



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

43 COM

WHC/19/43.COM/7

Paris, 26 June 2019

Original: English / French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Forty-third session

**Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan
30 June – 10 July 2019**

**Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage
properties**

SUMMARY

This document presents a global and analytical overview of Item 7 on the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties.

The document is composed of four parts: a statistical summary (Introduction), a section on statutory matters related to Reactive Monitoring (Part I), a focus on pressing conservation issues (Part II) and a synthesis of other conservation matters which might have strategic or policy implications (Part III).

Draft Decisions: 43 COM 7.1, 43 COM 7.2, 43 COM 7.3 see Part IV.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
A. WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES REPORTED ON IN 2019	2
B. THREATS AFFECTING THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES REPORTED ON IN 2019	3
C. INFORMATION ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES.....	4
D. THIRD EDITION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE SITE MANAGERS' FORUM.....	5
I. STATUTORY MATTERS RELATED TO REACTIVE MONITORING	5
A. EVALUATION OF THE REACTIVE MONITORING PROCESS	5
B. ISSUES RELATED TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER.....	14
C. SELECTION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES TO BE PROPOSED FOR DISCUSSION.....	15
II. PRESSING CONSERVATION ISSUES	17
A. EMERGENCY SITUATIONS RESULTING FROM CONFLICTS.....	17
B. RECONSTRUCTION	19
C. CLIMATE CHANGE	20
III. OTHER CONSERVATION ISSUES	21
A. MANAGEMENT PLANS IN THE CONTEXT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT	21
B. TOURISM.....	22
C. HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAS/EIAS)	23
IV. DRAFT DECISIONS	24

INTRODUCTION

A. World Heritage properties reported on in 2019

1. As part of the Reactive Monitoring process¹, the World Heritage Committee will examine at its 43rd session the reports on the state of conservation of 166 World Heritage properties (Agenda items 7A and 7B), including the 54 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Agenda item 7A). In addition, due to specific situations, two decisions, one on the World Heritage properties of Iraq and one on the World Heritage properties of Syrian Arab Republic, will also be examined under Agenda item 7A.
2. The properties reported upon are selected, among all those inscribed on the World Heritage List, according to the following considerations:
 - 54 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Agenda item 7A) and for which reports have to be reviewed annually by the Committee, in conformity with Paragraph 190 of the *Operational Guidelines*);
 - 96 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for which state of conservation reports were requested by the World Heritage Committee at its previous sessions (Agenda item 7B);
 - 16 additional properties that have also come under threat since the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Agenda item 7B);
 - For 5 properties out of these 166, a follow-up was requested by the World Heritage Committee upon their inscription on the World Heritage List.
3. The 166 properties for examination are distributed as follows:

Agenda item 7A Document WHC/19/43.COM/7A Document WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add Document WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.2 Document WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3			
	NAT	CLT	total
AFR	12	4	16
ARB	0	22	22
APA	2	4	6
EUR/NA	1	3	4
LAC	1	5	6
Total	16	38	54

Agenda item 7B Document WHC/19/43.COM/7B Document WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add Document WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add.2 Document WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3				
	NAT	MIX	CLT	total
AFR	6	2	10	18
ARB	1	1	16	18
APA	11	0	23	34
EUR/NA	8	1	17	26
LAC	8	1	7	16
Total	34	5	73	112

¹For further details on this process, please visit the dedicated page on the World Heritage Centre's online State of conservation Information System at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/reactive-monitoring>.

4. These 166 properties represent 15.1% of all the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. Significant variations among the regions are noticeable (see below Chart 1). For example, the Africa and the Arab States regions represent 30% and 41% respectively of all properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (item 7A), although they represent today only 9% and 8% of the World Heritage List respectively.




Chart 1: Percentage of properties located in each region

5. There are also significant variations when considering the categories of heritage (natural, mixed and cultural properties). Indeed, while natural properties represent 19% of the World Heritage List, they account for 30% of the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and 30% of all properties subject to the Reactive Monitoring process (see Chart 2 below).




Chart 2: Percentage of properties of each category (natural, mixed, cultural)

B. Threats affecting the World Heritage properties reported on in 2019

6. The 166 properties for which a state of conservation report is presented are facing a number of factors, which negatively impact, or may impact, their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). On average, a total of 4/5 different factors affect these properties, which emphasizes once more the cumulative impact of threats on the OUV.
7. Globally, the most reported factors affecting the properties in 2019 continue to be the following ones: Management systems/ management plan; Housing; Illegal activities;

Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation; Ground transport infrastructures; Legal framework; as well as War and Civil unrest.

8. However, factors affecting the World Heritage properties vary according to the category of heritage considered. The most reported factors affecting respectively natural and cultural properties, as identified in the state of conservation reports presented in 2019, as well as more detailed statistics, can be found at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc> (click “Advanced search”; enter “from 2019”; click “Search”; then on the “Views” tab, and “Statistics”).
9. The following sections of the document present insights on specific factors, such as conflict situations, reconstruction or climate change.

C. Information on the state of conservation reports submitted by States Parties

10. The World Heritage Centre wishes to underline that a substantial number of reports were not received within the statutory deadlines of 1 December 2018 and 1 February 2019, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. By 15 December 2018, only 82% of the reports requested by 1 December had been received by the World Heritage Centre; and by 15 February 2019, only 78% of the reports requested by 1 February had been received.
11. 84% of all the reports requested by the World Heritage Committee were received by the end of February 2019 and 93% by the end of March 2019. At the time of drafting this document, only 1 requested report had not yet been received. It should however be noted with appreciation that this year again, most of the States Parties reports followed the statutory format included as Annex 13 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The respect of the format greatly improves the treatment of the information and facilitates the monitoring of the implementation of previous Committee decisions.
12. The World Heritage Centre would like to recall that delayed submission of the reports and/or late submission of additional information by the States Parties inevitably leads to less time available for dialogue between the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the issues at stake. It should be noted that this year, States Parties have submitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a substantial amount of such additional documentation and information, sometimes at a very late point in the drafting process in late April and May, which delays the production of the relevant working documents. Furthermore, late submissions lead to an increasing number of SOC reports being included in the Addenda documents, thus reducing the time available for Committee members to review these reports before the Committee session. 96 SOC reports were made available by the Secretariat on 20 May 2019 (statutory deadline for dispatch of Documents WHC/19/43.COM/7A and 7B) and 70 remaining reports were made available on the following dispatches (Documents WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.2, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3, WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add, WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add.2 and WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3).
13. Although the sharing of information on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is crucial, States Parties should be reminded about Decision **35 COM 12B**, Paragraph 16, by which they were requested by the Committee to consider refraining from providing additional information regarding State of conservation issues after the deadlines indicated in the *Operational Guidelines*, as this information cannot be reviewed in due course.
14. The World Heritage Centre would also like to acknowledge that out of all reports received, over 80% have been made fully accessible to the public at http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/43com/documents/#state_of_conservation_reports with the agreement of the States Parties concerned. The online availability of such an

important number of complete state of conservation reports greatly contributes to the transparency of the Reactive Monitoring process and States Parties should be commended for allowing such online publication.

D. Third edition of the World Heritage Site Managers' Forum

15. As key actors of the World Heritage Reactive Monitoring process, site managers often emerge as the responsibility holders who oversee and lead site-specific managerial decision-making. The responsibility of implementing the decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee and preparing the state of conservation reports also often rely on them. However, too often, site managers are not directly involved in the decision-making processes and therefore might not be fully empowered to effectively implement the decisions adopted nor to assist other stakeholders to engage in World Heritage processes.
16. To address this issue, Poland, the host country of the 41st session of the Committee (Krakow, 2017) organized the first World Heritage Site Managers Forum, as a capacity-building exercise to achieve a more effective protection of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), as well as promote a greater engagement of all those dealing with World Heritage properties on a day-to-day basis. This initiative was greatly appreciated and has been continued in 2018 by the Kingdom of Bahrain, in conjunction of the 42nd session of the Committee (Manama, 2018). The outcomes of the two first editions of the Site Managers Forum can be found at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/1394/> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/1435/>.
17. In this context, the Republic of Azerbaijan, Host Country of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee session, decided to continue this commendable initiative. The third edition of the World Heritage Site Managers Forum, entitled “**Towards sustainable heritage management**”, will be held in Baku, from 26 June to 4 July 2019. For more information, see <https://43whcbaku2019.az/en/forums/2>.

