WHC-95/CONF.203/5/ADD.2

Agenda item 7

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2 ON MONITORING AND REPORTING

Chairman: Mr. Barry Jones (Australia)
Rapporteur: Mr. Harald Plachter (Germany)

1. In a general debate, the delegates recognized that the issue under consideration consists of two steps:

   1. the monitoring by the States Parties of the state of their World Heritage sites;

   2. the regular reporting on the state of these sites in the framework of the Convention.

2 A small group of States Parties (Australia, Canada, France, Germany and India) prepared a preliminary version of a draft resolution for the eleventh General Assembly. This text was discussed at length and amended accordingly. A final draft was prepared for discussion at the plenary session of the Committee (see attached). The Working Group reached agreement, in principle, on paragraphs 1 to 12. Due to time constraints, the paragraphs 13 to 16 remain to be examined in detail.

3. The recommendations of the Working Group are the following:

   (i) Subject to agreement on the remaining paragraphs the Committee should adopt the draft resolution as amended. Working documents for presentation to the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties should be delivered by the Committee and prepared by the Bureau.

   (ii) As to point A, B, C and D of the agenda item, the Working Group recommends the Committee to defer decision making until its next session.

Agenda item 7

WORKING GROUP 2: MONITORING AND REPORTING

Draft resolution for the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention

The General Assembly,

1. Noting that the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage has recognized that the cultural and natural heritage 'are increasingly threatened with destruction, not only by traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction';

2. Reaffirms that 'deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world';

3. Considers that the Convention would be interpreted in the light of twenty-three years of experience in its implementation and in establishing standards for classification and inscription;

4. Recognizing that such interpretation acknowledges the sovereign right of the State Party concerned over the World Heritage sites situated on its territory;

5. Considers that a well-reflected and formulated common policy for the protection of cultural and natural heritage is likely to create a continuing interaction between States Parties;

6. Emphasizes the interest of each State Party to be informed of the experience of others with regard to conservation methods and the possibilities so offered, through voluntary international cooperation, for the general improvement of all actions undertaken;

7. Reaffirms its role and the role of the World Heritage Committee as standard setting organizations;

8. Concludes that monitoring is the responsibility of the State Party concerned and that the committment to provide regular reports on the state of the site is consistent with the principles set out in the Convention in

(i) the first, second, sixth, seventh and eighth preambular clauses,
(ii) Art. 4
(iii) Art. 6.1. and 6.2.
(iv) Art. 7
(v) Art. 10
(vi) Art. 11
(vii) Art. 13
(viii) Art. 15
(ix) Art. 21.3
(x) Art. 29;

9. Emphasizes that monitoring by the State Party is part of the site management which remains the responsibility of the States Parties where the site is located, and that regular reports may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention;

10. Recalls that Article 4 of the Convention provides that 'Each State Party....recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage...situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State'.

11. Reiterates that while Article 6 lays down the concept of world heritage 'for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate', Article 7 requires the establishment of a 'system of international co-operation' and assistance 'designed to support States Parties' efforts to conserve and identify that heritage.

12. Emphasizes that regular reporting should be part of a consultative process and not treated as a sanction or a coercive mechanism;

13. Recognizes that within the broad responsibility of standards setting, the form, nature and extent of the regular reporting must respect the principles of State sovereignty.

option 1: The involvement of the Committee, through its Secretariat or advisory bodies, in the preparation of the regular reports would be in agreement with the State Party concerned. The personnel, and the qualifications of those to be involved, would be agreed with the State Party concerned;

option 2 (text from Operational Guidelines, para 72 adopted by Committee in Phuket): The States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies. The Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.

14. Invites the General Conference of UNESCO to activat- the procedures in Art. 29 of the Convention and to refer t' the General Assembly of States Parties the responsi..l . . . respond to the reports.

15. Encourages States Parties to take advantage of shared information and experience on World Heritage matters;

16. Invites other States to become States Parties to the Convention.