



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

36 COM

WHC-12/36.COM/7C

Paris, 15 June 2012

Original: English / French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-sixth session

**Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation
24 June – 6 July 2012**

**Item 7C of the Provisional Agenda: Reflection on the trends of the state of
conservation**

SUMMARY

At its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), the World Heritage Committee examined the outcomes of the expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges for World Heritage properties (Dakar, Senegal, 13-15 April 2011) (see Decisions **35 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E**). At this occasion, the Committee reiterated the need for a more systematic monitoring of threats affecting World Heritage properties.

The present document draws the attention of the Committee on a number of recurrent issues related to the state of conservation of properties.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7C, See Point VII.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SIGNIFICANT GLOBAL AND REGIONAL FACTORS NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE	1
III. RECURRENT CONSERVATION ISSUES	4
A. EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES.....	4
B. WINDFARMS.....	4
IV. DISASTER RISK REDUCTION	4
V. FOLLOW-UP TO DECISIONS 35 COM 7C AND 35 COM 12E	5
A. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS / HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS.....	5
B. GREEN BERETS FOR WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES	6
C. INCREASED DIALOGUE WITH STATES PARTIES ABOUT WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES FACING CHALLENGES.....	6
D. DESIRED STATE OF CONSERVATION FOR THE REMOVAL OF PROPERTIES FROM THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER.....	7
E. MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES.....	7
VI. OTHER CONSERVATION ISSUES NOT REPORTED ON AT THE 36TH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE (SAINT PETERSBURG, 2012) UNDER ITEMS 7A AND 7B	8
A. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AREAS OF POMPEI, HERCULANEUM AND TORRE ANNUNZIATA (ITALY) (C 829).....	8
B. FERRARA, CITY OF THE RENAISSANCE, AND ITS PO DELTA (ITALY) (C 733) AND MANTUA AND SABBIONETA (ITALY) (C 1287)	9
C. GIANT'S CAUSEWAY AND CAUSEWAY COAST (UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND) (C 369)	9
VII. DRAFT DECISION	10

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), the World Heritage Committee examined the outcomes of the expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges for World Heritage properties (Dakar, Senegal, 13-15 April 2011) (see Decisions **35 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E**) (see respectively Annexes 1 and 2). On this occasion, the Committee reiterated the need for a more systematic monitoring of threats affecting World Heritage properties.
2. After a statistical analysis of the state of conservation reports presented at the 36th session (see Chapter II below), the present document highlights a number of recurrent issues related to the state of conservation of properties (see Chapters III and IV) and takes stock of the progress achieved in the implementation of the related Decisions **35 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E** (see Chapter V).
3. Furthermore, in Chapter VI, this document draws the attention of the Committee on a number of conservation issues which have arisen in 2012, but too late to be incorporated into the reactive monitoring process (Agenda items 7A and 7B on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties).

II. SIGNIFICANT GLOBAL AND REGIONAL FACTORS NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

4. This Chapter provides an analytical summary based on a statistical analysis of the state of conservation reports which will be examined by the Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012).
5. As a preliminary comment, it should be noted that the current analysis is only based on the 2012 state of conservation reports and does not show “trends” as such, which could only be demonstrated over several years. It rather gives an overview of the threats and issues identified in the reports prepared for the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session. One also has to take into account the process of selection of these reports in accordance with reactive monitoring processes outlined in Chapter IV.A of the *Operational Guidelines*. Furthermore, it should be noted that the selection of these reports by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies is only the “tip of the iceberg”, as reports are prepared under the Agenda item 7B only in cases where actions are to be taken at the Committee level. Therefore, only a study over a 5 to 10 year period would bring the trends of World Heritage conservation into evidence.
6. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies report annually to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of a number of World Heritage properties facing various threats. At its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012), the World Heritage Committee will review **141 reports** (concerning **144 properties**¹, including the **35** properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger). All the state of conservation reports (“SOC”) can be consulted on-line in Documents WHC-12/36.COM/7A, WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add, WHC-12/36.COM/7B and WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add, available on the World Heritage Centre website (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM>).

¹ Note that the report 7B.106 provides information on the 4 World Heritage properties of Mali; hence the number of properties is higher than the number of reports presented to the Committee.