I. STATUTORY MATTERS RELATED TO REACTIVE MONITORING

A. Evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process

Note: This Section should be read in conjunction with the final Evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process, available at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/reactive-monitoring>.

18. During the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016), it was highlighted that the Reactive Monitoring process was perceived as a key indicator of the effectiveness of the *Convention* itself as an international agreement for heritage protection and that this process provided a unique global overview of the state of conservation of heritage. It was stressed however that its content and its procedures were not always clear. In addition, Committee members highlighted that the List of World Heritage in Danger is unfortunately often negatively perceived. The Committee decided that it was time that these issues be formally addressed and adopted Decision **40 COM 7**, requesting the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies:
 - a) To promote better understanding of the implications and benefits of the inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to develop appropriate information material in this regard with a view to overcome the negative perceptions of the List of World Heritage in Danger;
 - b) To evaluate the effectiveness of Reactive Monitoring including procedures and case studies.

19. In implementing this decision, the World Heritage Centre benefitted from the generous support of the State Party of Switzerland through the Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) to contract two senior expert consultants with outstanding experience in the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*.
20. The methodology followed by the experts to implement the project, which started in December 2017 in a fully open and consultative manner, encompassed a wide range of information inputs, including:
 - A detailed online survey distributed to all 193 States Parties and opened to all other stakeholders of the *World Heritage Convention* (World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, civil society, etc.) (90 respondents),
 - 53 direct interviews with key stakeholders,
 - A consultation with 27 World Heritage site managers at the 2018 Site Managers Forum held in conjunction with the 42nd session of the Committee (Manama, 2018),
 - Review of a wide range of documents relevant to Reactive Monitoring,
 - Attendance at the 42nd session of the Committee (Manama, 2018).
21. In order to assess the Reactive Monitoring process in its entirety and to be in a position to recommend options for the possible delivery of better outcomes, the experts considered four main areas:
 - The statutory framework of the Reactive Monitoring process (*World Heritage Convention*, *Operational Guidelines*, Rules of Procedure, etc.),
 - The roles of the key actors in the Reactive Monitoring process (Committee, States Parties, World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, civil society),
 - The Reactive Monitoring procedures (from initiation to termination of the process, selection of properties, reporting, monitoring missions, assessment of impacts, voluntary submission of information, etc.),
 - Other specific procedures (inscription on / removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger, deletion from the World Heritage List, Reinforced Monitoring mechanism).
22. A selection of 10 case studies complement the evaluation to illustrate the various issues identified, in terms of success stories, good practices but also in terms of difficulties.
23. Overall, the evaluation indicates that there is an overwhelming consensus that Reactive Monitoring is an essential element of the *World Heritage Convention* and is a key feature to achieve the objectives of the *Convention*; one of the main challenges being to ensure that the procedures of the Reactive Monitoring process are systematically applied and that its outcomes (mission recommendations, Committee decisions, etc.) are effectively implemented, particularly at site level. It is also noted that Reactive Monitoring has resulted in a number of conservation “success stories” for natural and cultural properties. Reactive Monitoring has led to a number of concrete and clear actions that make a difference on the ground through initiating positive conservation action and stopping or limiting development projects that impacted, or had the potential to impact, the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of properties.
24. Another positive aspect of Reactive Monitoring, which goes beyond the technical issues of site conservation and management, is the opportunity the process provides for engaging with key stakeholders to discuss fundamental issues relating to the properties. Reactive Monitoring frequently provides a framework for ensuring effective dialogue and cooperation between States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, Site Managers, Advisory

Bodies and civil society. For the latter, the Reactive Monitoring process is often the only entry point to discuss and present their views.

25. The Reactive Monitoring process has also led to enhanced cooperation between the World Heritage Convention and the other biodiversity related conventions, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, for the conservation of key sites. It has also encouraged States Parties to allocate more resources for conservation and management of properties and has helped States Parties to rethink and improve their own management systems. Furthermore, the Reactive Monitoring process has supported and stimulated the development of specific capacity building activities, as well as the introduction of systematic Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs).
26. Regrettably, the review of the process also highlighted an increasing deviation by the Committee from the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in relation to Reactive Monitoring, especially relating to the potential inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
27. The limited financial and institutional resources available for Reactive Monitoring were highlighted as an important challenge, especially regarding the mismatch between the recommendations arising from the Reactive Monitoring process and the funding available to address these. Specifically, the means are not sufficient to achieve the objectives of the Reactive Monitoring process.
28. The need for increased communication and a more effective dialogue between all stakeholders of the *Convention* is another salient point of the evaluation and represents an area where improvement is desirable.
29. The evaluation concluded that the current statutory framework for Reactive Monitoring is adequate and does not require changes at this time, also emphasizing that the *Operational Guidelines* are relevant, clear and well formulated. The challenge identified related to the effective application of the *Operational Guidelines* and, to some extent, a lack of understanding of their terminology.
30. Relating to the key actors of the Reactive Monitoring process, the evaluation demonstrates an overall high level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee in addressing conservation issues. An element arising from the evaluation is that all of the key actors are under pressure due to limited, and sometimes inadequate, resources related to ever-increasing workload and an increasing number of state of conservation reports to process. Greater attention should also be given to ensure that Committee decisions are based on the highest level of objective and scientific considerations, better reflect on-ground realities and are easier to implement by States Parties. Capacity building activities for States Parties on Reactive Monitoring needs to be expanded, with the primary focus to improve the quality and effectiveness of their reporting to the Committee.
31. The procedures related to the Reactive Monitoring process are clear and straightforward. However, their effective application is hampered by the reluctance of some States Parties to provide information and from the considerable time and energy spent by States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in checking and verifying third-party information. A recurrent comment also made during the evaluation relates to the properties that remain under the Reactive Monitoring process for extended periods. Clearer criteria for the termination of the process once all issues impacting the OUV of the property have been addressed by the State Party would be beneficial.
32. The evaluation further states that, although there are many pragmatic reasons for limiting the number of reports for discussion during the Committee sessions and that there appears to be general satisfaction amongst those interviewed with the selection of

reports opened for discussion, more communication on these processes may be necessary to ensure appropriate awareness by all Committee members and States Parties concerned.

33. The evaluation also looked into the preparation and submission of state of conservation reports by the States Parties, as well as the Reactive Monitoring and Advisory missions, also identifying possible areas for improvement, such as involving more Site Managers, adjusting timeframes for reporting, ensuring reports are shorter, clearer, more realistic and focussed on key issues, ensuring more streamlined mission reports, etc.
34. Regarding the List of World Heritage in Danger, the evaluation confirmed that, despite various “success stories” and the original positive intent to draw attention to issues within the property and highlight the need for support, the List of World Heritage in Danger continues to suffer from a negative connotation. To address this, the evaluation provides a series of positive examples where the Danger listing of properties has led to significant and positive action to improve their conservation status. An analysis of funding and assistance available for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger highlighted that the World Heritage Fund and technical assistance funding provided for such properties is not adequate, and stressed the importance of mobilizing international support.
35. The evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process includes a prioritized set of recommendations to address the improvement of practices, for implementation by all stakeholders. In summary, no structural or statutory changes were identified as being required to improve the effectiveness of the Reactive Monitoring process, rather a focus on operational changes at various levels, as follows:

