turn can be fostered through participatory approaches to heritage management.
54. **[Australia]** In ~~the Preamble and~~ Article 7.5 of the Paris Agreement, its Parties acknowledge that adaptation action should follow “a country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems, and should be based on and guided by the best available science and, as appropriate, traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems, with a view to integrating adaptation into relevant socioeconomic and environmental policies and actions, where appropriate”. World Heritage properties should seek to exemplify this approach. The importance of Indigenous Peoples’ and local communities’ knowledge for understanding impacts and designing and implementing appropriate adaptation actions should be valued and appropriately utilised via a participatory process characterised by respect for the diversity of cultural expressions⁵. The use of traditional practices in climate adaptation should be supported by practical training for local experts and communities in order to support dynamism, internal creativity and experimentation in such knowledge systems.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

55. **[Australia]** ~~This Policy Document also acknowledges that adaptation action should follow a country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems. Adaptation actions~~

⁵ See <https://unfccc.int/LCIPP-FWG> for more details on the UNFCCC’s Facilitative Working Group of the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform

at World Heritage properties should also contribute towards increasing the resilience of indigenous peoples and local communities.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The first sentence of this paragraph is redundant with the above Para.54 and can indeed be removed.

However, it is suggested to retain the last sentence referring to increasing the resilience of indigenous peoples and local communities, and formulate it as follows:

“This Policy Document acknowledges that adaptation actions at World Heritage properties should also contribute towards increasing the resilience of indigenous peoples and local communities.”

56. World Heritage processes need to be strengthened to support the expected climate adaptation outcomes. Areas for further focus on this topic to World Heritage properties and World Heritage Climate Action Goal 2 are set out in Annex II to the Policy Document.

D.3. Climate [Thailand: English only] change Mitigation

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

57. Aligning the management of World Heritage properties with the imperative of climate change mitigation through a comprehensive climate [Thailand] change mitigation framework is the objective of World Heritage Climate Action Goal 3 (see Section II.B above). This goal asks States Parties to implement at national and/or other appropriate levels, comprehensive climate [Thailand: English only] change mitigation frameworks that guide mitigation action for cultural sites and safeguard natural ecosystems that are carbon sinks. It also encourages the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions associated with World Heritage properties.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

58. The IPCC defines mitigation as “a human intervention to reduce emissions or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases.”⁶ IPCC’s reports, and most notably the 1.5°C Special Report (2018), makes clear that limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require rapid and far-reaching transitions in the global economy, with deep emissions reductions in all sectors, a wide portfolio of mitigation options and a significant upscaling of investments in those options. Within this context, this Policy Document encourages States Parties to the Convention to aim for a transition towards low-carbon alternatives for World Heritage properties management as soon as possible, [Thailand] in accordance with the equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances.

⁶ The word ‘mitigation’ is used in this Policy Document in the technical sense in which it is used by the IPCC: “a human intervention to reduce emissions or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases.” This is essentially the same sense in which the word was used in the 2007 Policy Document (“Mitigation: an anthropogenic intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases (IPCC)”). Users of this Policy Document should not confuse this usage with the sense in which the word ‘mitigation’

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

59. Given the high profile, global reach, and a broad mix of heritage typologies included within the World Heritage List, States Parties are encouraged to maximise the ‘signalling’ value and inspirational power of World Heritage properties to showcase ‘win-win’ mitigation practices that both reduce greenhouse gases and safeguard Outstanding Universal Value, with the potential to set international standards in heritage management.
60. Noting that by representing some of the world’s most outstanding natural ecosystems and by their important role in the mitigation of climate change with the large amount of carbon they store, the protection of natural World Heritage properties is considered the Convention's most impactful contribution to addressing climate change mitigation.
61. World Heritage properties, especially natural, mixed and large-scale cultural landscapes, are among those places that might significantly contribute to climate mitigation by:
- Safeguarding natural ecosystems that are carbon sinks;
 - When feasible and consistent with protecting Outstanding Universal Value, undertaking actions to enhance carbon sequestration in natural systems.
- Such approaches would need to adhere to strict environmental and social safeguards and consider carbon storage permanence.
62. In the context of cultural and mixed properties, and especially for cultural landscapes, mitigation actions based on enhanced land use management, should avoid and minimise impact on heritage values including customary land management practices, consider the concomitant impact on the livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and be consistent with the States Parties’ obligations under the Convention to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value.
63. Among the options to consider are:
- Use of traditional passive measures in historical buildings as strategies to reduce energy consumption;
 - Use of the Life cycle assessment (LCA) methodology for the selection of replacement materials requiring less energy to produce, and thus emitting less GHG;
 - Promoting the critical role of routine maintenance and good conservation in reducing operational GHG.
64. Annex III to this Policy Document frames some key areas for additional focus of GHG emissions reduction efforts in the context of management of World Heritage properties, including: (a) Built environment; (b) Land use management; (c) Life cycle assessment; (d) Tourism management.

D.4. Knowledge Sharing, Capacity Building and Awareness

65. [Brazil] Article 11 of the 2015 Paris Agreement recognises the importance of education and capacity building for [Brazil] “developing country Parties, in particular countries with the least capacity, such as the least developed countries, and those

is used in the heritage context (namely, measures to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset negative effects on Outstanding Universal Value or other values).

that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, such as small island developing States, to take effective climate change action” enhancing climate action. The World Heritage Convention and its processes also consider these factors as important for the effective management and conservation of World Heritage.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The added text by Brazil referring to Article 11 of the Paris Agreement is accurate and somewhat appropriate in this context. However, the Paris Agreement also contains provisions for education and capacity building located elsewhere than Article 11, and therefore the language of the original text is most appropriate in encompassing the importance of knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness through the Policy Document, in alignment with the Paris Agreement.

It is suggested to keep the original text, but to include a new sentence at the end of this paragraph, which would read as follows:

“In addition, the evolution of the Paris Agreement implementation mechanisms is aiming to enact common and enhanced provisions while differentiating between developed and developing countries in the short term, and greater implementation-related capacity-building for developing countries through viable commitments from developed countries in terms of technology transfer and financing.”

66. In line with World Heritage Climate Action Goal 4 (see Section II.B above), States Parties are encouraged to build capacities of decision-makers, stakeholders, local communities, users and managers of the World Heritage properties, and other heritage specialists to upgrade their skills and knowledge about the impacts of climate change on properties, including the intrinsic link between nature loss and climate change, developing and implementing appropriate climate actions, possible sources of technical and financial assistance, and engaging with climate change-related networks.
67. The vast majority of the climate-related issues that World Heritage properties are facing are persistent problems. Therefore, World Heritage needs interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary knowledge, that is created by researchers, practitioners, site managers and local communities and Indigenous Peoples, working together to address climate change that will influence heritage management for the decades to come.
68. In line with references to training and awareness-raising set out in the World Heritage Convention and the UNFCCC, national educational strategies should adequately address the intersections between heritage, in general, and World Heritage in particular, and climate change. Such approaches benefit from emphasising the importance of knowledge exchange across a wide range of stakeholders and rights holders including those from heritage management and climate science, encouraging research, recognising existing ways of learning about climate change, while encouraging the intergenerational exchange of knowledge.
69. States Parties and managers of World Heritage properties are encouraged to share with other managers their experience on dealing with climate change impacts on their properties by developing case studies on challenges and good practices and the lessons learnt. World Heritage properties should also be used, wherever appropriate and possible, as means to raise awareness about the impacts of climate change on heritage and should act as a catalyst in the international debate to obtain support for policies, and to communicate good practices of climate action.
70. Mobilising public and political support for climate action inside and outside World Heritage properties is essential. This can be achieved through workshops, exhibitions and expositions, site interpretation, media campaigns, audio-visual material and

publications which link the impacts of the global phenomenon of climate change to national, local and property levels. This would require the development of tools to communicate effectively the impacts of climate change and implications of actions on World Heritage properties to various audiences, including civil society, with subsequent benefits for research, decision-making, planning and management.