7. The analysis of threats in the present document is based on the reports of those 141 properties (51 natural, 5 mixed and 85 cultural), which are geographically distributed as follows:

<u>Regions</u>		
Africa	36 properties	(25%)
Arab States	16 properties	(11%)
Asia-Pacific	26 properties	(18%)
Europe and North America	41 properties	(29%)
Latin America and the Caribbean	25 properties	(17%)

Table 1: Distribution of the World Heritage properties reported to the World Heritage Committee per region

8. The percentage of properties being reported on in 2012 for each region is more or less matching the percentage of properties of each region inscribed on the World Heritage List with a much higher rate of reporting however for the African region, and lesser for the Europe and North American region.

	Africa	Arab States	Asia-Pacific	Europe and North America	Latin America and the Caribbean
Percentage of the World Heritage List					
2012	8.8	7.5	21.9	48.3	13.6
Percentage of the List of World Heritage in Danger					
2012	40	14.3	17.1	11.4	17.1
Percentage of the state of conservation reports examined by the World heritage Committee					
2012	23.4	11.3	18.5	29.1	17.7

**Table 2: % of the total number of World Heritage properties per region
% of the total number of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger per region
% of the total number of SOC reports presented per region**

9. As in the previous years, even though almost 50% of the World Heritage properties are located in Europe and North America, they contribute to 11% of the List of World Heritage in Danger. To the contrary, even though the African region counts for only 9% of the total number of World Heritage properties, the African properties represent 40% (14 properties) of the List of World Heritage in Danger. We notice the same trend for the Arab States region. The figures are rather balanced for the Asia-Pacific region and the Latin America and the Caribbean region.
10. The current format of the state of conservation reports presented to the World Heritage Committee includes a section where the factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property identified either at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List or in previous reports are listed. These factors have been reviewed and analyzed according to the standardized list of factors affecting the World Heritage properties used in Section II of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire in order to have a consistent approach on all the properties examined throughout the different regions of the world and the categories of heritage (such as natural, mixed, cultural). This will also make the analysis of the trends over the years more relevant.

11. Finally, it should also be noted that in the majority of cases, more than one factor affects the Outstanding Universal Value of a property. In the 141 properties considered in this study, 475 different occurrences of the 82 identified factors have been noticed. This represents an average of 3.4 factors per property (with an average of almost 5 factors per property for those inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and 2.85 for all the other).

Factors affecting the OUV	% of properties affected
Management and institutional factors	70,8
Buildings and development	43,1
Other human activities	37,5
Social/ cultural uses of heritage	27,8
Transportation infrastructure	23,6
Biological resource use/ modification	23,6
Physical resource extraction	18,8
Utilities or service infrastructure	13,2
Sudden ecological or geological events	11,8
Pollution	9,7
Climate and severe weather events	9,7
Local conditions affecting physical fabric	9,0
Invasive/ alien species or hyper-abundant species	8,3

Table 3: Percentage of properties affected by each factor (in 2012)

12. Globally, one can notice that the main groups of threats affecting the properties are due to Management issues, Development projects, Illegal activities (such as poaching and illegal logging), Social and cultural uses of heritage (mainly, impact of tourism activities), Transportation infrastructures (mainly construction of roads), Biological resource use or modification (such as encroachment, cattle grazing), Physical resource extraction (mostly due to mining-related activities). A significant proportion of the properties is also affected by Utilities infrastructures, mostly development of dams.
13. This situation is fully coherent with the outcomes of the 2005-2009 statistical analysis conducted in 2010 (see Document WHC-10/34.COM/7C).
14. More statistical data will be uploaded shortly on the following webpage: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/691> .

III. RECURRENT CONSERVATION ISSUES

A. Extractive industries

15. In recognition of the increasing concerns related to extractive industries and World Heritage properties, an independent review was launched in 2011, with the participation of the extractive industries, banks, government representatives, IUCN and the Secretariat. The survey analyses case studies in which emerging challenges relating to extractive industries were studied. The survey is expected to lead to a series of recommendations providing valuable contributions to the request by the Committee to develop policy guidelines as a means to capture a range of policies for the eventual adoption by the Committee and the General Assembly (**35 COM 12B** para 11).
16. Within the framework of the Periodic reporting in the Africa region, an Expert meeting on managing the impacts of development activities and resource extraction in and around World Heritage properties in the Africa region was organized in South Africa from 23-25 May 2012. The meeting brought together African World Heritage specialists, the Advisory Bodies and Mining industry specialists. The meeting was conceived as a first step to create dialogue between World Heritage and development professionals, as an on-going process, and in specific terms, heritage and mining. A series of recommendations were made with regards to the promotion of best practices, the responsibilities of African States Parties, and the role of the World Heritage Committee.