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High H , Medium M or Low L)
1	Noting the limited awareness of the many positive conservation outcomes of Reactive Monitoring under the WH [World Heritage] Convention, it is recommended that: The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, working with and through States Parties, should develop a communication strategy to highlight and promote the success stories of the WH Convention, including those associated with the List of World Heritage in Danger.	H
2	Noting the need for better dialogue regarding Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: WH States Parties, the WH Centre and Advisory Bodies should ensure effective dialogue occurs at all stages of the Reactive Monitoring process. This should be guided by a clear communication plan, developed at the outset of the RM process for WH properties which identifies key stakeholders and outlines how they should be engaged. Key stakeholders should include relevant government agencies, WH Site Managers and civil society in each country. Non-traditional sectors, such as the infrastructure development, energy, banking and insurance sectors, should also be involved where such dialogue is relevant to the protection of World Heritage properties.	M
3	Noting the mismatch between outcomes from the Reactive Monitoring (RM) process and available resources, it is recommended that: Decisions and recommendations arising from the RM process should be more clearly linked to potential funding sources, at national and international levels, and also should be practical in terms of the resources and time available for implementation. Prioritization of recommendations and decisions	H

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L))
	should be undertaken to take into account resource and time constraints.	
4	While noting most interviewees considered the WH Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure to be adequate, the RM Review Team notes some improvements could be made and recommends: The WH Committee consider changes, through the development of internal policy and procedure documents, to improve the functionality of the WH Operational Guidelines in areas including, but not limited to: terminology to describe the Danger List in a more positive way; the development of costed action plans for DL properties; and the need for special attention to properties that have been on the DL for more than 10 years.	M
5	Noting issues raised through this RM Review regarding the understanding and application of WH Committee decisions, it is recommended that: Greater attention should be given to ensuring WH Committee decisions reflect on-ground realities and also to ensuring that WH Committee decisions are clearly explained to relevant stakeholders, particularly those responsible for their implementation, including WH Site Managers. Where required, WH Committee decisions and recommendations should be translated into local languages to enhance understanding and application.	H
6	Noting concerns expressed during the RM Review regarding the increasing “politicization” of the WH process, it is recommended that: WH Committee decisions relating to Reactive Monitoring must be based on the highest level of objective and scientific considerations, consistent with the Operational Guidelines. Further, all WH Committee members should include natural and cultural experts (Article 9.3 of the Convention) within their delegations and ensure they fully participate in the discussions and decision-making processes of the WH Committee.	H
7	Noting the importance of capacity building to improve the application of Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: Capacity building of States Parties for Reactive Monitoring should be continued and expanded, with the primary focus being to strengthen the capacity of those directly involved in the SOC process, including WH Site Managers. SPs should aim to maintain the continuity of staff engaged in SOC process. Existing WH orientation sessions should continue to address the Reactive Monitoring Process and the time allocated for presentation and discussion of this topic should be increased. Any future revisions to the WH Capacity Building Strategy, should strengthen the capacity of those engaged in Reactive Monitoring.	H
8	Noting the productive WH Site Managers Forums held in conjunction with recent WH Committee Meetings, it is recommended that: The WH Site Managers Forum (SMF) should continue to be held as an important part of future WH Committee Meetings. Options for better utilizing Site Managers expertise in Reactive Monitoring discussions and issues at WH Committee meetings should be proactively explored and the Forum should be used to enhance capacity building of WH Site Managers.	H

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L))
9	Noting States Parties have established WH Focal Points and further noting the importance of Reactive Monitoring at national levels, it is recommended that: Existing WH Focal Points within States Parties should also coordinate aspects relating to Reactive Monitoring or, alternatively, identify another Focal Point for this purpose. States Parties should ensure that WH Site Managers are always closely involved in all aspects of Reactive Monitoring for sites for which they are responsible for.	H
10	Noting the important roles of the WH Centre and the Advisory Bodies in Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: Measures to improve dialogue on Reactive Monitoring between key stakeholders should be undertaken, particularly at national and regional levels, including between UNESCO Regional Offices and relevant States Parties, and also between the respective Regional Offices of IUCN and relevant National Committees of ICOMOS.	M
11	Noting the importance of role definition between the WH Centre and the Advisory Bodies in relation to Reactive Monitoring, and further noting differing views on this subject, it is recommended: That the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies be clearly communicated to key WH stakeholders, including the WH Committee and WH States Parties. The RM Review Team considers the role of the Advisory Bodies is to provide objective, high quality technical advice on Reactive Monitoring to the WH Committee and to States Parties, while the primary function of the WH Centre should be to: provide advice and guidance to States Parties regarding RM policies and processes; ensure effective coordination regarding Reactive Monitoring. However, the Review Team notes that the WH Centre should also continue to play an important technical role in relation to WH Reactive Monitoring.	H
12	Noting differing views expressed regarding the roles of the WH Centre and the Advisory Bodies in Reactive Monitoring missions, it is recommended that: Reactive Monitoring missions should, where possible, be undertaken on a joint basis between the WH Centre and the Advisory Bodies, particularly when there are politically sensitive issues involved. Joint missions must not, however, compromise the primary function of Reactive Monitoring missions, which is to provide high quality technical and objective advice to the WH Committee and States Parties.	M
13	Noting the importance of increased fundraising to address issues at WH properties, it is recommended that: The WH Centre should be more proactive and agile in relation to issues such as fundraising, while noting the constraints of available resources, and also that the primary responsibility for fundraising for WH properties rests with States Parties. The WH Centre should also be more proactive in encouraging States Parties to make more use of Section [Paragraph] 172 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> where resources should generate from relevant activities.	H
14	Noting the critically important role played by the WH Advisory Bodies on Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM should explore ways to strengthen their capacity on Reactive Monitoring, including: for IUCN, increasing its	H

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L))
	level of involvement of other IUCN Programmes and IUCN Regional Offices in Reactive Monitoring; for ICOMOS, exploring options such as development of similar networks to those of IUCN as well greater use of the expertise within ICOMOS National Committees to support Reactive Monitoring; and for ICCROM, exploring options to expand its activities and sharing of responsibilities with ICOMOS using its worldwide Alumni network.	
15	Noting the Advisory Bodies should be continually seeking to improve the way in which they can improve their role on RM and also the number of suggestions received through interviewees for this project, it is recommended that: The Advisory Bodies should continually explore ways in which their role on Reactive Monitoring can be improved, including but not limited to, through: ensuring the performance of mission experts is continually assessed; improving cooperative work between the ABs and the WH Centre; and exploring “smarter” approaches to undertaking RM.	M
16	Noting the important role Civil Society (CS) plays in Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: Civil Society should be more involved in the Reactive Monitoring process and they should also be encouraged to work more closely with WH States Parties, as well as with the Advisory Bodies. Existing frameworks for engaging CS in the work of the WH Convention, such as the IUCN WH Outlook process, should be examined for possible wider application within States Parties and other ABs.	M
17	Noting the recent trend to limit the number of SOC's verbally presented to the WH Committee and some concerns regarding the way in which these sites are selected, it is recommended that: SOC's presented to the WH Committee, including those “opened” for discussion, should be based on clear and objective criteria, including the level and urgency of the threat to the property, and also whether or not the site is on the Danger List, rather than being based on geographic representativeness.	H
18	Noting the need for clearer communication of the process of “opening up” SOC's for discussion at WH Committee Meetings, it is recommended that: The process and criteria for the selection and “opening up” of SOC's should be more clearly and effectively communicated, including through a clear description of the process within the introduction by the WH Centre to Agenda 7 of the WH Committee. This aspect should also be addressed within sessions on Reactive Monitoring within the WH Orientation sessions.	H
19	Noting the importance of streamlining and improving Reactive Monitoring reporting, it is recommended that: Options to streamline and improve State Party reporting on Reactive Monitoring should be explored, to enable States Parties to more effectively meet obligations under the WH Convention, without compromising the OUV of WH properties.	M
20	Noting the importance of fully involving WH Site Managers in the SOC process, it is recommended that: States Parties should ensure that WH Site Managers are adequately and effectively engaged in the preparation of Reactive Monitoring reports for the WH Committee and the follow up actions arising.	M