71. World Heritage properties can serve as living laboratories, or platforms for knowledge and research, for monitoring change, linking policy and practice and fostering understanding of climate change and of the need for climate action. World Heritage properties should take advantage of the diverse fields of heritage research both in sciences and humanities, and World Heritage properties should be monitored to advance understanding of short-term and long-term environmental and global change on properties. This could include using science, traditional/indigenous and local knowledge (with free, prior and informed consent as appropriate) and the history of World Heritage properties to track past human interactions and their effects on environments, and to assess climatic, environmental and social baselines from where contemporary climate and society are shifting.
72. Areas for further focus regarding knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness are set out in Annex IV to the Policy Document.

D.5. Transformative change

73. This transformative change section of the Policy Document highlights and synthesises the elements associated with the urgency and scale of action required by the World Heritage Convention to support bold decisions to transition to a carbon neutral and resilient world that can sustain World Heritage properties for future generations.
74. World Heritage is immersed in an unprecedented global change: a rapidly changing climate and the progressive loss of global biodiversity are perhaps the most prominent indicators of how rapidly humans are negatively transforming the planet. The majority of direct drivers of those changes share common causes in that they are underpinned by societal values and behaviours that induce unsustainable production and consumption patterns.
75. Global initiatives, most notably led by IPCC and IPBES, are indicating the need for urgent and concerted efforts for a “fundamental, system-wide reorganisation across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values”, that ultimately lead to a “*transformative change*” to address both nature loss and climate change. Both IPCC and IPBES indicate that except in scenarios that include transformative change, negative trends in climate and nature are projected to continue to 2050 and beyond.
76. In the short term (before 2030), all heritage decision-makers could contribute to that transformative change, through enhanced and improved implementation and enforcement of effective national and local climate policy. Additional measures are necessary to enable transformative change in the long term ([Brazil] up to 2050 by mid-century) to contribute to addressing the indirect drivers that are the root causes of climate change, including changes in social, economic and technological structures within and across nations.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

77. In the context of climate adaptation, transformative change for limiting the risks from global warming of 1.5°C implies system transitions that can be enabled by an increase of adaptation investments, policy instruments, the acceleration of technological

innovation and behaviour changes. For example, World Heritage can be safeguarded through enhanced international cooperation and linked locally relevant measures. The review and renewal of agreed climate-related international goals and targets based on the best available scientific knowledge and the widespread adoption and funding of transformative and resilient heritage management plans, are key to this safeguarding.

78. Another aspect of transformative change in the heritage sector, are the pathways undertaken by each country for limiting global warming to 1.5°C that should imply rapid and far-reaching transitions in many heritage-related sectors. These transitions are unprecedented in terms of scale, and imply deep GHG emissions reductions in all sectors, a wide portfolio of mitigation options and a significant upscaling of investments in those options.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY DOCUMENT

79. This section articulates recommendations for implementing the Policy Document at various levels, namely World Heritage Committee, States Parties and World Heritage property levels. The five key considerations for implementing the Policy Document are:

- Integrating measures to identify and manage climate related risks to the Outstanding Universal Value at the property level and in the processes of the Committee;
- Integrating **[Australia] World Heritage in climate change [Australia] planning and design in World Heritage property management** at national and local levels;

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is suggested to keep the original text in order to align with the World Heritage Climate Action Goals (Section II.B), especially Goals 2 & 3 (as originally drafted), which provide goals centred around integrating World Heritage into national and/or other appropriate level planning and design:

Goal 2: ‘...States Parties should establish at the national and/or other appropriate levels, and implement at the site level, robust climate adaptation frameworks...’

Goal 3: ‘...States Parties should implement at national and/or other appropriate levels, comprehensive climate mitigation frameworks that guide mitigation action for cultural, natural and mixed properties...’

The original text also derives from Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention; it is therefore suggested that it remains as in initially proposed.

- Developing and sharing tools and methodologies to assess and manage the current and future impact of climate change with **[Brazil] and among Parties and** various stakeholders and rights holders, at the property, national and international levels (particularly through the process of establishing regional Action Plans);

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is suggested to replace “Parties” by “States Parties”.

- Enabling World Heritage properties to contribute to the transformative change that is necessary for low carbon **[Thailand] and climate-**resilient development;

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

- Utilising a place-based approach to contextualise climate action responses, integrating nature and culture in the management of all properties in response to climate change, and respecting the rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.
80. To achieve these, various actions are recommended at World Heritage Committee, States Parties and World Heritage property levels. For the effective implementation of the Policy Document, an internationally collaborative approach is advocated through engagement of all the stakeholders and rights holders to develop and implement the tools and methodologies that can support climate action for World Heritage properties. This should utilise existing mechanisms where appropriate, including Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting, to promote best practice and regional engagement opportunities for climate-related action concerning World Heritage protection.

A. Enabling conditions

81. Successful implementation of this Policy Document requires enabling conditions that support the feasibility of adaptation and mitigation options and can accelerate and scale-up systemic transitions and enhance capacities of systems and societies to adapt to climate change, while safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value, achieving sustainable development, eradicating poverty and reducing inequalities. These include [Brazil] the provision and mobilization of finance, technological innovation, institutional capacity, multi-level governance, and changes in human behaviour and lifestyles. They also include inclusive processes, attention to power asymmetries and unequal opportunities. States Parties will endeavour to enhance the feasibility of actions contemplated through this Policy Document by attention to the enabling conditions underpinning climate action in the World Heritage context. [Russian Federation] ~~The World Heritage Committee will be an advocate for climate action and will work to support partners that are expected to carry out such action under this Policy Document.~~

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies concur with the additional text propose by Brazil, but it is suggested to re-word “...*the provision and mobilization of...*” to “...*the transfer and mobilisation of...*” to align with ‘Finance’ section below (Section III.A).

It is however suggested not to retain the deletion proposed by the Russian Federation, as the original text is in line with the recommendations set out in Section III.B. of the Policy Document on World Heritage Committee-level implementation. In addition, as the Policy Document already notes, safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value depends for many properties on the pursuit of precautionary approach that mitigates the cause of climate change. Part of the duty of the international community as a whole is to co-operate in this pursuit of climate action.

Governance

82. Climate governance is key to creating the conditions for implementing transformative change in the World Heritage context. Such World Heritage climate governance systems should embrace inclusive approaches that accommodate a plurality of heritage values, beyond Outstanding Universal Value, and can ensure equitable sharing of heritage-benefits, including through rights-based approaches. Climate governance should encourage novel strategies for climate-related knowledge production and co-production that are inclusive of diverse values and knowledge systems. Local communities should

be closely involved in the processes of investigation of the impacts of climate change and the development of climate action strategies. Adaptive approaches, including learning from heritage experiences, monitoring and feedback cycles, contribute to preparing for and managing the inevitable uncertainties and complexities associated with climate change. Governance systems should also link the management of natural and cultural values, including at a landscape scale, where possible.

83. The 2017 UNESCO Declaration of Ethical Principles in relation to climate change provides a useful framework for addressing justice and equity and the need for prioritising action in an equitable and transparent manner. The 2017 UNESCO Policy on engaging with Indigenous Peoples provides further useful references on participation and actions.