B. Windfarms

17. On this issue, ICOMOS considers that windfarms need to be on exposed sites to catch the wind and thus always make a strong visual statement. Their impact can be highly detrimental in visual terms to the setting of World Heritage properties, particularly in flat open landscapes where they can disturb long views. There is an urgent need to understand when and where turbines can be erected in relation to World Heritage properties in order that turbines that generate green energy are not seen to be always in conflict with heritage assets. Heritage Impact Assessment are a way of defining the potential visual impact of turbines, but if these are to be carried out to provide reliable and robust conclusions, they need to be based first of all on a clear articulation of the attributes of OUV, and secondly on sound indisputable topographical data upon which the turbines can be modelled and this data needs to be readily available both to developers and to those who will be considering planning permissions. There is also a need for proactive three dimensional modelling of the settings of World Heritage sites in order to define where turbines need to be excluded as well as where they might be accommodated within certain height limitations.

IV. DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

18. With regard to the issue of disasters, World Heritage properties that were affected over the past year include the “Historic City of Ayutthaya” (Thailand), due to major floods; the “Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)” (Italy), as a result of land-slides (also see Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B); the “Pitons, cirques and remparts” of Reunion Island (France), owing to fires; and the “Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordillera” (Philippines), which were struck by two consecutive typhoons (also see Document WHC-12/36.COM/7A). It is difficult at this stage to draw general conclusions from these events, given the specificity of the situations. What can be said is that lack of general maintenance has been observed in each case as an underlying factor which aggravated the consequences of the disaster.

19. Another issue that has drawn attention during the last twelve months is the political unrest in the Arab region. Although detailed information is not yet available, the regime changes and related uncertain transitions associated to the so-called “Arab Spring” have been cause for concern for World Heritage properties, and heritage in general. As the security improves, as in the case of Libya and Egypt, the World Heritage Centre will work with national authorities and partner institutions to gather information on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties of the concerned countries with a view to identifying needs and priorities.
20. On another front, the World Heritage Centre has worked to mainstream a concern for heritage within global disaster-risk-management policies and processes. In close cooperation with the World Bank, UNDP and the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), for example, a chapter on Culture, which includes consideration for heritage, has been developed for the first time in the guidance for the so-called “Post-Disaster-Needs-Assessment” (PDNA), the main international mechanism through which needs assessments are carried out, and recommendations for actions and funding are formulated, after major disasters. In the framework of the “One-UN” policy, moreover, individual pilot initiatives are underway in various countries such as Albania, Vietnam and Thailand, which aim to implement the Strategy for Disaster Risks adopted by the Committee in 2007 by integrating heritage within national disaster risk management programmes.

V. FOLLOW-UP TO DECISIONS 35 COM 7C AND 35 COM 12E

A. Environmental Impact Assessments / Heritage Impact Assessments of potential developments

21. IUCN notes that the Committee in Decision **35 COM.12E** requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to “develop guidance to clarify the need for Environmental Impact Assessments/Heritage Impact Assessments of potential developments’ impact on Outstanding Universal Value, the range of proposed activities with a likely impact on Outstanding Universal Value to be reported on and the documentation required by the World Heritage Centre (under Paragraph 172).” IUCN intends to develop an advice note on this issue prior to the 37th session and considers that all proposals for activities which may affect a natural or mixed World Heritage property, including proposals located outside its boundaries, should be subject to an appropriate and rigorous appraisal process, such as an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), prior to considering whether to grant consents and licenses. These appraisal processes should respect the highest international best-practice standards, including, but not limited to:
 - a) Specifically assessing the likely effects of the proposal(s) on the site’s Outstanding Universal Value, including direct, indirect and cumulative effects;
 - b) Identifying and evaluating alternatives, to determine least damaging options;
 - c) Being publicly disclosed and subject to thorough public consultation; and
 - d) Proposing an environmental management plan detailing operating, monitoring and restoration conditions.
22. Such assessments should include a dedicated section or chapter presenting the assessment’s conclusion on the proposal(s) potential impacts on Outstanding Universal Value. For multiple or large-scale proposals, a Strategic Environmental and Social Impact Assessment should be undertaken in order to assess their potential cumulative impacts, as these types of proposals cannot be adequately assessed through individual ESIA’s.