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L))
21	Noting comments regarding the format of Reactive Monitoring mission reports, it is recommended that: The Reactive Monitoring mission format should be shortened and streamlined and more clearly focus on key issues and solutions and that this task be undertaken by the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre.	H
22	Noting the use of both Advisory Missions, at the invitation of the State Parties, and Reactive Monitoring Missions, and the associated potential for confusion, it is recommended that: Reactive Monitoring missions and “Advisory Missions” should be clearly distinct and separate and this difference should be clearly communicated to key stakeholders. Advisory Missions should be used sparingly and their use reduced over time.	H
23	Noting concerns raised by some interviewees regarding the selection of RM Mission Experts and the needs to ensure the highest quality of RM Mission reports, it is recommended that: The WH Centre and the ABs collectively develop a policy on how they select Mission experts and on how they assess their performances in relation to their roles and responsibilities. This should be shared with States Parties.	M
24	Noting the importance of effective dialogue throughout the Reactive Monitoring process, it is recommended that: The Reactive Monitoring mission process should be used more effectively to encourage constructive dialogue between key WH stakeholders. The Reactive Monitoring mission process must be effectively managed, including through ensuring: (a) there are clear and relevant ToRs for each mission; (b) there is a clear and open dialogue between SP and Mission Team, before, during and after the mission; and (c) all relevant key stakeholders are effectively engaged in Reactive Monitoring Missions.	H
25	Noting the different and emerging approaches to conservation and management of Heritage, it is recommended that: The WHC and ABs should ensure on-going review of the factors included in the conceptual framework, and standard list of factors, for both Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting.	M
26	Noting the need to better communicate aspects relating to the List of WH in Danger, including positive elements, it is recommended that: The WH Centre and Advisory Bodies should develop a targeted awareness campaign around the application of the WH in Danger and this should include the identification and promotion of positive examples of where the Danger Listing of WH properties has led to significant and positive action to improve the conservation status of WH properties. This campaign should also note that external factors, such as climate change, can impact the values of WH properties and that such threats require coordinated and effective action involving States Parties, the WH centre and the ABs.	H
27	Noting the need for transparency of funds allocated through the WH Fund, it is recommended that: The WH Fund Danger Sites Budget Line should be revised to separately show the amount of resources allocated for properties inscribed on the List of WH in Danger.	M

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L))
28	Noting the low level of funds available for WH properties on the WH List of WH in Danger from the WH Fund, it is recommended that: Funds available from the WH Fund for properties on the WH List of WH in Danger should be increased in percentage terms, while recognizing the limitations of the Fund and that alternative sources of funding will always need to be identified. Funds made available from the WH Fund to States Parties should be used in a catalytic manner, including through stimulating other sources of funding through fund raising and other related means.	H
29	Noted the importance of adequate funding to address threats to properties on the WH List of WH in Danger, it is recommended that: Every DL Site should have a Fully Costed Action Plan developed at the time of inscription on the DL. This should identify the actions and itemized costs, in priority order, required to address issues, which led to the Danger Listing of the Property.	H
30	Noting that the removal of a WH property from the List of WH in Danger generally provides grounds for celebration, it is recommended that: The removal of a WH property from the List of WH in Danger should generally be promoted and widely communicated as a significant “success story” for the Convention.	M
31	Noting the importance of cooperation between Conventions on issues relating to Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: The WH Centre should maintain its already close relationship with the Ramsar Convention on wetlands, and regularly share information on areas where there are overlapping areas of interest, such as in relation to the addition and removing sites from respective “danger lists”, or equivalent. The WH Centre should also cooperate with other relevant Conventions, such as CITES and CMS, including at national levels, where this is relevant to the protection of WH properties.	M
32	Noting differing views regarding the deletion of properties from the WH List, it is recommended that: The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies discuss the issue of “deletion of properties” and bring forward recommendations to improve the process of deletion of properties from the WH List, for the consideration of the WH Committee.	M
33	Noting the [Reinforced] Monitoring Mechanism has been used on a number of occasions, and the potential for confusion with Reactive Monitoring, it is recommended that: The Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be continued but only used in exceptional circumstances, such as when the WH Committee agrees there is potential for the immediate loss of Outstanding Universal Value at WH properties. It should not be used generally as an alternative to the WH DL process and procedures. Given the validity of findings from the 2011 Evaluation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, it is further recommended that these findings be discussed by the WH Centre and the ABs with a view to bringing forward recommendations for a subsequent WH Committee Session, including on whether or not RMM should be included within the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> .	L

	Text of Recommendation	Priority (High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L))
34	<p>Noting the need for a phased and practical approach to this Reactive Monitoring Review, it is recommended: That the following Implementation Plan, be adopted and implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WH Centre, in consultation with the WH Advisory Bodies, should prepare a detailed Implementation Plan for these recommendations for consideration by the first WH Committee Meeting to follow the 2019 Committee Session. • The WH Centre, in consultation with the WH Advisory Bodies, should report on progress towards implementing this Reactive Monitoring Implementation Plan at subsequent WH Committee Meetings, 3 years after the adoption of the Implementation Plan at the 2020 WH Committee Meeting, thus at the 47th Session of the WH Committee in 2023 • The assessment of achievement of the Implementation Plan and specific recommendations should be undertaken by the WH Committee on a biennial basis, based on advice from the WH Centre and the Advisory Bodies. 	H

B. Issues related to the List of World Heritage in Danger

36. With regards to the implementation of the Committee's Decision **40 COM 7**, calling for a "better understanding of the implications and benefits of properties being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to develop appropriate information material in this regard with a view to overcome the negative perceptions of the List of World Heritage in Danger" and Decision **42 COM 7**, asking for "a workshop to assist States Parties with properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger", the State Party of Romania had requested funding in October 2018, through the UNESCO Participation Programme (PP), to organize an "International meeting of World Heritage in Danger stakeholders", in 2019 in Bucharest. It is understood that this meeting is intended to be the requested workshop.
37. The main objective of this international workshop is "*to create a platform for multi-stakeholder participation that can facilitate the networking, exchange of good practices related to the World Heritage in Danger and raise awareness. It will gather about 30 people, government representatives of Member States with sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, international intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, experts/specialists, academia, local state authorities, national governmental central authorities, military, or mass-media*". It is proposed to promote properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the efforts to improve their state of conservation through movie-clips and a brochure containing information about the List of World Heritage in Danger, coupled with the results of the international meeting debates. The project will be promoted extensively, both in Romania and globally. The project has received support letters from various regions. While approving the request however, the UNESCO Participation Programme recommended that the World Heritage Centre be consulted by the State Party as soon as possible regarding the concept and programme, the possible list of participants and selection process, participation of LDC representatives, dates and modalities foreseen, as well as other related matters.
38. It is also considered desirable that this project and other initiatives undertaken to address the Committee Decisions **40 COM 7** and **42 COM 7** should be designed to reflect the ultimate objective of the List of World Heritage in Danger, being to ensure the retention of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of properties where the attributes that

contribute to OUV are under ascertained or potential threat. In this regard, the States Parties to the Convention should be strongly encouraged to understand that inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not, in any sense, to be interpreted as a sanction nor as commentary on the State Party itself, but rather an acknowledgement of the need for specific intervention and international assistance to ensure a positive conservation trajectory for the property in a timely manner. It is therefore important that this project seek innovative ways to reinforce this important message.

39. In a recent communication to the World Heritage Centre, the State Party of Romania suggested organizing this workshop at the end of September 2019, in order to present its conclusions during the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in Paris, in November 2019. At the time of drafting this document, modalities for implementation of this project are still being discussed with the State Party of Romania.
40. With regards to costed Action Plans for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process (see Chapter I.A above – Recommendation 29) stresses that a costed Action Plan is a tool, which “should identify the actions and itemized costs, in priority order, required to address issues, which led to the Danger Listing of the Property” and that “every [Danger Listed] Site should have [one]”.
41. Although having such a costed Action Plan for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger is a requirement of the Convention itself (Article 11.4), each property has its own specificities and it is extremely challenging to identify a “one size fits all” model or mechanism. Realistic resources, beyond those provided through International Assistance requests, would also be required in most cases for the effective implementation of any Action Plans.
42. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will continue to review the progress with the proposed meeting and other processes arising from inclusion of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and will keep the Committee informed on progress achieved.

