Reactive Monitoring and state of conservation
Learning objectives

At the end of the session, trainees will be able to:

✓ understand what World Heritage Reactive Monitoring is and why it is crucial for the conservation of World Heritage properties

✓ be aware of the conservation measures and obligations required to preserve the state of conservation of properties over time

✓ differentiate between Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting as two different processes related to the assessment of the state of conservation of properties

✓ acknowledge the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a conservation and monitoring tool

✓ navigate through all relevant documents and tools related to monitoring and conservation

✓ understand the crucial role the World Heritage Committee plays in monitoring the state of conservation of properties

✓ use the Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties available on the World Heritage Centre’s website page
Module outline

I. Reactive Monitoring and World Heritage properties’ conservation
   1. Reactive Monitoring: general presentation
   2. Differences between Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting
   3. State of conservation (SOC): general presentation and reports format
   4. Monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties

II. Monitoring and conservation related documentation and tools
   1. SOC reports’ working documents
   2. Role of the World Heritage Committee in monitoring the state of conservation of properties
      • General presentation
      • Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger: a conservation and monitoring tool
      • Reactive monitoring missions and advisory missions
   3. UNESCO World Heritage Centre: Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties
      • General presentation of the online tool
      • Demo presentation of the online tool
I. Reactive Monitoring and World Heritage properties’ conservation

Reactive Monitoring: general presentation


169. Reactive Monitoring is the reporting by the Secretariat (World Heritage Centre), other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat. To this end, the State Parties shall submit specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur or work is undertaken which may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property or its state of conservation.”

Reactive Monitoring and conservation are at the heart of the *World Heritage Convention*, as stated in its Articles 4 and 6:

4. Each State Party to this Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 and situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State. It will do all it can to this end, to the utmost of its own resources and, where appropriate, with any international assistance and co-operation, in particular, financial, artistic, scientific and technical, which it may be able to obtain.”

6. The States Parties undertake, in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, to give their help in the identification, protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 if the States on whose territory it is situated so request.”
I. Reactive Monitoring and World Heritage properties’ conservation

Reactive Monitoring: differences with Periodic Reporting

Although Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting are complementary exercises and may share similarities in their monitoring objectives, it is crucial not to confuse them.

World Heritage properties are subject to various reporting measures, and they are also reported through the Periodic Reporting exercise (Article 29 of the Convention, Paragraph 199 of the Operational Guidelines). The Periodic Reporting exercise serves four main purposes, which are to provide:

- an assessment of the application of the World Heritage Convention by the State Party;
- an assessment as to whether the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List is being maintained over time (see Focus 1 – OUV);
- up-dated information about the World Heritage properties to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the properties;
- a mechanism for regional co-operation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the Convention and World Heritage conservation

Source: https://whc.unesco.org/en/periodicreporting/
Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting differ from one another on various aspects:

- The section I of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire is completed by National Focal Points at a national level, whereas Reactive Monitoring never takes place at a national level but at World Heritage properties’ level.
- The Periodic Reporting process involves all the States Parties of the same region, while Reactive Monitoring is properties-driven.
- Periodic Reporting is run according to pre-defined cycles of about 6-years, whereas Reactive Monitoring can be triggered at any time by the World Heritage Committee or the World Heritage Centre, if a threat requires it.
- If Periodic Reporting happens every 6-years, Reactive Monitoring can be each in a year. That is the case of sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
- In Periodic Reporting, factors affecting properties are self-declared by National Focal Points and Site Managers themselves, while the factors identified through the Reactive Monitoring process are highlighted by experts during reactive monitoring missions, advisory missions or through information received from other sources than the State Party.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission report</th>
<th>Reactive Monitoring</th>
<th>Periodic Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At what level?</td>
<td>At properties’ level</td>
<td>At properties and States Parties’ levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What properties are concerned?</td>
<td>Some World Heritage properties</td>
<td>All World Heritage properties and all States Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td>Whenever during the year (adapted to emergency situations)</td>
<td>Approximately every 6 year per region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are data collected?</td>
<td>Reactive monitoring or advisory missions, other relevant source, etc.</td>
<td>National focal points and World Heritage properties’ managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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State of conservation (SOC): general presentation

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies review all information available on the state of conservation (SOC) of properties whose examination is foreseen by the World Heritage Committee:

- SOC reports submitted by the State Party;
- information received from a third parties;
- press articles;
- mission reports;
- comments and feed-back on these by the State Party, etc.