23. ICOMOS notes that Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) for World Heritage properties that consider the potential impact of proposed developments on Outstanding Universal Value are becoming useful tools that set out the evidence upon which decisions can be made. Now that all properties either have, or will soon have, an approved Statement of OUV that allows a clear understanding of the attributes that convey their OUV, the baselines for such impact assessments are in place. The ICOMOS Guidelines for HIA set out a suggested methodology for carrying out such assessments. Details can be found at: <http://openarchive.icomos.org/266/>
24. World Heritage HIAs need to be seen as a discrete part of a wider Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for which regulations exist in most countries. The World Heritage HIAs will consider the very specific impact of any project on the attribute of OUV and should be seen as a key component of a wider EIA that considers impact on other cultural, environmental, social and economic parameters.

B. Green berets for World Heritage properties

25. The World Heritage Centre, through the UNESCO Office in New-York, liaised with the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), Policy Evaluation and Training Division - Peacekeeping Best Practices Section, regarding the possible "*recognition for the protectors of World Heritage properties in conflict and post conflict zones, including through the use of blue/green berets or other appropriate insignia*" (Decision **35 COM 12E** para 11).
26. The representative of DPKO explained the complexity of peace keeping mandates, being in the primary instance to end the conflicts and in the secondary instance to prevent a relapse back into conflict:
 - a) In a peace-keeping mission or mandate in conflict situations, the protection of World Heritage, and recognition of its protectors, would not specifically be raised, unless the property was directly related to the conflict (i.e. as a cause of the conflict or as a reason for relapse into conflict).
 - b) In a peace-building mission or mandate in post conflict situations, the fragility of the State is the immediate focus, as well as longer term efforts to normalize the situation and avoid a relapse into conflict (e.g. enabling a viable economy could be prioritized, and involve World Heritage protection or protectors as it relates to local employment generation).
27. UN Country Teams are important players in this scenario, and it would be important for UNESCO and the local government to make the case that the peace-building mandate include World Heritage (e.g. as a driver for employment, tourism, national identity and unity). Within the UN Country Team, the link could be drawn up and evidence shown that protecting World Heritage in conflict and post-conflict situations is important to peace building and recovery.
28. It is however very unlikely that UN blue helmets/berets would be able to take on new "unfunded" responsibilities involving World Heritage properties, unless the latter is a cause of the conflict itself, or possible relapse into conflict, as explained above.

C. Increased dialogue with States Parties about World Heritage properties facing challenges

29. Throughout the year, the World Heritage Centre receives letters from States Parties concerning major restorations or new constructions, which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of a property (in application of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

30. Letters received from a State Party, accompanied by all relevant information are always transmitted to the respective Advisory Body/ies for comments and evaluation. The World Heritage Centre acknowledges receipt to the State Party and informs it about the transmission to the Advisory Body/ies, indicating a tentative deadline for feedback.
31. Whenever the letters received from a State Party are not accompanied by relevant information or information just partial, the World Heritage Centre requests the State Party to provide all the necessary elements needed for the evaluation by the respective Advisory Body/ies. In the mean time, the letter received is transmitted to the Advisory Body/ies for information, while expecting to receive the requested information from the State Party. Once received, the latter is duly transmitted to the Advisory Body/ies for comments and evaluation.
32. Finally, the World Heritage Centre also receives letters from third parties providing information about a situation at a World Heritage property. If, according to an assessment by the World Heritage Centre, this situation may affect the OUV of the property, the concerned State Party is informed and requested to provide all the relevant information needed for evaluation by the respective Advisory Body/ies, in conformity with Paragraph 174 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In the mean time, the letter received is transmitted to the Advisory Body/ies for information, while expecting to receive the requested information from the State Party. Once received, the latter is duly transmitted to the Advisory Body/ies for comments and evaluation. In any case, the World Heritage Centre acknowledges receipt to the third party, informs it that the concern was transmitted to the State Party and requests the third party to send additional information, wherever appropriate.

D. Desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger

33. At its 35th session, the World Heritage Committee amended Paragraph 183 of the *Operational Guidelines* to formally adopt, when considering the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, a Desired state of conservation for the removal of this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **35 COM 7C**). It also requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to prepare “clear modalities and guidance for the drafting and adoption of the Desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger”, for examination at its 36th session. Furthermore, at its 18th session (UNESCO, 2011), the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention* endorsed the recommendations made by the UNESCO External Auditor on the Global Strategy, including to “strengthen the monitoring of properties; define monitoring indicators for the state of conservation” and to “fully use the mechanism of In-Danger listing, in conformity with the provisions of the *Guidelines* (both for inscription and removal)” (Resolution **18 GA 8**).
34. This issue has been discussed at several occasions between the different parties concerned. A first draft of such guidance has been prepared by IUCN for natural properties. However, such guidance has to be applicable to all categories of World Heritage properties; it therefore still has to encompass the requirements for cultural and mixed properties. In this regard, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are still working on this important document, which is on the Agenda of the next World Heritage Centre / Advisory Bodies meeting (Paris, September 2012) and will be submitted to the Committee’s examination at its 37th session in 2013.

E. Monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties

35. In the 40 years of existence of the *Convention*, several thousands of reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties have been prepared by the

UNESCO Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for examination by the World Heritage Committee. These reports represent an exceptional and extensive documentation on various conservation issues. It is one of the most comprehensive monitoring systems of any international conventions, through a global network of nearly 1,000 sites. However, these data remain difficult to exploit in their current recording system.

36. At its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), the World Heritage Committee, considering the need for more systematic monitoring of threats, called upon the States Parties to the *Convention* to support the establishment of a comprehensive “state of conservation information system” with the target to make this system operational, on the World Heritage Centre’s website, by its 37th session in 2013 (Decision **35 COM 7C** – para. 5).
37. In response, a project aiming at developing such information system, in both French and English, for all stakeholders of the *Convention* (World Heritage Centre staff members, Advisory Bodies, States Parties to the *Convention*, national focal points for World Heritage, site managers, researchers, students, members of the public, etc.) was developed and presented to various potential donors. The Flanders Government has kindly accepted to fully finance this project. More information on this project is available at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/691>
38. At term, the database will be accompanied by a multi-search form (per year, per property, per State Party, per Region, per type of threat, etc) in order to extract the exact set of data required by the users. It will also allow users to conduct comprehensive analyses of the threats affecting the properties and their evolution over time. These analyses will help identifying generic threats, underlying key issues and potential trends over time. In addition to its purpose in terms of monitoring the state of conservation of properties, this information system will greatly contribute to the institutional memory of the *World Heritage Convention* and will facilitate well-informed and consistent decision-making.
39. Within the framework of the cooperation between the various Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), a joint web-page of environmental treaties (Informea) has recently been updated, making possible to now directly search for specific threats to World Heritage properties (for example for “invasive species”), including all decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee (see page <http://informea.org/treaties>).

VI. OTHER CONSERVATION ISSUES NOT REPORTED ON AT THE 36TH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE (SAINT PETERSBURG, 2012) UNDER ITEMS 7A AND 7B

40. A number of conservation issues affecting World Heritage properties have arisen in 2012, but too late to be incorporated into the reactive monitoring process (Agenda items 7A and 7B on the state of conservation of World heritage properties). A summary of those cases is presented below for the Committee’s consideration.

A. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829)

41. On 22 April 2012, the World Heritage Centre was informed that a red-frescoed wall had collapsed in the World Heritage property Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata. This most recent collapse is the fourth in a series of structural collapses at the property. Following heavy rainfall, there were two collapses in November 2010 that substantially affected the House of Gladiators and the House of the Moralist, and in December 2011, a courtyard column of the House of Loreius Tiburtinus – also known as the House of Octavius Quartio – collapsed.

42. Despite funds from different sources, including 105 million euros from the European Union, which have been provided for the conservation of the property, the recent series of collapses shows that previous efforts have not been sufficient to prevent the continued deterioration of the property and that a more effective approach to the problem needs to be found urgently.