C. Selection of the World Heritage properties to be proposed for discussion

43. In 2003, the World Heritage Committee requested (Decision **27 COM 7B.106.3**) that the state of conservation (SOC) reports should be presented to the Committee according to the two following categories:
 - Reports with recommended decisions which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, require discussion by the World Heritage Committee,
 - Reports which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, can be noted without discussion.
44. Since the adoption of this decision, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had been refining the selection process for the properties to be discussed by the World Heritage Committee, taking into account the procedures and statutory deadlines as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, the different monitoring tools at the disposal of the World Heritage Committee and the ever growing number of properties to report on at each Committee session.
45. Since 2010, it has been the usual practice that the following state of conservation reports be brought to the Committee’s attention for discussion:
 - If deletion of the property from the World Heritage List is proposed,
 - If inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,

- If removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,
 - If the property is subject to the Reinforced Monitoring mechanism,
 - If the property presents serious conservation issues of utmost urgency,
 - If significant new information regarding the property has been received after the report was issued, requiring a revision of the draft Decision.
46. At an early stage in this process, usually four weeks prior to the opening of the Committee session, the list of the reports proposed for discussion by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies was shared with all States Parties to the *Convention* (Document “INF.7”). At this occasion, Committee members were invited to propose other reports they also felt important to be discussed during the session, by providing a written request to the Chairperson of the Committee, sufficiently in advance of the session, and indicating the reason why the report was requested to be opened for discussion. At least 10 days prior to the opening of the session, a revised list of reports to be discussed by the Committee was made available to all States Parties (Document “INF.7.Rev”).
47. However, at its 42nd session (Manama, 2018), the World Heritage Committee, while recognizing the importance of focusing on the properties of greatest concern, recommended that, *“with effect from the 43rd session of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre considers geographical and thematic distribution of properties as additional criteria when determining which properties to open for discussion under Agenda items 7A and 7B”* (Decision **42 COM 7**, para.12). In large part, this was based on the perception that the process in place focused too much on conservation challenges facing World Heritage properties in Africa rather than challenges in other regions of the world.
48. Subsequently, this matter was addressed by the experts tasked with the evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process (see Chapter I.A. of this Document). In the course of the evaluation, the experts sought inputs from all stakeholders of the *World Heritage Convention*, either through direct interviews, mostly conducted during the 42nd session of the Committee, or through an online consultation. As a result, it turned out that the majority of persons interviewed acknowledged that there are many pragmatic reasons for limiting the number of reports for discussion during the Committee sessions and there appeared to be general satisfaction amongst those interviewed with the selection of SOC reports opened for discussion. The experts also made the recommendation (Recommendation 17) that the SOC reports presented to the Committee, *“including those “opened” for discussion, should be based on clear and objective criteria, including the level and urgency of the threat to the property, and also whether or not the site is on the Danger List, rather than being based on geographic representativeness.”*
49. Considering all of the above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies assessed the feasibility of having such geographical and thematic distribution of properties, as recommended by the Committee. They unanimously concluded that the selection of reports to be discussed by the Committee should continue to be guided by scientific criteria and by the urgency of the threats facing the property, as has always been the case since 2003. They were of the view that ensuring such representativity would lead to including in the list of reports to be discussed some properties for which the level of threat is not commensurate to that requiring an in-depth debate. Considering the limited time available to discuss conservation issues during the Committee sessions, such change could also be a disadvantage for properties and global conservation issues that require the most urgent attention of the Committee. Therefore, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have agreed to only propose for discussion the following SOC reports, leaving it to the Committee members to add any other report they wish to be opened for discussion, as is already the case:
- If removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,

- If inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,
- If deletion of the property from the World Heritage List is proposed.

II. PRESSING CONSERVATION ISSUES

A. Emergency situations resulting from conflicts

50. Conflicts (war and civil unrest) continue to represent a major threat to World Heritage properties. It remains one of the major reasons why properties have been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Of the 54 properties currently inscribed on that List, at least 25 were included because of the impacts by conflicts.
51. In Africa, at least six natural sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger continue to be affected by the direct and indirect impacts of civil conflict and war. Manovo-Gounda Saint Floris National Park (Central African Republic) is situated in a part of the country under the control of rebel forces and currently no surveillance or other management operations can be conducted by the State Party. However, following the recent peace agreements, there is hope that management operations could resume in this property in the near future, with help from the international community. In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the security situation continues to improve, resulting in a significant increase in patrol coverage by the park staff of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN - Institut congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature) in several properties. Nevertheless, in several properties in the DRC armed groups continue to be present and involved in illegal resource extraction activities such as elephant poaching, charcoal production and illegal mining. Often these groups are motivated by financial gain and operate in a very violent manner, attacking park staff, in order to secure their illegal business. Since the previous session, three further park staff were tragically killed in Virunga National Park. Military contingents from the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC) continue to be deployed in all the natural properties in the DRC to undertake joint patrols with the ICCN.
52. Wildlife poaching and the illegal trafficking of wildlife products continues to be one of the most important threats to the integrity of natural sites in many regions of the world in particular in Africa and Asia. While poaching is often closely linked to conflict and the presence of armed groups, it is also on the rise in countries that are not directly affected by armed conflict. Organized crime and criminal gangs are often involved in these activities. Further efforts are needed to contain these illegal wildlife trade and illegal timber trade syndicates, including through cooperation with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).
53. In Mali, in the Mopti region in the centre of the country, and particularly within and around the World Heritage property of the Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons), inter-community conflicts observed in recent months between the Fulani and Dogon communities have led to acts of violence, cultural heritage destruction and deadly attacks, notably on 23 March 2019 in the Fulani village of Ogossogou, about 15 km from Bankass. These conflicts have resulted in the death of more than 150 people, and on 9 June 2019 in the Dogon village of Sobane-Da, which killed at least 25 people. Apart from the deplorable loss of human lives, about 13 of the 26 villages already affected are located within the boundaries of the property. Their exceptional built and movable heritage, including cultural objects, dwellings, granaries, altars, sanctuaries and toguna (palaver huts) as well as its rich intangible heritage (ritual festivals, ancestor worship, ceremonies) of the Fulani and Dogon communities have been particularly targeted.
54. In response to this unprecedented conflict situation in this area, UNESCO decided to send a mission to the area to assess the damage occurred to the World Heritage

property, initiate a consultation with the communities concerned in order to identify safeguarding actions that would contribute to the establishment of a climate of trust, including the identification, where appropriate, of elements of the intangible cultural heritage that federate or are common to both communities and traditional conflict management means. Similarly, the mission will be tasked with assessing the needs relating to the built and intangible cultural heritage and the objects and practices associated with the Bandiagara Cliffs, in order to propose an Action Plan for the rehabilitation of the villages concerned, including immediate restoration and recovery actions for the components essential to the return to peaceful life in the various villages. Historically and before the political-military crisis of 2012, these two communities maintained good relations, having found effective mechanisms for peaceful coexistence between Dogon farmers and the traditional transhumant pastoral Fulani.

55. The Arab States Region continues to be severely affected by ongoing violence. In Syria, Libya and Yemen, armed conflicts and political instability have continued to degrade humanitarian conditions and the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, sites inscribed on Tentative Lists, and cultural heritage as a whole. In Iraq, there are major challenges in post-conflict recovery while the unprecedented humanitarian crisis is being addressed.
56. The armed conflict in Yemen continues to cause tragic loss of human lives and an unprecedented humanitarian crisis with around 65% of the population considered as food insecure according to the UN Security Council². While the State Party is commended for its efforts to protect and conserve its cultural and natural heritage, these properties still suffer considerably from natural hazards and ongoing conflict. The situation in the Socotra Archipelago continues to raise great concerns about impacts of reported uncontrolled developments, unsustainable use of natural resources, and the absence of adequate biosecurity measures on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
57. In Libya, the recent escalation of the conflict in some areas of Libya raises concerns about the protection of properties, including potential looting and illicit trafficking. UNESCO continues to pursue its follow-up to the implementation of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions related to cultural heritage protection, humanitarian and security considerations, in particular resolutions 2199, 2253 and 2347.
58. The large-scale damage in urban areas such as in the Ancient City of Aleppo (Syria), Mosul (Iraq) and Sana'a (Yemen) continues to raise the stakes of post-conflict recovery and urban reconstruction in relation to cultural heritage conservation and protection, amidst the urgency of providing shelter and basic services for the inhabitants. To support the growing urban reconstruction needs, several initiatives are reported under the paragraph on Reconstruction below.
59. In the liberated areas of northern Iraq, demining of cultural heritage sites remains a very necessary but hazardous and laborious endeavour prior to undertaking any field initiatives, making large areas inaccessible for further protection and emergency consolidation actions. In addition, challenges prevail in terms of the fragile situation and limited resources.
60. Following the launch of the initiative "Revive the Spirit of Mosul" in February 2018, UNESCO has pursued its actions towards the recovery of Iraq's cultural heritage, notably in Mosul, an update of which is available in section 21 of Document WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.2.
61. The UNESCO *Heritage Emergency Fund* (HEF), established in 2015, has provided support to Member States in protecting natural and cultural heritage from disasters and