Finance

84. Transfer and mobilisation of finance are among the necessary enabling conditions to promote climate action for World Heritage properties, including investment in infrastructure for mitigation and adaptation. Adaptation needs have typically been supported by public sector sources such as national and subnational government budgets, and in developing countries together with support from [Saint Kitts and Nevis] **multilateral and bilateral** development assistance, multilateral development banks, **and** the UNFCCC [Brazil] **and its Paris Agreement**. In this aspect, World Heritage properties should be considered as part of the overall national and regional planning strategies to ensure that adequate financial resources are made available to support property-level climate action, [Brazil] **taking into account the developed countries' leading role in the provision and mobilization of such resources in support of developing countries**. Barriers include the scale of adaptation financing, limited [Saint Kitts and Nevis] **institutional and national financing** capacity and access to adaptation finance. The better incorporation of funding for World Heritage properties into global climate finance mechanisms is needed. International cooperation is a critical enabler for developing countries and vulnerable regions, [Saint Kitts and Nevis] **notably SIDS and LDCs**, to strengthen their action for the implementation of responses at World Heritage properties consistent with transformative change.

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

Technological Innovation

85. Climate technologies are technologies used to address climate change and include renewable energies such as wind energy, solar power and hydropower that help reduce GHG. [Australia] ~~Traditional knowledge and Indigenous science can also constitute climate technology with relevance to contemporary climate action.~~ Various climate technologies – such as drought-resistant crops, early warning systems and sea walls – can be used to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change at World Heritage properties. [Australia] ~~This is particularly useful for active cultural landscapes in which the strong human connections to the natural environment are key to the survival of such sites and to the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of such properties.~~

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

Since 2020, there has been a UNFCCC mechanism to engage with traditional knowledge and indigenous science: the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP) allows for sharing of best practices on adaptation and mitigation. The platform needs to be developed in full partnership with indigenous peoples and local communities and used to help inform ambition in NDCs.

“Traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples” is also referred to in Article 7.5 of the Paris Agreement. In addition, in light of the importance of respecting the rights and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, which is a clearly stated policy of the World Heritage Convention and therefore important that this is represented in the Policy Document.

Cultural landscapes are sites explicitly recognized under the World Heritage Convention representing the “*combined works of nature and of man*” and “*illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.*” (Para.47 of the Operational Guidelines).

It is therefore suggested to retain the sense of the original text, with slight modifications and to group the two sentences proposed for deletion by Australia at the end of Paragraph 85 as follows:

“Traditional technologies and Indigenous sciences can also contribute to climate technology with relevance to contemporary climate action. These are key to the survival of many World Heritage properties and to the conservation of their Outstanding Universal Value; this is particularly true for cultural landscapes where there is a strong human connection to the natural environment.”

B. World Heritage Committee-level implementation

86. Implementation of climate actions related to the enabling conditions (see Section III.A above) at the World Heritage Committee-level could be supported by:

- Developing and implementing a funding strategy to attract public and private sector support for climate action and capacity building for World Heritage properties. Prioritisation process should be set up to provide financial support to the States Parties for carrying out various mitigation and adaptation measures for protecting, conserving and presenting the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. Moreover, better incorporation of funding for World Heritage properties into global climate finance mechanisms is needed;
- Ensuring that basic documents of the World Heritage system, such as the Operational Guidelines and the Resource Manuals, adequately address climate change;
- Promoting climate action measures for properties that are on the frontlines of climate change impacts in order to express solidarity with them and encourage South-South collaboration.

87. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 1 (Assessing Climate Risks) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage Committee-level could be supported by:

- Strengthening the link between the World Heritage Convention and UNFCCC in terms of monitoring and reporting mechanisms related to climate change and World Heritage properties;
- Promoting synergies with existing international policies and tools from various sectors including SDGs, Sendai framework, biodiversity conventions and agreements, Paris Agreement, New Urban Agenda, as well as the site-based instruments such as the 1971 Ramsar Convention of Wetlands of International Importance, the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere and Global Geoparks

Programmes for a comprehensive approach towards climate change and its impact on World Heritage;

- Considering amendments to the formats of World Heritage Periodic Reporting and state of conservation reporting by including indicators that identify the impact of climate change on World Heritage properties and indicate site-specific adaptation strategies based on the UNESCO's Culture|2030 Indicators;
 - Identifying regional (across States Parties) or thematic actions such as promoting the development of risk and vulnerability maps for regions and sub-regions, which overlay climate data and World Heritage property locations and operationalise such initiatives.
88. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 2 (Adaptation) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage Committee-level could be supported by:
- Enhancing opportunities for collaboration and partnerships with key international organisations such as the World Bank, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC), the G20, etc. for various projects that promote climate action in World Heritage properties; In this regard, it should be recognised that the ability of the World Heritage Committee to interact with other international mechanisms will depend on, and be limited by, the respective mandates and responsibilities of each body.
89. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 3 (Mitigation) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage Committee-level could be supported by:
- Considering amendments to the formats of World Heritage Periodic Reporting and state of conservation reporting by including indicators that collect information on site-specific mitigation strategies being pursued.
90. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 4 (Knowledge, Capacity Building and Awareness) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage Committee-level could be supported by:
- Strengthening the links between the World Heritage Convention and UNFCCC **[Brazil] and its Paris Agreement** in terms of sharing of information and communication related to climate change and World Heritage properties;

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

- Developing, compiling and sharing good practice guidance and capacity building tools for climate vulnerability and risk assessment and developing and implementing climate mitigation and adaptation measures;
- Facilitating sharing of scientific information and experience across States Parties through setting up of an online platform for effective implementation, monitoring and review of implementation of the Policy Document;
- Identifying mechanisms to support needs and capacities of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to address climate change impacts.

C. National-level implementation

91. Implementation of climate actions related to the enabling conditions (see Section III.A above) at the national-level could be supported by:
 - Identifying and accessing the resources needed from all sources through collaboration with government and corporate/private sectors;
 - Achieving coherence with other national policies by building synergies between the heritage sector and other sectors such as environment, urban and disaster risk management. This may include identification and mapping of relevant sectors which can collaborate and creation of shared data sources and benchmark methodologies;
 - Ensuring that national guidance on World Heritage and for cultural and natural heritage generally addresses climate change;
 - Developing pilot projects that promote good practices in climate action for World Heritage properties that are inclusive of diverse values and knowledge systems and disseminating these at international, national and property levels to demonstrate how World Heritage properties are assets to protect as well as resources to strengthen community adaptation, resilience and continuity.
92. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 1 (Assessing Climate Risks) (see Section II.B above) at the national-level could be supported by:
 - Standardising and sharing data gathering across various World Heritage properties to facilitate identification and analysis of common hazards and impacts of climate change at national level;
 - Consistent with any World Heritage Committee standards and guidelines, developing effective processes for assessing the vulnerability of Outstanding Universal Value and other heritage values to climate change impacts, and evaluating the effectiveness of climate action measures implemented at the World Heritage properties in the Nomination process, Periodic Reports and the state of conservation reports;
 - Developing climate vulnerability and risk indicators and establishing baseline data for World Heritage properties at national level to assess and track Climate risks, as the first step in strengthening capacity to manage climate risks at all World Heritage properties. These can include the Climate Adaptation and Resilience indicators (under the Environment and Resilience thematic dimension) of the UNESCO's Culture|2030 Indicators;
 - Supporting reassessment and adjustments in all stages of heritage practice including inventorying, documentation and monitoring, impact assessments, conservation and management planning, and risk assessment in view of the unprecedented, systemic threat posed by climate change.
93. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 2 (Adaptation) (see Section II.B above) at the national level could be supported by:
 - Recognising and including World Heritage in National Adaptation Frameworks and other national policies for climate action in order to strengthen actions to adapt and build resilience to climate change, and to promote collaboration to ensure that adequate financial resources are made available to support property-level climate action, including investment in infrastructure for adaptation;
 - Working in partnership with relevant organisations, stakeholders and rightsholders in field activities to develop and implement adaptation strategies;

- Sharing methodologies and tools, respecting traditional knowledge and methods;
- Encouraging, relevant institutions to the extent possible and within the available resources, to monitor relevant climate parameters and contribute to preparing for and managing the inevitable uncertainties and complexities associated with climate change through various adaptation strategies.

94. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 3 (Mitigation) (see Section II.B above) at the national level could be supported by:

- Implementing precautionary approaches that pursue pathways that contribute to limiting global warming to 1.5°C, with no or limited overshoot **[Brazil] in light of the CBDRC principle;**

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

- Recognising and including World Heritage in national climate action plans and other national policies for climate action in order to strengthen actions to mitigate and to promote collaboration to ensure that adequate financial resources are made available to support property-level climate action, including investment in infrastructure for mitigation;
- Working in partnership with relevant organisations, stakeholders and rightsholders in field activities to develop and implement mitigation strategies;
- Developing frameworks that identify and promote the co-benefits of climate action and heritage safeguarding and which reduce real and perceived tensions between climate action and safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value, for example through impact assessment tools, environmental and social standards and taxonomies which take into account the cultural and social dimension of climate action projects; as well as through planning processes and methodologies for proactively avoiding and mediating conflicts. Such frameworks may be particularly relevant in addressing proposed renewable energy projects (e.g. terrestrial and maritime “wind farms” energy infrastructure, transmission grids), carbon dioxide removal/capture projects, flood control schemes, changes in land-use, and the renovation of heritage buildings for energy efficiency.

95. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 4 (Knowledge, Capacity Building and Awareness) (see Section II.B above) at the national level could be supported by:

- Elaboration on the role of World Heritage in climate-resilient development pathways that strengthen sustainable development (including efforts to eradicate poverty and reduce inequalities) and promote mitigation of and adaptation to a changing climate.

D. World Heritage property-level implementation

96. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 1 (Assessing Climate Risks) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage property level could be supported by:

- Undertaking climate vulnerability and risk assessments for World Heritage properties to assess potential impact on Outstanding Universal Value caused by projected climate change hazards and the impact on associated communities including:

- i) Acquiring data on climate related hazards, vulnerabilities and risks and other baseline information, including a current inventory of not only attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, but other relevant cultural and natural values,
 - ii) Developing strategies to reduce non-climatic stress factors on properties to enhance resilience of the property to climate change impacts.
97. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 2 (Adaptation) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage property level could be supported by:
- Developing and implementing climate adaptation strategies consistent with climate adaptation frameworks developed at the national level including:
 - i) Integrating climate action measures (mitigation and adaptation) in site management systems and management plans, and reporting, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of these measures,
 - ii) Developing the capacity to access local climate scenarios (i.e. simulations of the future climate at local level) and incorporate the results into medium term planning and policy making for the property;
 - Prioritising monitoring of climate hazards, assessing and reducing climate risks and enhancing adaptive capacity at the property;
 - Implementing management practices that reduce the vulnerability and increase the resilience of World Heritage properties to existing non-climatic pressures and threats that will be exacerbated by climate change impacts, such as urbanisation and uncontrolled tourism;
 - Engaging with traditional knowledge holders and local communities to appreciate and apply community and indigenous values and understanding of climate change and adaptation, when formulating and implementing climate actions and priorities.
98. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 3 (Mitigation) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage property level could be supported by:
- Contributing to the establishment of carbon footprint systems that demonstrate measurable progress on quantifying and, where appropriate, reducing or otherwise offsetting any net greenhouse gas emissions associated with the property, including by engaging with relevant stakeholders and service providers in order to monitor, measure and reduce the GHG emissions associated with the property, including from tourism, land use and buildings.
99. Implementation of climate actions related to World Heritage Climate Action Goal 4 (Knowledge, Capacity Building and Awareness) (see Section II.B above) at the World Heritage property level could be supported by:
- Designed and implemented activities to improve diverse knowledge mobilisation, education, awareness raising, and human and institutional capacity in relation to the risks and responses arising from climate change impacts on World Heritage properties, including:
 - i) Using properties as observatories of climate change to support climate science, Indigenous Peoples' knowledge systems and understanding of short-term and long-term environmental change,
 - i) Increasing messaging on climate change matters,
 - ii) Showcasing case studies and better conservation practices related to climate action and climate change,

- iii) Updating site interpretation by including climate change stories for increasing awareness and providing enhanced visitor experience of World Heritage;
- Enhancing climate action governance processes including by involving local communities closely in the processes of investigation of the impacts of climate change and the development of climate action strategies;
- Contributing knowledge, data and perspectives derived from the properties to broader climate policy processes through participation in appropriate local, regional and national climate planning processes and climate science initiatives, including interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary cooperation and knowledge co-production.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I - GLOSSARY

The glossary contains definitions of concepts that have been used in the Policy Document. These are drawn from IPCC reports (2012 – “Special report on Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance Climate Change adaptation” – SREX; 2018 – “Special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C”; 2019 – “Special report on Climate Change and land”). It is hoped that these terms will be understood by the heritage sector to enable better communication and coordination with the environment sector. The discrepancy between some of the terms such as mitigation used in heritage and defined in the glossary based on IPCC reports also need to be recognised.

Adaptation:

“In human systems, the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects, in order to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In natural systems, the process of adjustment to actual climate and its effects; human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects” (IPCC-2018)

Adaptation limits:

“The point at which an actor’s objectives (or system needs) cannot be secured from intolerable risks through adaptive actions”. (IPCC-2018)

Adaptive capacity:

“The ability of systems, institutions, humans and other organisms to adjust to potential damage, to take advantage of opportunities, or to respond to consequences”. (IPCC-2018)

Baseline scenario:

“In much of the literature the term is also synonymous with the term business-as-usual (BAU) scenario, although the term BAU has fallen out of favour because the idea of business as usual in century-long socio-economic projections is hard to fathom. In the context of transformation pathways, the term baseline scenarios refers to scenarios that are based on the assumption that no mitigation policies or measures will be implemented beyond those that are already in force and/or are legislated or planned to be adopted. Baseline scenarios are not intended to be predictions of the future, but rather counterfactual constructions that can serve to highlight the level of emissions that would occur without further policy effort. Typically, baseline scenarios are then compared to mitigation scenarios that are constructed to meet different goals for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, atmospheric concentrations or temperature change. The term baseline scenario is often used interchangeably with reference scenario and no policy scenario”. (IPCC-2018)

Carbon budget:

“This term refers to three concepts in the literature: (1) an assessment of carbon cycle sources and sinks on a global level, through the synthesis of evidence for fossil-fuel and cement emissions, land- use change emissions, ocean and land CO₂ sinks, and the resulting atmospheric CO₂ growth rate. This is referred to as the global carbon budget; (2) the estimated cumulative amount of global carbon dioxide emissions that is estimated to limit global surface temperature to a given level above a reference period, taking into account global surface temperature contributions of other GHG and climate forcers; (3) the distribution of the carbon budget defined under (2) to the regional, national, or sub-national level based on considerations of equity, costs or efficiency”. (IPCC-2018)

