



AMENDMENT/PROPOSAL

Agenda Item	State of conservation of World Heritage properties
Draft Decision	45 COM 7.1
Submitted by the Delegation of....	Japan
Co-author(s) (if any)	
Date of submission	5 September 2023

TEXT

Japan would like to add a new section under “STATUTORY MATTERS RELATED TO REACTIVE MONITORING” as follows:

Enhancing dialogue among States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre

12. Recommends that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies ensure the following steps regarding the monitoring of state of conservation of the inscribed properties;

- 1) Whenever an expert mission takes place within the framework of reactive monitoring process, the draft mission report will be shared, prior to its publication, with the concerned State Party to allow them to review the report and to propose corrections on any factual inaccuracies and comment on other critical issues and/or misunderstandings, and consultations will be held, if necessary, between the concerned State Party and relevant Advisory Body/ies;
- 2) Whenever a an expert mission takes place within the framework of reactive monitoring process and the inscription of the concerned property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is recommended in the mission report, consultations will be held between the concerned State Party and relevant Advisory Body/ies, and the State Party’s view will be referred to in the mission report or in its annex in the event that the views of the both parties do not converge in the consultations;
- 3) Whenever the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed in a working document on State of Conservation produced by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to be examined by the Committee, consultations will be held, within the available deadlines, prior to the distribution of the document, between the concerned State Party, relevant Advisory Body/ies and the World Heritage Centre, and the

State Party's view will be referred to in the working document such as in its annex in the event that the views of the concerned parties do not converge;

13. Recommends that the States Parties enhance dialogue among themselves regarding properties that are or may be proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in particular cases in which causes of the danger are transboundary;

14. Recommends that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies continue to work on knowledge sharing of best practice cases in which the property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and also encourage them to enhance providing capacity building for the States Parties who have properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger;

15. Recommends that the budget of the Advisory Bodies be adjusted in proportion with the additional workload generated by the additional dialogue and consultations as well as for capacity building for States Parties with properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.