² <https://reliefweb.int/report/yemen/security-council-press-statement-yemen-10-june-2019-0>

conflicts by more effectively preparing for and responding to emergency situations. The Fund is supported by the Qatar Fund for Development, the Kingdom of Norway, the Government of Canada, ANA Holdings INC., the Principality of Monaco, the Republic of Estonia, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Principality of Andorra and the Slovak Republic. Since the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee (Krakow, 2017), the Heritage Emergency Fund supported emergency interventions concerning World Heritage properties affected by conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, Mali, Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic.

B. Reconstruction

62. In its Decision **42 COM 7**, the World Heritage Committee welcomed the [Warsaw Recommendation on the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage](#) and requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to disseminate it to States Parties, World Heritage actors and partner organizations. The Committee also requested the World Heritage Centre to continue the reflection on reconstruction and to report on the implementation of the Warsaw Recommendation at its 43rd session. Finally, the Committee encouraged continued cooperation with the World Bank and United Nations agencies to better address the challenges related to the reconstruction of World Heritage.
63. In order to ensure the wide dissemination of the results of the Warsaw Conference, the Polish Government has published the proceedings of the Conference, which will be distributed to the members of the Committee and the States Parties. A 68-page brochure introducing the Warsaw Recommendation was also published in October 2018, and regularly distributed to States Parties by the World Heritage Centre. The Recommendation is available on Wikipedia, and was cited by the Director-General of UNESCO as one of the references that could be used in the reflection for the reconstruction of Notre-Dame Cathedral (France).
64. UNESCO continued its cooperation with the World Bank by publishing the joint policy document entitled "Culture in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of cities". This 60-page document, which was officially launched in Paris in November 2018, aims to help development practitioners, national and local authorities and international organizations integrate culture into all phases of urban reconstruction and rehabilitation processes in urban crisis situations, following conflict or natural disaster. It is based on an in-depth analysis of existing frameworks and lessons learned from case studies around the world - from Medellin to Timbuktu - and presents a culturally based approach to urban reconstruction that takes into account the needs, values and priorities of communities, known as the CURE Framework (Framework for Culture in Urban Reconstruction and Recovery). The policy paper was also the subject of another promotional event in March 2019 at the World Bank in Washington, D.C., and at the Fourth World Conference on Reconstruction in Geneva, Switzerland, in May 2019. It can be downloaded at the following address: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265981>.
65. Finally, ICCROM and ICOMOS launched on 2 May 2019, a call for expressions of interest for the preparation of a case study as part of the joint project "Analysis of Case Studies on Recovery and Reconstruction" and on the basis of an analytical grid prepared by ICOMOS in 2018 for the compilation of case studies. This joint project, which runs for two years until 2020, aims to help the two Advisory Bodies, site managers and decision-makers to analyze the different experiences of recovery and reconstruction in order to better understand the challenges of World Heritage reconstruction, and to improve decisions and processes for reconstruction as well as advice on this subject.

C. Climate Change

66. At its 40th session in 2016, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to “periodically review and update the “Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage properties”, so as to make available the most current knowledge and technology on the subject to guide the decisions and actions of the World Heritage community” (Decision **40 COM 7**).
67. As indicated last year in Document [WHC/18/42.COM/7](#) (paragraph 50), the World Heritage Centre successfully attracted the generous support of the State Party of the Netherlands for this activity.
68. The World Heritage Centre has identified two senior consultants with extensive experience in both natural and cultural heritage, who have started reviewing all relevant background documents and outcomes of recent meetings held on this issue, as well as contacting other international experts in the field of climate change. They are also currently designing a questionnaire for a widespread online consultation to be undertaken shortly, in order to gather inputs from States Parties, Advisory Bodies, NGOs, civil society and other major stakeholders and interested parties.
69. A Technical Advisory Group will be convened for a 2-day meeting at UNESCO Headquarters, proposed for March 2020, to review the draft of the updated Policy Document taking into account inputs received during the online consultation, and to make further proposals. This geographically and gender-balanced group will be comprised of independent international experts as well as representatives of the Advisory Bodies.
70. It is foreseen that the final draft of the updated Policy Document will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020 for adoption. Once the updated Policy Document has been discussed and adopted by the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre will ensure its widespread distribution and communication by various means (e.g. online versions will be available in French and English on the World Heritage Centre’s dedicated Climate Change webpage (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/climatechange>)).
71. In addition to this process, in October 2018, the World Heritage Centre, together with a global private-public consortium of partners, launched a four-year [USD 9 million initiative to build climate adaptation strategies](#); initially, for five marine World Heritage properties, in Australia (2), Belize, France and Palau. The launch of this initiative took place at the 3rd Global Marine World Heritage managers’ conference in Galapagos, Ecuador, in September 2016. This initiative is a follow-up to the outcomes of the [first global assessment of the effects of climate change](#) in World Heritage listed coral reefs, published in 2017 and updated in 2018.
72. ICOMOS formed a 26-member geographically and gender balanced Climate Change and Heritage Working Group (CCHWG) to help respond to the Committee’s requests regarding the Policy Document update and for greater Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) engagement. In consultation with over 100 experts from diverse fields including climate science, the CCHWG prepared an Outline of Climate Change and Cultural Heritage, which maps the core competencies of cultural heritage to the Paris Agreement and catalogues how climate change drivers are impacting cultural heritage including World Heritage properties. The Outline will help organize inputs into the Policy Document update process.
73. IUCN will be undertaking a further update of the IUCN World Heritage Outlook scheduled for delivery in late 2020. As was the case in 2017, Climate Change may be anticipated as a major and pervasive threat across many natural World Heritage properties. IUCN, with its partners, is exploring ways of more comprehensively addressing this fast moving threat such as through the development of climate vulnerability assessments and action

plans and will be pleased to report on this to the World Heritage Committee in due course.

74. The next IUCN World Conservation Congress will be held in Marseille, France, from 11 to 19 June 2020 and will cover seven themes; one of which is on [Accelerating climate change mitigation and adaptation](#). The IUCN Congress will bring together representatives from governments, businesses, indigenous peoples, academia, civil society and other stakeholders to agree on actions for change. The call for proposals closes on 17 July 2019.