Carbon footprint:

“The process of storing carbon in a carbon pool” (IPCC-2018)

Carbon sink:

“A reservoir (natural or human, in soil, ocean, and plants) where a greenhouse gas, an aerosol or a precursor of a greenhouse gas is stored. Note that UNFCCC Article 1.8 refers to a sink as any process, activity or mechanism which removes a greenhouse gas, an aerosol or a precursor of a greenhouse gas from the atmosphere”. (IPCC-2018)

Climate change:

“Climate change refers to a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g., by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. Climate change may be due to natural internal processes or external forcings such as modulations of the solar cycles, volcanic eruptions and persistent anthropogenic changes in the composition of the atmosphere or in land use. Note that the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in its Article 1, defines climate change as: “*a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.*” The UNFCCC thus makes a distinction between climate change attributable to human activities altering the atmospheric composition and climate variability attributable to natural causes”. (IPCC-2018)

Climate risk:

“In the context of the assessment of climate impacts, the term risk is often used to refer to the potential for adverse consequences of a climate-related hazard, or of adaptation or mitigation responses to such a hazard, on lives, livelihoods, health and wellbeing, ecosystems and species, economic, social and cultural assets, services (including ecosystem services), and infrastructure. Risk results from the interaction of vulnerability (of the affected system), its exposure over time (to the hazard), as well as the (climate-related) hazard and the likelihood of its occurrence”. (IPCC-2018)

Co-benefits:

The positive effects that a policy or measure aimed at one objective might have on other objectives, thereby increasing the total benefits for society or the environment. Co-benefits are often subject to uncertainty and depend on local circumstances and implementation practices, among other factors. Co-benefits are also referred to as ancillary benefits. (IPCC-2018)

[Secretariat/Advisory Bodies] Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC):

“Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR–RC) is a key principle in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that recognises the different capabilities and differing responsibilities of individual countries in tackling climate change. The principle of CBDR–RC is embedded in the 1992 UNFCCC treaty. The convention states: “... the global nature of climate change calls for the widest possible cooperation by all countries and their participation in an effective and appropriate international response, in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and their social and economic conditions.” Since then, the CBDR-RC principle has guided the UN climate negotiations.” (IPCC-2018)

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The addition of this definition in the Glossary is suggested by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, in line with the World Heritage Committee Decision **44 COM 7C** para.7.

[Brazil] Ecosystem-based Approaches

“The ecosystem approach is a strategy for the integrated management of land, water and living resources that promotes conservation and sustainable use in an equitable way. Thus, the application of the ecosystem approach will help to reach a balance of the three objectives of the Convention: conservation; sustainable use; and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resource”. (CBD, COP5 Decision V/6)

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

No specific comment.

Enabling condition:

“Conditions that affect the feasibility of adaptation and mitigation options, and can accelerate and scale-up systemic transitions that would limit temperature increase to 1.5°C and enhance capacities of systems and societies to adapt to the associated climate change, while achieving sustainable development, eradicating poverty and reducing inequalities. Enabling conditions include finance, technological innovation, strengthening policy instruments, institutional capacity, multi-level governance, and changes in human behaviour and lifestyles. They also include inclusive processes, attention to power asymmetries and unequal opportunities for development and reconsideration of values”. (IPCC-2018).

Exposure:

“The presence of people; livelihoods; species or ecosystems; environmental functions, services, and resources; infrastructure; or economic, social, or cultural assets in places and settings that could be adversely affected”. (IPCC-2018)

Extreme weather event:

“An extreme weather event is an event that is rare at a particular place and time of year. Definitions of rare vary, but an extreme weather event would normally be as rare as or rarer than the 10th or 90th percentile of a probability density function estimated from observations. By definition, the characteristics of what is called extreme weather may vary from place to place in an absolute sense. When a pattern of extreme weather persists for some time, such as a season, it may be classed as an extreme climate event, especially if it yields an average or total that is itself extreme (e.g., drought or heavy rainfall over a season)”. (IPCC-2018)

Land use, Land use change and Forestry (LULUCF):

“In the context of national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories under the UNFCCC, LULUCF is a GHG inventory sector that covers anthropogenic emissions and removals of GHG from carbon pools in managed lands, excluding non-CO₂ agricultural emissions.” (IPCC-2018)

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA):

A Life Cycle Assessment involves the investigation and evaluation of the environmental impacts of a given product or service, based on the identification of energy and materials inputs and emissions released to the environment. In LCA, the environmental impacts are calculated over the entire lifetime of the product ‘from cradle-to-grave’ – hence the name ‘life cycle’. In the context of carbon mitigation, is used to quantify the emissions of products or services along the supply chain of the product or service.

Maladaptation:

Maladaptive actions (maladaptation) are actions that may lead to increased risk of adverse climate-related outcomes, including increased vulnerability to climate change, or diminished welfare, now or in the future. Maladaptation is usually an unintended consequence.

Mitigation:

This report uses the IPCC definition of mitigation: “A human intervention to reduce emissions or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases”. (IPCC 2018). This is essentially the same sense in which the word was used in the 2007 World Heritage Committee Policy (“Mitigation: an anthropogenic intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases (IPCC)”). Readers should not confuse this usage with the more general sense in which the word ‘mitigation’ is sometimes used in the heritage context (namely, measures to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset negative effects on Outstanding Universal Value or other values).

Nature-based solutions (NbS):

[Brazil] This report acknowledges that there still does not exist a multilaterally agreed definition on NbS. In the lack thereof, one of the possible definitions might be: “Actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being and biodiversity benefits”. (IPBES-2019)

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The provided definition is the same as that adopted by IUCN at 2016 Congress.

[Secretariat/Advisory Bodies] Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)

“A term used under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) whereby a country that has joined the Paris Agreement outlines its plans for reducing its emissions. Some countries’ NDCs also address how they will adapt to climate change impacts, and what support they need from, or will provide to, other countries to adopt low-carbon pathways and to build climate resilience. According to Article 4 paragraph 2 of the Paris Agreement, each Party shall prepare, communicate and maintain successive NDCs that it intends to achieve. In the lead up to 21st Conference of the Parties in Paris in 2015, countries submitted Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs). As countries join the Paris Agreement, unless they decide otherwise, this INDC becomes their first Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC).” (IPCC-2018)

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

The addition of this definition in the Glossary is suggested by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, in line with the World Heritage Committee Decision **44 COM 7C** para.7.

Resilience:

“The capacity of social, economic and environmental systems to cope with a hazardous event or trend or disturbance, responding or reorganising in ways that maintain their essential function, identity and structure, while also maintaining the capacity for adaptation, learning and transformation”. (IPCC-2018)

Risk:

“The potential for adverse consequences where something of value is at stake and where the occurrence and degree of an outcome is uncertain”. (IPCC-2018)

Risk assessment:

“The qualitative and/or quantitative scientific estimation of risks”. (IPCC-2018)

Risk management:

“Plans, actions, strategies or policies to reduce the likelihood and/or consequences of risks or to respond to consequences”. (IPCC-2018)

Risk transfer:

“The process of formally or informally shifting the financial consequences of particular risks from one party to another whereby a household, community, enterprise, or state authority will obtain resources from the other party after a disaster occurs, in exchange for ongoing or compensatory social or financial benefits provided to that other party”. (IPCC-2013)

Safeguard:

In the context of the Policy Document, it refers to law, rules, or measures intended to prevent social and environmental systems from being harmed by climate mitigation and/or adaptation actions.

