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

**Draft Decision: 45 COM 7.1**

The World Heritage Committee,

**Climate Action for World Heritage**

1. Having examined Document WHC/23/45.COM/7,
2. Recalling Decisions 40 COM 7 and 44 COM 7C, adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016) and at its extended 44th session (Fuzhou/online, 2021),

Notes that the Panel of experts in relation to Decision 44 COM 7C concerning climate change and World Heritage met by end of March 2022 and made recommendations on the amendments proposed by the Members of the World Heritage Committee and provided a report to the Open-ended Working Group of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention on Climate Change;

4. Also notes that the Open-ended Working Group of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention on Climate Change has met seven times to discuss the proposed amendments and the recommendations of the Panel of experts;

5. Recognizes Climate Action for World Heritage as an important thematic area of work, thanks the Governments of Australia, Azerbaijan and the Netherlands for their generous financial support and invites States Parties to contribute towards this thematic area to enable the Secretariat to support activities related to the development of the updated Policy Document on Climate Action for World Heritage and its dissemination;
6. Recalls again Decision 41 COM 7 in which the Committee "reiterate[d] the importance of States Parties undertaking the most ambitious implementation of the Paris Agreement adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (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 above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change"", again strongly urges all States Parties to undertake actions to address Climate Change under the Paris Agreement consistent with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances, that are fully consistent with their obligations within the World Heritage Convention to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of all World Heritage properties;

(···)

*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 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.