III. OTHER CONSERVATION ISSUES

A. Management Plans in the context of urban development

75. The state of conservation reports examined this year revealed the urgent need to connect Management Plans, for properties located in and around cities and towns, within the institutional and regulatory framework of development of their urban setting. It is commendable that at present, many World Heritage properties have prepared Management Plans that set out management systems together with policies and action plans directed at sustaining the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) – or are in the process of preparing them. However, it is becoming increasingly apparent that many properties have difficulties in implementing these Management Plans as they are not sufficiently well integrated into a supportive planning framework and therefore, do not have legal planning status.
76. Today, more than 2,700 component parts of World Heritage properties are either located in urban areas or have urban areas within their boundaries. Needless to add that this number would be considerably higher if the buffer zones were considered as well. Regardless of whether the properties are single monuments or archaeological sites in or around urban areas, historic town centres, or towns within cultural landscape properties, the Management Plans for these properties need to engage with urban development plans and processes. Urban areas are dynamic and driven by the development needs and aspirations of local communities, as well as national strategic objectives and urban development policies. City Development Plans, Local Development Plans, Master Plans and Special Area Plans are some of the different types of planning instruments adopted by cities and towns that give them legal status.
77. The institutional systems and processes for managing and regulating urban development are stronger and more effective in some urban areas than in others. Nevertheless, most systems and processes for urban development operate within some type of legal framework and authority. In contrast, Management Plans of most properties are prepared independently of these institutional systems and processes, and many are therefore independent of the urban development plans and regulations, focusing exclusively on the conservation of heritage values, both attributes of OUV and local values. Thus, the Management Plans, and often the management systems for properties, are not adequately anchored in the legal mechanisms and processes for urban development. In other words, the development control processes neither reflect, respect nor harmonize with the aims and obligations of the Management Plans. The drivers of urban development most often do not take into account the protection of the property's OUV or anticipate the adverse impact of proposed developments on OUV.
78. Thus, however good a Management Plan is in setting out policies and constraints for development, by and large, these will not be respected until, and unless, the obligation to protect OUV is integrated into statutory plans and processes. In recent years, there have been many examples in State of Conservation reports of cases where the

Management Plans have not been respected and approval for development has been secured through parallel planning processes, with eventual adverse impact on OUV.

79. The approach of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape has highlighted the need for urban areas to be well integrated into their wider social, economic and cultural context. This management approach is leading towards integration across a wide range of parameters and it is an approach that is equally valid for properties in and around urban areas regardless of whether they are inscribed for their urban qualities or not. However, in order for these links to be fully effective, they need to be clearly defined in planning terms and integrated into the urban development plans, instruments, and processes.
80. It is becoming clear that Management Plans for heritage in and around urban areas need to be strengthened through integration with other planning instruments. They should be considered as part of a suite of planning documents. For the effective management of World Heritage properties, the Management Plans should be prepared and delivered so that their planning elements can be directly integrated into planning documents such as the Master Plan, Local Development Policies, Building Guidelines, including regional and national Strategic Development Plans and policies – and revised periodically in conjunction with these.
81. There is a need for further discussion on how the objectives and requirements for Management Plans in urban areas should be delivered in order to make them better fit for purpose to address properly the prevailing pressures for urban development in and around properties today. Mechanisms and tools are also necessary to assess and guide interventions in and around properties to support OUV of the property as well as the objectives of sustainable development. Further reflection is necessary on ways that the management activities could engage positively with planning and development processes and instruments, so as to integrate and valorizes OUV as part of new aspirations for the property and its wider setting.

B. Tourism

82. Data from the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) shows that international tourist arrivals worldwide reached 1.4 billion in 2018, representing an increase of 6% compared to 2017. Travel & Tourism, as one of the world's largest economic sectors, supported one in 10 jobs (319 million) worldwide and generated 10.4% (US\$8.8 trillion) of world GDP in 2018. Tourism has the potential to contribute, both directly and indirectly, to all of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) found within the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including SDG 8 on inclusive and sustainable economic growth, SDG 11 on cities and human settlements, SDG 12 on sustainable consumption and production, and SDG 14 on the sustainable use of oceans and marine resources. Tourism also has the potential to generate resources for the conservation of World Heritage properties and to support their local communities and Traditional Owners. However, if poorly planned and/or mismanaged, tourism could have profound negative impacts on World Heritage values, conservation and host communities.
83. According to the state of conservation reports presented to the Committee in 2019, 49 properties are facing challenges associated with planning and managing tourism, including visitor management and development of tourism-related infrastructure.
84. The recently emerged term “overtourism” is where the impact of tourism exceeds physical, ecological, social, economic, psychological, and/or political capacity thresholds. Overtourism may place cultural and natural heritage at risk and directly threaten Outstanding Universal Value, leave communities disenfranchised, and threaten the future attraction and appeal of the destination.

85. The reasons for overtourism are manifold. The tourism industry is large, stratified and complex. Low cost airlines and cruise ships are bringing a higher number of visitors to destinations. Travel trends indicate that these numbers are likely to continue to increase. Coach tourism is also increasing dramatically with more visitors coming for a few hours at a time putting pressure on destinations and communities without providing a substantive economic benefit to local communities. These combined factors lead to a situation where destinations are overwhelmed by large visitor numbers.
86. New tools and strategies are needed to help site managers monitor and manage tourism more sustainably. The UNESCO World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme, adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2012, provides a global platform to promote and disseminate tools, strategies and good practice aimed at providing solutions to key challenges, including overtourism (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/tourism/>). In 2018, IUCN launched the new Best Practice Guidelines on *Tourism and visitor management in protected areas*, addressing best practices for protected areas including World Heritage.
87. A number of capacity building tools have been developed to help sites manage tourism effectively, including the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Toolkit (launched in 2016). The Toolkit has been used in World Heritage sites in South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Tanzania, Malaysia, Philippines, Indonesia, Finland, Netherlands and China, where it has been translated into Chinese. This has resulted in the implementation strategies and action plans for sustainable tourism in several sites.
88. A Visitor Management Assessment Tool is currently under development to enable World Heritage site managers to rapidly and efficiently assess how tourism is being managed according to a set of sustainability indicators and identify strategies to address the priority issues. Currently in the pilot phase, the tool will enable Site Managers to assess tourism management according to a set of social, economic and environmental indicators, linked to the SDGs. An advanced assessment has been completed for the Town of Luang Prabang World Heritage site (Lao People's Democratic Republic) in collaboration with the German Corporation for International Cooperation GmbH (GIZ) and the University of Western Sydney in Australia.
89. Well-informed visitors are more likely to appreciate the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties, stay longer in the destination, recommend the experience to others, and potentially become ambassadors for World Heritage conservation. To encourage people to travel more sustainably and with greater awareness, UNESCO has developed the World Heritage Journeys of Europe project in collaboration with National Geographic, and supported by the European Union. The first ever travel website for World Heritage was launched in September 2018 to inspire people to travel around the participating 34 World Heritage sites in Europe in a sustainable way, as recommended by local heritage and tourism experts. As part of the process, site managers received training and networking opportunities to share experiences and address shared challenges relating to tourism. Based on the success of this initiative, UNESCO is expanding it to include other thematic routes in South Asia with the potential to further expand to other regions.

C. Heritage Impact Assessments / Environmental Impact Assessments (HIAs/EIAs)

90. The ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for Cultural World Heritage properties was introduced in 2011, and the IUCN World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Impact Assessment in 2013. There has been a significant number of HIAs and EIAs requested for World Heritage sites, and the number of requests continues to increase every year for sites already on the List, but also being included in the recommendations adopted for new inscriptions.
91. Taking into account the various experiences and lessons learned in applying the approaches of both ICOMOS and IUCN over the years, a revision is currently taking

place to produce an integrated guidance on impact assessment for World Heritage under the ICCROM-IUCN World Heritage Leadership Programme. Funded by Norway, this Programme is working together with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, IUCN and the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) for this work. The aim is to assist those preparing these IA reports and also reviewing them, towards the ultimate objective of providing a sound basis for optimal decision-making in World Heritage management.

92. The revision of the guidance is based on the analysis of prior examples and evaluations, and also on the needs of the wider range of practitioners collected through multiple capacity building courses conducted in recent years. With the development of the new guidance, diverse capacity building courses and activities for impact assessment will be designed in conjunction, to raise awareness and promote wider dissemination of the guidance.