Transformation:

A change in the fundamental attributes of natural and human systems. Societal (social) transformation A profound and often deliberate shift initiated by communities toward sustainability, facilitated by changes in individual and collective values and behaviours, and a fairer balance of political, cultural, and institutional power in society. (IPCC-2018)

Transformative change:

“A system wide change. This requires more than technological change to consideration of social and economic factors that with technology can bring about rapid change at scale”. (IPCC-2018)

Uncertainty:

A state of incomplete knowledge that can result from a lack of information or from disagreement about what is known or even knowable. It may have many types of sources, from imprecision in the data to ambiguously defined concepts or terminology, incomplete understanding of critical processes, or uncertain projections of human behaviour. Uncertainty can therefore be represented by quantitative measures (e.g. a probability density function) or by qualitative statements (e.g. reflecting the judgment of a team of experts). (IPCC-2018)

Vulnerability:

“The propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected. Vulnerability encompasses a variety of concepts and elements including sensitivity or susceptibility to harm and lack of capacity to cope and adapt”. (IPCC-2018)

ANNEX II - AREAS FOR FURTHER FOCUS REGARDING ADAPTATION

Overview

1. This Policy Document recommends that each State Party implements at national and/or other appropriate levels, all the necessary actions to have in place a comprehensive climate risk management framework that fosters adaptation and resilience building actions, and that are also synergistic, better coordinated with the local, subnational, national and international climate adaptation developments (See World Heritage Climate Action Goals 1 and 2).
2. Adaptation actions should be based on and guided, as appropriate, by traditional knowledge, knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local knowledge systems. The importance of Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' knowledge for understanding impacts and designing and implementing appropriate adaptation action should be valued and utilised via a participatory process characterised by respect for the diversity of cultural expressions. Traditional methods and systems for preventing, conserving and addressing the negative impacts of climate change on World Heritage properties should be included in relevant climate policies.
3. States Parties are also encouraged to maximising the 'signalling' value and inspirational power of World Heritage properties to showcase effective adaptation practices.

A. Assessing climate risks

4. The Policy Document is inclusive to all hazards that are directly and indirectly attributed to climate change, and related vulnerability factors of the heritage properties (physical, social, economic, institutional, etc.).
5. Climate change will alter the severity, frequency and spatial distribution of many types of climate-related hazards. In consequence, climate risk assessments should be based on predictions of future climate change impacts developed using recent and current observations as proxies for future change, integrated with a range of local climate scenarios (i.e. simulations of the future climate at local level) (see Section II.D.1 above). While these simulations have considerable uncertainty (there are several sources of uncertainty: development patterns of society, population, wealth distribution and GHG emissions levels), current methodologies yield results that are useful to medium term planning and policy making for World Heritage properties.
6. Climate-related hazards also serving as multipliers of pre-existing threats and vulnerabilities, it is increasingly difficult to minimise the exposure of heritage sites to a dangerous climate, and the assessment of heritage-climate vulnerability and implementation of options to reduce it are central to adaptation planning.
7. Responding to the unprecedented and systemic threat of climate change calls for adjustments in all stages of heritage practice. Climate change will require reassessments of many heritage methodologies including inventorying, assessments, documentation and monitoring, impact assessments conservation management planning and risk assessment.

B. Climate risk management

8. Climate risk management incorporates all actions necessary to assess and manage the risks of a changing climate, considering:
 - The multiplicity of climate-related hazards, including both rapid and slow onset events:
 - 'Rapid-onset' events are short-lived, acute, intensive, recurrent, highly damaging and uncontrollable. They include extreme winds, hurricanes,

typhoons, storm surge, extreme precipitation, hailstorms, flash Floods, landslides, heat waves, and wildfires. Climate change is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of many of these types of events through much of the world,

- 'Slow-onset' events are long-lived, progressive and potentially permanent transitions that are less damaging in the short-term, but which may have profound consequences over the longer-term. They include Glacier melt, Sea Level Rise, acidification, desertification and changes in seasonality and species distribution;
 - Differences in exposure of heritage sites to those climate-related hazards;
 - How climate-related hazards exacerbate other hazards and stressors, often with negative outcomes for heritage sites;
 - The multidimensional factors of climate vulnerability at the human-environment system level (exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity) - or the combination of elements that made a heritage site more susceptible to be negatively affected;
 - The climate risks (or the combined likelihood and potential negative impacts to World Heritage properties) on attributes bearing the Outstanding Universal Value and local values, and including impacts on the economic, social, health, education, and well-being of associated communities (including effects on social cohesion);⁷
 - Options for responding to climate-related risks, with continuing uncertainty about the severity and timing of climate-change impacts and with limits to the effectiveness of adaptation.
9. Climate risk management approaches can benefit from:
- Partnering with relevant organisations, stakeholders and local community groups in field activities to develop and implement adaptation strategies; sharing methodologies and tools, respecting traditional knowledge and methods;
 - Pilot test and share good practices at regional, national and international levels to promote climate action at World Heritage properties through knowledge dissemination, networking and coordination;
 - Identifying regional (cross-State Party)/thematic actions such as promoting the development of risk and vulnerability maps for regions and sub-regions which overlay climate data and World Heritage property locations and operationalise such initiatives;
 - Developing frameworks for the successful negotiation of co-benefits and trade-offs of Climate adaptation and Outstanding Universal Value to identify and avoid potential maladaptation.
10. As it is fundamental to assess climate change impact in the state of conservation of the World Heritage property, new tools may be needed to address climate change preparedness, as well as identifying factors that can become threats that could ultimately impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. World Heritage processes, such as Nomination, Periodic Reporting, Reactive Monitoring, need to be strengthened to support these outcomes, with special attention to the Operational Guidelines.

⁷ The 2019 ICOMOS report "*The Future of Our Pasts: Engaging Cultural Heritage in Climate Action*" contains one matrix of climate drivers (e.g. temperature and precipitation changes, climate-influenced wildfires, changes in seasonality, etc) as well as some compounding related stressors (e.g. pollution and ocean acidification) correlated to resulting impacts on six major cultural heritage typologies.

11. The integration of World Heritage within national and regional climate risk management approaches can support all necessary actions to strengthen national and local capacities to manage climate-related risks for heritage, as they can be understood now, and the more complex climate risk expected in the future. Whether dealing with actual potential negative risks and its corresponding impacts or climate-related disaster contexts, or future impacts associated with climate variability, extreme weather events and climate change, the essential challenge is both climate risk reduction and the maintenance (with possibly increase) in human and ecosystem's resilience, including through the valorisation of traditional ecological knowledge.
12. States Parties are encouraged to promote a synergistic implementation of existing international policies and tools from various sectors like SDGs, Sendai framework, biodiversity conventions and agreements, Paris Agreement, New Urban Agenda etc. for a comprehensive approach towards climate adaptation and its mainstreaming on World Heritage processes.
13. Elements of adaptation planning relevant to World Heritage properties can include anticipatory risk management (ensuring that future heritage management reduces rather than increases climate risk), compensatory risk management (actions to mitigate the negative impacts associated with existing climate risk) and reactive climate risk management (ensuring that risk is not reconstructed after climate-related impacts, including disaster events). Moreover, measurers will need to consider both potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties, and, where relevant, the related socio-economic and environmental systems, before decisions are made.
14. At the national level, States Parties to the World Heritage Convention should develop and implement integrated climate risk management strategies, plans and programmes, as these can ultimately increase the coordination among the disparate institutional and administrative mechanisms, projects, human and financial resources currently applied to climate adaptation and disaster risk management.