An essential source of information are the SOC reports submitted by the States Parties: it gives to the State Party the opportunity to bring all relevant information to the attention of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. States Parties are also invited to submit detailed information on development projects which can impact on the OUV to inform the World Heritage Centre (Para. 172, Operational Guidelines)
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State of conservation (SOC): SOC reports format

The SOC reports are then prepared jointly by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Once ready, they are presented as a working document for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

The States Parties can contribute to ensuring the accuracy of the SOC reports through several entry points:

- State Party’s report on the state of conservation to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre (see format in Annex 13, Operational Guidelines)
- specific information submitted in advance by the State Party (Para. 172, Operational Guidelines)
- State Party’s reply to World Heritage Centre’s letters regarding specific information received from other sources (Para. 174, Operational Guidelines)
- information provided by the State Party during a Reactive Monitoring mission
- comments by the State Party to the Reactive Monitoring mission report

The SOC report’s format comprises:

- background information
- current conservation issues
- analysis and conclusion of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies
- draft decision

Monitoring the state of conservation of cultural and natural World Heritage properties can be done in different ways, depending on the nature of the properties, their specificities and their different situations.

To better understand how monitoring the state of conservation of properties happens in both a theoretical and a practical way, various tools are made available by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, such as:

- Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage (2010)
- Managing Natural World Heritage (2012)
- Managing Cultural World Heritage (2013)
- The Benefits of Natural World Heritage (2014)
- Guidance and Toolkit for Heritage Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context (2022)
SOC reports’ working documents

State of conservation reports are prepared according to different type of working documents, the most useful ones notably being:

- States Parties reports;
- Reactive Monitoring mission reports;
- previous Decisions of the World Heritage Committee

Source: https://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/44COM/?documents&
II. Monitoring and conservation related documentation and tools
Role of the World Heritage Committee in monitoring the state of conservation of properties

Subsequently to the examination of the SOC reports during its ordinary session, the World Heritage Committee adopts a decision, which may take one or more of the following steps. It may decide that:

- no further action should be taken, if the property has not seriously deteriorated;
- the property be maintained on the World Heritage List, if it has seriously deteriorated, but not to the extent that its restoration is impossible. The Committee may also decide that technical co-operation be provided under the World Heritage Fund;
- to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Para. 177-189, Operational Guidelines), when specific requirements and criteria are met;
- to delete the property from List, when there is evidence that the property has deteriorated to the point where it has irretrievably lost those characteristics which determined its inscription on the List. Before any such action is taken, the World Heritage Centre will inform the concerned State Party. Any comments which the State Party may make will be brought to the attention of the Committee;
- when the information available is not sufficient to enable the Committee to take one of the measures described above, the World Heritage Centre be authorised to take the necessary action to ascertain, in consultation with the State Party concerned, the present condition of the property, the dangers to the property and the feasibility of adequately restoration the property, and to report to the Committee on the results of its action. In case an emergency action is required, the Committee may authorise its financing from the World Heritage Fund through an emergency assistance request.
Reactive Monitoring also includes provisions for monitoring in case of danger threatening World Heritage properties, as stated in Article 11.4 of the Convention regarding the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

11.4. The Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish, whenever circumstances shall so require, under the title of “list of World Heritage in Danger”, a list of the property appearing in the World Heritage List for the conservation of which major operations are necessary and for which assistance has been requested under this Convention. The list may include only such property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage as is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as:

- the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects;
- destruction caused by changes in the use or ownership of the land;
- major alterations due to unknown causes;
- abandonment for any reason whatsoever;
- the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict;
- calamities and cataclysms;
- serious fires, earthquakes, landslides;
- volcanic eruptions;
- changes in the water level, floods and tidal waves."

Source: https://whc.unesco.org/en/danger/
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**Role of the Committee:** Reactive monitoring missions and advisory missions

The World Heritage system provides for two types of on site missions to monitor the properties’ state of conservation: reactive monitoring missions and advisory missions. They differ from one another on several aspects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reactive monitoring missions</th>
<th>Advisory missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong></td>
<td>A decision from the World Heritage Committee initiates this type of missions</td>
<td>Happens when a State Party or the World Heritage Committee ask for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>The goal of reactive monitoring missions is to address specific issues raised in the SOC report</td>
<td>Their objective is to give advices on issues raised by the concerned State(s) Partie(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of reference</strong></td>
<td>Based on the Committee’s decision and are financed by the World Heritage Fund</td>
<td>Based on request by the concerned State(s) Partie(s) or by the Committee; funded by the State Party itself (exceptions mentioned in Para.28, OGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>Consists of meetings and field visits at the World Heritage properties. They focus on the terms of reference but also look at the general state of the property. They evaluate the progress on existing corrective measures, and can sometimes result in a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR)</td>
<td>Consists in meetings and field visits. These missions focus solely on the terms of reference. They result in advice given to the State(s) Partie(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report</strong></td>
<td>In their report, recommendations are expressed on actions to be taken as well as on Danger-listing (see slide 13) or on the removal from the World Heritage List and/or the List of World Heritage in Danger. The recommendations are expressed to the concerned State(s) Partie(s) via the World Heritage Committee</td>
<td>Their reports only focus on recommendations on actions to be taken. These recommendations are directly expressed to the State(s) Partie(s) without going through the World Heritage Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNESCO World Heritage Centre: Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties

The State of conservation Information System is an online tool made available on the World Heritage Centre website

It aims at giving a trove of reliable data on the state of conservation of all World Heritage properties since 1979. It also points out the threats properties have faced in the past, or are still currently facing

The information available through this comprehensive monitoring system are thousands of reports and decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee

In order to enhance institutional memory, improve transparency of processes and easier access to the relevant information by the largest number of stakeholders, the World Heritage Committee encouraged all States Parties to make public the reports submitted on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties through the World Heritage Centre’s State of conservation Information System (Decision 37 COM 7C). Such reports have to be submitted following a standard compulsory format (Annex 13, Operational Guidelines)

Source: https://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/
Through the online tool, it is possible to extract statistical data on the way World Heritage properties are being conserved over time since 1979. This includes cultural, natural and mixed properties from all regions across the world.

To this date, this comprehensive system deals with:
- 4,051 reports
- 593 properties
- 147 States Parties
- 408 cultural properties
- 157 natural properties
- 28 mixed properties
To help site managers and other heritage stakeholders identify factors that could potentially impact a property World Heritage property, the system also lists threats/factors affecting the OUV of World Heritage properties. This standard list gives a series of 14 primary factors, also used in the Periodic Reporting exercise, encompassing each number of secondary factors.
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Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties: Demo presentation
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![Search and Filter interface with numbers and filters for properties, states parties, regions, periods, text, threats, and criteria.]

- Properties: 1,154
- States Parties: 3
- Regions: 194
- Periods: 83
- Text: 6
- Year/Period: 10
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Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties: **Demo presentation**

Please note that the screenshots here displayed are for illustrative purposes only and will change over time.
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---

### International Assistance: requests for the property until 2018

**Requests approved: 9 (from 1982-2017)**

**Total amount approved**: 206,799 USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Mise à jour du plan de gestion du Parc national de ... (Approved)</td>
<td>29,674 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Dénombrement de la grande et moyenne faune mammalienne, ... (Approved)</td>
<td>30,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Extension du Sito du PM du Niokolo-Koba (Senegal) à la ... (Approved)</td>
<td>9,084 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Derby Eland Monitoring Programme (Approved)</td>
<td>20,296 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Purchase of 2 all-terrain vehicles to improve ... (Approved)</td>
<td>45,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Consultancy services for environmental and ... (Approved)</td>
<td>20,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Additional cost of radios ordered in 1985 for ... (Approved)</td>
<td>6,196 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Purchase of 4 portable radios for protection programme ... (Approved)</td>
<td>9,618 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Vehicles, camping equipment and radio communication ... (Approved)</td>
<td>27,031 USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Missions to the property until 2018


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mission Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Rapport de la mission UICN au Parc national du Niokolo-Koba (Senegal), 10-17 mai 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>IUCN mission report, Niokolo-Koba National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rapport de mission, Parc national de Niokolo-Koba (Sénégal), 4 - 11 mai 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Rapport de la mission de suivi conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial/IUCN au Parc national du Niokolo Koba, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>IUCN / Senegal National Park Service / University of Dakar joint mission report, Niokolo-Koba National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>World Bank mission report, Niokolo-Koba National Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties: Demo presentation

The world Heritage Committee:
1. Emphasised the importance of data and information for decision-making processes and for the implementation of the corrective measures.

Decisions adopted by the Committee in 2018

Adopted Draft Decisions

42 COM 7A.55
Nikko-Koba National Park (Senegal) (in 1953)

The world Heritage Committee,

1. Recognised the importance of data and information for decision-making processes and for the implementation of the corrective measures.

2. Revised the programme for the State Party to submit the World Heritage Convention and the National Parks Programme of Wales (WNP) to the World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee, with a view to assessing the state of conservation of the property and to identifying opportunities for further improvement.

3. Invited the State Party to provide updated information on the state of conservation of the property, including an analysis of the causes of the decline and the potential measures for its conservation and management.

4. Recognised the importance of data and information for decision-making processes and for the implementation of the corrective measures.

5. Emphasised the need for the State Party to submit revised information on the state of conservation of the property, including an analysis of the causes of the decline and the potential measures for its conservation and management.

6. Welcomed the revised information on the state of conservation of the property, including an analysis of the causes of the decline and the potential measures for its conservation and management.

7. Welcomed the revised information on the state of conservation of the property, including an analysis of the causes of the decline and the potential measures for its conservation and management.

8. Noted the progress made by the State Party in implementing the corrective measures and the need for further efforts.

9. Invited the State Party to provide updated information on the state of conservation of the property, including an analysis of the causes of the decline and the potential measures for its conservation and management.

10. Decided to retain Nikko-Koba National Park (Senegal) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.