IV. DRAFT DECISIONS

Statutory matters related to Reactive Monitoring

Draft Decision: 43 COM 7.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC/19/43.COM/7,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **40 COM 7**, **41 COM 7**, and **42 COM 7**, adopted at its 40th (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016), 41st (Krakow, 2017) and 42nd (Manama, 2018) sessions respectively,*
3. *Thanks the State Party of Azerbaijan, Host Country of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Baku, 2019), for having organized the third World Heritage Site Managers' Forum, as a capacity-building exercise aiming at increasing the understanding of the World Heritage decision-making process among site managers, in order to achieve a more effective protection of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), takes note with appreciation of the 2019 World Heritage Site Managers' Forum Statement and encourages the future Host Countries to continue this initiative in conjunction with the World Heritage Committee session;*

Evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process

4. *Taking note with appreciation of the evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process launched by the World Heritage Centre, thanks the State Party of Switzerland for its financial support, as well as the experts tasked with this evaluation for their thorough analysis of this process, instrumental in achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Convention;*
5. *Expresses its gratitude to all the stakeholders of the Convention who have actively contributed to this evaluation;*
6. *Notes that the recommendations formulated in the evaluation refer to improvements of the current practices and do not call for structural changes nor amendments to the statutory documents, and requests all stakeholders of the Convention to take them on-board and implement them at their level as soon as possible;*

7. Also requests the World Heritage Centre to present a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020;

Issues related to the List of World Heritage in Danger

8. Reaffirming the need to promote a better understanding of the implications and benefits of properties being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger,
9. Thanks the State Party of Romania for its initiative to host a multi-stakeholders international workshop focusing on the List of World Heritage in Danger, including exchange of good practice, promotion of the properties inscribed on this List and the conservation needs to improve their state of conservation, such as Costed Action Plans;
10. Requests the World Heritage Centre to present a report on this workshop and other initiatives related to the List of World Heritage in Danger at the 44th session in 2020;

Selection of the World Heritage properties to be proposed for discussion

11. Reaffirming the importance of focusing the debates on those properties and global conservation issues of greatest concern during the World Heritage Committee sessions, and taking into account the results of the evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process,
12. Supports the outcomes of the reflection conducted by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regarding the elaboration of the list of state of conservation reports to be proposed for discussion by the Committee, as well as the current practice allowing Committee members to add to this list the reports they wish to discuss, by providing a written request to the Chairperson of the Committee, through the World Heritage Centre, sufficiently in advance of the session, and indicating the reason why the reports are requested to be opened for discussion;
13. Recognizes that the selection of the state of conservation reports to be discussed by the Committee during its sessions should be based on clear and objective criteria, including the level of threat to the property, rather than being based on representativity.

Pressing conservation issues

Draft Decision: 43 COM 7.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/19/43.COM/7, WHC/19/43.COM/7A, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.2, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3, WHC/19/43.COM/7B, WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add, WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add.2 and WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3,
2. Recalling Decisions **40 COM 7**, **41 COM 7**, and **42 COM 7**, adopted at its 40th (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016), 41st (Krakow, 2017) and 42nd (Manama, 2018) sessions respectively,

Emergency situations resulting from conflicts

3. *Deplores the loss of human life as well as the degradation of humanitarian conditions resulting from the prevailing conflict situations in several countries, and expresses its utmost concern at the devastating damage sustained and the continuing threats facing cultural and natural heritage in general;*
4. *Expresses its deep concern at the inter-community conflicts observed in Mali between the Dogon and Fulani communities, which have caused considerable loss of human life and significant damage to the cultural heritage, particularly within the World Heritage property of the Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons);*
5. *Thanks the State Party of Mali for the urgent actions that have been put in place to ensure the safety of communities in and around the property, and encourages the State Party, to also take into account in its actions the protection of the property's rich cultural heritage, and welcomes the dispatch of a UNESCO mission to assess the damage caused to the property, and identify the needs related to the built and intangible cultural heritage and the objects and practices associated with the Cliffs of Bandiagara, in order to propose an Action Plan for the rehabilitation of the villages concerned;*
6. *Urges again all parties associated with conflicts to refrain from any action that would cause further damage to cultural and natural heritage and to fulfill their obligations under international law by taking all possible measures to protect such heritage, in particular the safeguarding of World Heritage properties and the sites included in the Tentative List;*
7. *Also urges again the States Parties to adopt measures against using World Heritage properties for military purposes and to stop related uncontrolled development and impact;*
8. *Reiterates its utmost concern about the continuing threats of wildlife poaching and illegal trafficking of wildlife products linked to impacts of conflict and organized crime, which is eroding the biodiversity and Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of many World Heritage sites across the world, and urges States Parties to take the necessary measures to curb this problem, including through the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES);*
9. *Calls upon the international community to further support the safeguarding of the cultural and natural heritage of countries affected by conflict, through earmarked funds or through contributions to the UNESCO Heritage Emergency Fund;*
10. *Appeals to all Member States of UNESCO to cooperate in the fight against the illicit trafficking of cultural objects, as well as cultural heritage protection in general, including through the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 2199 (2015), 2253 (2015) and 2347 (2017);*

Reconstruction

11. *Thanks the State Party of Poland for the efforts to widely disseminate the Warsaw Recommendation on the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of World Heritage, as well as the proceedings of the international conference "The Challenges of World Heritage Rehabilitation" of May 2018;*
12. *Welcomes the policy document "Culture in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of cities", published by UNESCO and the World Bank, which contributes to the reflection launched on the challenges related to the reconstruction of World Heritage properties;*

13. Requests the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM to continue the reflection on the reconstruction of World Heritage properties and to report to it on progress made in improving advice in this regard;

Climate Change

14. Notes with appreciation the initiatives taken by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to advance work on updating the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage properties, including through a planned widespread online consultation with States Parties, Advisory Bodies and civil society;
15. Requests that the development of the updated Policy Document be completed for consideration by the Committee at its 44th session in 2020;
16. Welcomes the initiative taken by the World Heritage Centre together with a global private-public consortium of partners, to build climate adaptation strategies across five marine World Heritage sites in Australia, Belize, France and Palau;
17. Urges all States Parties to step up action toward better understanding the climate vulnerability of World Heritage properties and put in place adaptation strategies that strengthen the resilience of properties and ensure the conservation of their Outstanding Universal Value.

Other matters

Draft Decision: 43 COM 7.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/19/43.COM/7, WHC/19/43.COM/7A, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.2, WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3, WHC/19/43.COM/7B, WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add, WHC/19/43.COM/7B.Add.2 and WHC/19/43.COM/7A.Add.3,
2. Recalling Decision **42 COM 7**, adopted at its 42nd (Manama, 2018),

Management Plans in the context of urban development

3. Noting that the many Management Plans and management systems for urban properties are not adequately anchored in the legal mechanisms, systems, and processes for urban development,
4. Also noting that the pressures of high investment urban development projects in and around properties are increasingly a threat to their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and that in contrast, the OUV could provide a valuable opportunity for the property and its wider setting to define a new urban vision that integrates and valorizes the OUV with new needs and aspirations,
5. Recalling that the approach of the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape has highlighted the need for urban areas to be well integrated into their wider social, economic and cultural context, calls on all States Parties to prepare and deliver Management Plans, for properties in and around urban areas, so that their

planning elements can be integrated directly into the planning and development policies, plans, processes and instruments; regardless of whether the property is inscribed for its urban values or not;

6. *Requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to continue reflecting on the mechanisms and tools needed to assess and guide interventions in and around urban properties to sustain the OUV of the properties and to promote sustainable development and actively engage with the wider development processes that could over time impact the appearance, use, and meaning of buildings and spaces in properties and their settings.*

Tourism

7. *Acknowledging the contribution of sustainable tourism to the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and the positive impact it can have on local communities and the protection of World Heritage properties, nevertheless notes with concern that the number of properties negatively affected by overcrowding, congestion and tourism infrastructure development continues to increase;*
8. *Noting that the protection of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) must be a central objective for all World Heritage properties, requests States Parties to develop visitor management plans and strategies that address seasonality of tourism (smoothing visitor numbers over time and spreading visitors across sites), encourage longer more in-depth experiences promoting tourism products and services that reflect natural and cultural values, and limit access and activities to improve visitor flows and experiences, while reducing pressures on the attributes which underpin OUV ;*
9. *Encourages the States Parties to support UNESCO in its efforts to assist heritage and tourism managers with system development and data collection to help destinations understand their specific situations and early warning signs, provide incentives for sustainable tourism development and raise awareness to change visitor behaviour;*

Heritage Impact Assessments / Environmental Impact Assessments (HIAs/EIAs)

10. *Notes the progress of revising the guidance on impact assessment for World Heritage undertaken by the ICCROM-IUCN World Heritage Leadership Programme together with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.*