C. Baseline information

15. Data on climate related hazards, vulnerabilities and risks should be acquired, managed and updated by the responsible agencies and consequently shared with those responsible for managing World Heritage properties. Managers of World Heritage properties must have access to relevant data and modelling, and the capacity to collect and process data so they can build climate risk models.
16. More appropriate adaptation actions can be selected and applied if there is baseline information, that includes:
 - A current inventory of not only attributes of Outstanding Universal Value but other relevant cultural and natural values;
 - Knowledge of current and projected climate related hazards;
 - Understanding key social, physical, economic, environmental, and institutional and factors that all together determine the vulnerability of heritage properties to those hazards;
 - Understanding of the potential direct and indirect Impacts (climate risks); and
 - Understanding the type of heritage at risk (movable, immovable and intangible).
17. It is essential that heritage managers assess climate risks that adequately inform adaptation. These should be undertaken at macro-scale to gain a broad overview at a regional level, and micro-place level, which tends to be holistic and considers the site-specific dynamics of hazards, vulnerabilities and potential /observed negative impacts.

18. Considering that multiple resources will be required for adaptation activities, heritage property managers need to properly assess the costs, benefits of climate adaptation strategies and, to ensure resources are allocated responsibly.
19. A key complementary method that heritage sites managers can implement, are Adaptation Capacity Assessments. This type of assessment builds on the climate risk assessments and evaluates the existing capacity to address those risks. Depending on the context, it helps to identify gaps and strengths of existing heritage sites management to effectively implement climate adaptation strategies.
20. Recognition of diverse interests, circumstances, social-cultural contexts, and expectations can benefit climate risk based–decision making processes.

D. Damage and loss of Outstanding Universal Value

21. This Policy Document encourages every State Party to do all it can to implement site-based adaptation, to the utmost of its own resources and with any international assistance and co-operation which it may be able to obtain, including efforts of other States Parties to implement a precautionary approach.
22. Although adaptation to a changing climate will often result in adjustments that are within a given heritage system's adaptive limits, completely preventing all projected impacts of climate change on every World Heritage property may not be possible, and in some cases damage to and loss of attributes of Outstanding Universal Value as a result of climate change may still result.
23. Acknowledging that completely preventing all projected impacts of climate change on every World Heritage property may not be possible, the impact of such loss will need to be fully assessed and evaluated by the World Heritage Committee who will need to consider whether Outstanding Universal Value has been completely or partially lost.
24. Strategies to avert, minimise and address damage and loss are crucial to plan for and manage potential loss of attributes of Outstanding Universal Value in World Heritage properties. There exists a range of approaches and instruments to develop damage and loss strategies associated with the impacts of climate change. The challenge is to identify which strategies are more appropriate for World Heritage properties, not only to the type of climate risks but also to the social, environmental, economic, geographical, landscape and institutional context of the properties for which Outstanding Universal Value may be a risk of being irretrievably damaged or lost (see second Guiding Principle in Section I.C).

E. Managing for Resilience

25. Improving adaptive capacity and building climate resilience could be supported by reducing non-climate sources of stress on World Heritage properties. Consideration and management of existing non-climatic pressures should be included in adaptation plans. Doing this acknowledges that climate change will exacerbate existing pressures such as urbanisation, invasive species, pollution and uncontrolled tourism. Management approaches for these non-climatic stresses will need to be responsive and regularly reviewed to account for a changing climate (see World Heritage Climate Action Goal 2 above).
26. Management approaches for World Heritage properties should be proactive rather than reactive to allow them to better address the cumulative nature of multiple impacts. Property managers should contemplate immediate actions to address existing pressures, including 'no regret-policy' actions. Doing this has the dual benefit of reducing vulnerability and increasing the resilience of properties to existing non-climate sources of stress, and also reducing their vulnerability to climate change related stresses.

ANNEX III – AREAS FOR FURTHER FOCUS REGARDING MITIGATION

Overview

1. This Policy Document recommends that each State Party implements at national and/or other appropriate levels, all the necessary actions to have in place a comprehensive climate mitigation framework, that fosters synergies, better coordination and enhance effective implementation, of the local, subnational, national and international climate mitigation developments since the adoption of the Paris Agreement (see Section II.B above).
2. Climate mitigation responses of the World Heritage Convention to the threat of climate change should be based on the most recent scientific and political developments, and therefore take advantage of the body of knowledge developed to understand Green House Gas (GHG) emissions in World Heritage properties and the interventions needed to reduce those emissions and effectively decarbonise the Heritage sector (see World Heritage Climate Action Goal 3).
3. Acknowledging that there is significant progress in the international community on the technical frameworks required to accomplish climate mitigation goals, and also taking into consideration the IPCC's GHG emissions sectors, this Policy Document frames the climate mitigation recommendations in four categories: Built environment, Land use management, Life cycle assessment, and Tourism management (see Section II.D.3 above).

A. Built environment

4. The IPCC 1.5 °C Special Report (2018) makes clear that the built environment, including the entire building and construction supply chain, must decarbonise. In consequence, this Policy Document recognises that mitigation measures for the built environment within World Heritage properties should aim to assess and reduce their carbon footprint, with special attention to demand for electricity and other forms of energy that are required to deliver energy services for buildings.
5. Actions for climate mitigation of the built environment should avoid negative impacts on heritage values and be consistent with the obligations of States Parties under the Convention to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of properties. Among the options to consider are:
 - Retrofitting of historical buildings to decrease energy consumption where possible, recognising that thermal massing and other features of some traditional building systems are inherently efficient, making wholesale energy retrofitting unnecessary and even wasteful;
 - Using traditional passive measures in historical buildings as strategies to reduce energy consumption;
 - Using Life cycle assessment (LCA) methodologies for the selection of replacement materials requiring less energy to produce, and thus emitting less GHG;
 - Promoting knowledge of the appropriate use of new technologies for the rehabilitation of historical buildings for energy efficiency and to reduce GHG emissions;
 - Guarding against insensitive retrofitting and maladapted mitigation strategies that fail to understand how older buildings 'behave' and can degrade traditional climate-friendly features, waste materials and damage heritage values.

6. Considering national circumstances, this Policy Document recommends that States Parties adopt a carbon footprint target for World Heritage properties in connection with the World Heritage Climate Action Goals. This will allow heritage managers to assess in a scientific and robust way progress towards the decarbonisation of the heritage sector.

B. Land-use management

7. IPCC's 1.5 °C Special Report (2018) and Climate and Land Report (2019) find that limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require rapid and far-reaching transitions in the way countries use land, specifically to minimise emissions associated with land use change.
8. Heritage properties, particularly natural properties, are among those places that can significantly contribute to climate mitigation by: (i) safeguarding the natural carbon sinks; (ii) when feasible, increasing carbon sequestration in natural systems. Such approaches should adhere to strict environmental and social safeguards and consider carbon storage permanence.
9. Considering national circumstances, this Policy Document recommends the adoption of two mitigation targets for natural World Heritage properties:
 - No net loss of the natural carbon sinks present in World Heritage properties (by 2030): the earth's natural carbon sinks are also places of exceptional importance for biodiversity conservation, and are facing major threats. The carbon stored in those ecosystems is fundamental to achieve the 1.5°C Climate target and should be a priority for natural properties;
 - ~~[Brazil] Low GHG eEmissions from land use change [Brazil] are reduced to zero~~ (by 2030): IPCC states that it is one of the most important sources of GHG emissions. ~~[Brazil] Consequently, tackling land use change is imperative to address Climate Change.~~

Response by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the amendments:

It is suggested to keep the original text, as the changes proposed by Brazil do not represent a measurable target. The original language is supported by science (IPCC Special Report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems, 2019: https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/08/4.-SPM_Approved_Microsite_FINAL.pdf).

C. Life cycle assessment

10. For the World Heritage sector, another way to assess the different types of GHG emissions is by applying Life cycle assessment (LCA). This is a tool widely used among IPCC reports to assess environmental impacts of a system by accounting for all emissions along the full value chain and over the full life cycle. LCA can investigate and compare the potential carbon footprint of products and services, by understanding the mass and energy flows throughout production, use, and disposal. These flows are then translated into environmental indicators such as greenhouse gas emissions.
11. Utilising the competencies of heritage properties management, LCA methodologies can be used to provide systematic evaluation of the carbon footprint caused throughout the life cycle of products or services from raw material extraction to waste treatment, and to scientifically assess a baseline, and possible carbon reduction targets and future heritage-management practices that support climate mitigation objectives. Where possible, properties are encouraged to conduct environmental analyses of site

operations, services, events and exhibitions and identify energy-saving opportunities; to adopt 'green' procurement (energy, waste and water), and to emphasise green products, services and business models.

D. Tourism

12. As one of the world's largest industries, tourism's carbon footprint is an expanding component of global GHG emissions, with tourism to World Heritage properties being a highly visible component.
13. At the same time, World Heritage destinations, if appropriately managed through sustainable tourism strategies, can generate positive economic and social benefits for local communities⁸. Tourism can raise visitors' understanding of different history, cultures and environments and has the potential to promote empathy with communities managing the impacts of climate change on their World Heritage properties. Tourism destinations also have the opportunity of demonstrating and publicising climate impacts and sustainability practices.
14. Among the interaction between climate change and tourism at World Heritage properties, States Parties, in collaboration with World Heritage sites managers and other stakeholders, can undertake the following actions:
 - Develop and implement methodologies for monitoring and measuring the GHG emissions caused by tourism at World Heritage properties, including through Life cycle assessment, and identify carbon-saving measures (for example, energy efficient visitor infrastructure);
 - Work with the tourism sector at different levels to explore options for determining accountability for carbon mitigation of the GHG emissions associated with the contributing service components of the tourism industry (for example, aviation, hospitality etc.) attributable to World Heritage tourism;
 - Consider alternatives for offsetting of GHG emissions associated with tourism at World Heritage properties. It is fundamental that options considered for offsetting (for example certified carbon credits) adhere to strict social and environmental safeguards.

⁸ At its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), the World Heritage Committee adopted the "World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme" (Decision **36 COM 5E**), which represents a new approach based on dialogue and stakeholder cooperation where planning for tourism and heritage management is integrated at a destination level, the natural and cultural assets are valued and protected, and appropriate tourism developed. See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tourism/>

ANNEX IV - AREAS FOR FURTHER FOCUS REGARDING KNOWLEDGE SHARING, CAPACITY BUILDING AND AWARENESS

Drawn from Section I(D)(21) of the 2006 Strategy

1. The importance of education and capacity building for enhancing climate action has been recognised in the 2015 Paris Agreement (Article 12). The World Heritage Convention and its processes also consider these factors as important for the effective management and conservation of World Heritage. Indeed, strengthening of capacity building is important for dealing with effects of climate change as well as for good communication and awareness programmes.
2. The Policy Document therefore draws the attention of all actors of the World Heritage system on the crucial role of knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness for successful climate actions (see Section II.D.4).
3. Furthermore, World Heritage Climate Action Goal 4 (see Section II.B) highlights that by 2030, States Parties should have developed and implemented activities aimed at improving education, awareness raising, and human and institutional capacity in relation to the risks and responses related to climate change impacts on World Heritage properties, including programmes designed to promote these properties as exemplars of climate action.
4. Mobilizing public and political support for climate action inside and outside World Heritage properties is essential⁹. This has to range from local to regional and global approaches and involve a variety of measures: workshops, exhibitions and expositions, media campaigns, audio-visual material and popular publications which link the global phenomenon of climate change to the local and regional contexts.

A. Global-level actions (World Heritage Convention)

5. At the global level, the Secretariat of the World Heritage Convention (the UNESCO World Heritage Centre) is encouraged to implement knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness activities, such as:
 - Informing the UNFCCC Secretariat and its Parties of the impacts of climate change on World Heritage in order to include these into their guidelines for national communications;
 - Establishing cooperation with the IPCC Secretariat in order to:
 - i) Assess the existing and potential impacts of climate change on World Heritage,
 - ii) Identify opportunities to mention issues related to World Heritage in the future Assessment Reports;
 - Ensuring that capacity building activities on climate risk assessments, reporting, adaptation and mitigation strategies are coordinated with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, other international organisations and secretariats of other conventions;

⁹ See paragraph 11 of Decision **29 COM 7Ba** (Durban, 2005), by which the World Heritage Committee indicated that “the results about climate change affecting World Heritage properties [should] reach the public at large, in order to mobilize political support for activities against climate change and to safeguard in this way the livelihood of the poorest people of our planet.”

- Overseeing the organisation of international and regional workshops to:
 - i) Share the knowledge, experience,
 - ii) Establish networking among States Parties on addressing climate change impacts on World Heritage;
- Taking advantage of the World Heritage global network, develop communication strategies to inform the public and policy makers on climate action for World Heritage properties and build public and political support to address climate change impacts;
- Promoting and sharing good practices on climate action for World Heritage properties among States Parties.

B. State Party-/Property-level actions

6. States Parties and managers of World Heritage properties are encouraged to implement knowledge sharing, capacity building and awareness activities, such as:
 - Collecting information and establish national level database on the past and existing impacts of climate change on World Heritage properties;
 - Promoting the development of risk and vulnerability maps at national level which overlay climate data and World Heritage property locations;
 - Providing information to decision-makers, stakeholders, local communities, users and managers of the properties, and other heritage specialists about the existing and potential impacts of climate change on properties, management responses, possible technical and financial assistance, existing networks and institutions from heritage and climate sectors and various capacity building activities;
 - Promoting and sharing of good practices on integrating climate action in conservation and management of World Heritage properties;
 - Encouraging managers of World Heritage properties to provide feed-back based on their experience by developing case studies on good practices and lessons learnt and share these with other managers of properties;
 - Encouraging academic institutions to share their research on existing and potential impacts of climate change including on social and demographic changes in relation to World Heritage properties. Furthermore, they should promote and encourage interdisciplinary projects and data synthesis to improve links between heritage research fields and other areas of climate science.
7. In addition, World Heritage properties can also support climate science in several ways, including by:
 - Using palaeoenvironmental climate data from heritage sites, museums and other curated collections to explore climate trends and shifting climatic baselines;
 - Collating and synthesising existing palaeoenvironmental and archaeological data (from heritage sites, museums and other curated collections) to assess past baselines and tipping points of ecological and social change;
 - Promoting better understanding of traditional knowledge in design, construction, materials and management practices in the light of climate change and assessing their effectiveness in current context as the basis for developing proposals for adapting them to cope with climate change;

- Researching and documenting current and recent traditional land management and maintenance processes, particularly related to water management techniques and community participation;
- Using archaeological data and other information from heritage places, museums and other curated collections to identify and explore past human impacts on environments over short, medium and long periods and at local, regional and global scales;
- Exploring application of past adaptation and mitigation techniques to climate and landscape change, including agriculture and animal husbandry, architecture and land-use patterns, subsistence strategies, and use of material culture.