B. Ferrara, City of the Renaissance, and its Po Delta (Italy) (C 733) and Mantua and Sabbioneta (Italy) (C 1287)

43. On 20 May 2012, a powerful earthquake hit the region of Emilia Romagna, in the north of Italy, followed by numerous aftershocks, notably on 29 May and 3 June. This caused several casualties and considerable damage to several important historic buildings, some of which unfortunately collapsed.
44. On 7 and 8 June 2012, in close consultation with the Italian authorities, UNESCO dispatched an urgent technical mission aimed to assess the damage at the three World Heritage Properties located in the affected region, i.e. Mantua and Sabbioneta; the Cathedral, Torre Civica and Piazza Grande, Modena; and Ferrara, City of the Renaissance, and its Po Delta.
45. The situation at the three properties is serious and characterized by widespread damage, although not catastrophic. In most of the buildings observed, the earthquake caused the opening of cracks, often along previous ones that had been repaired in the past, and the fall of small architectural parts on the top of the tallest buildings as well as of parts of plaster and stucco decorations. In the most worrying cases, whole structural elements seemed to have moved with possible risks for their overall stability. The complex water management system of the Po Delta, near Ferrara, has been also partially disrupted. No damage was reported, on the other hand, to the two sites included in the tentative List of Italy within the region affected by the earthquake, i.e. the "Porticoes of Bologna", in Bologna, and the "Scrovegni Chapel", in Padua.
46. In terms of the response by the competent authorities, they are at present doing their utmost, working around the clock in difficult conditions, to assess the damage and carry out emergency interventions. The interventions included localized propping, reinforcement rings of towers and the removal and storage in safe premises of items at risk from buildings, such as paintings or statues. The sheer number of the buildings and sites to control, however, is posing a real challenge, especially considering the risk of new seismic events. In the longer term, it will be essential to introduce new approaches to the conservation and management of the three affected properties so as to strengthen their resilience to hazards such as the recent earthquake, which had apparently not been anticipated.

C. Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 369)

47. On 22 Feb 2012, a planning application for the development of a golf resort including an 18-hole championship golf course, clubhouse, golf academy and driving range, 120 bedroom hotel and 75 guest suites at the World Heritage property Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast in Northern Ireland was granted. On the same day, the State Party of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland submitted a state of conservation report following the World Heritage Centre's request of 20 December 2011 for information on this development proposal. According to the report, the proposed development lies within the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, a designated Distinctive Landscape Setting for which protective policies have been proposed in the draft Northern Area Plan.

48. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend to the World Heritage Committee to request the State Party to halt the development project until the potential impact of the proposed development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property has been assessed, and until it has been confirmed that no impact on Outstanding Universal Value will occur.

VII. DRAFT DECISION

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7C

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7C,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **35 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*

Significant factors negatively impacting the Outstanding Universal Value

3. *Takes note of the statistical analysis and encourages the World Heritage Centre to continue with the production of such informative data, including regional analyses ;*

Recurrent conservation issues

4. *Also takes note of the independent review on extractive industries and World Heritage properties and welcomes this contribution to the Policy Guidelines development process;*

Disaster risk reduction

5. *Reiterates its request to States Parties to ensure that disaster risks, including from human-induced hazards such as conflicts and political unrest, are given appropriate consideration in the management plans and systems for the World Heritage properties located in their territories;*
6. *Requests the World Heritage Centre, with the support of the Advisory Bodies, to continue working with global and regional institutions involved in disaster risk management, with an aim to mainstream a concern for heritage within their policies and programmes as well as in UN-led processes such as the Post-Disaster-Needs-Assessment (PDNA);*

Follow-up to decisions 35 COM 7C and 35 COM 12E

7. *Further takes note of the information provided regarding the recognition for the protectors of World Heritage properties in conflict and post conflict zones, including through the use of blue/green berets or other appropriate insignia;*
8. *Takes note furthermore of the correspondence process in place to increase dialogue between the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regarding conservation issues at World Heritage properties;*

9. Thanks the Flanders Government for its support to the establishment of a “state of conservation information system” hosted on the World Heritage Centre’s website and also requests the World Heritage Centre to present a progress report on the database and its access online, during the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013;

Other conservation issues not reported on at the 36th session under Items 7A and 7B

10. Expresses its concern with regard to the state of conservation of World Heritage property of “Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata” and urges the State Party of Italy to intensify its efforts towards implementing the Committee’s decision taken at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011);
11. Extends its sympathy to the victims of the earthquake in northern Italy; also encourages the State Party of Italy to continue its important efforts for the assessment of the damage occurred and for the planning and implementation of the necessary remedial measures, including with a view to strengthening the overall resilience of the three properties in the future against all possible hazards; and further requests the State Party of Italy to provide to the World Heritage Centre updated information on the situation and to coordinate with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies possible initiatives for the recovery and restoration of the three affected properties;
12. Requests furthermore the State Party of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to halt the proposed development of a golf resort at the World Heritage property “Giant’s Causeway and Causeway Coast” until its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property has been assessed.

Decision 35 COM 7C adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011)

7C. Reflection on the trends of the state of conservation

Decision: 35 COM 7C

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC-11/35.COM/7C, WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C and WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7C**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Thanks the States Parties of Senegal and Australia for the organization of the Expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges for World Heritage properties (Dakar, Senegal, 13-15 April 2011);
4. Endorses the recommendations of the Expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges for World Heritage properties presented in Document WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C and invites States Parties to the *Convention*, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to develop plans to implement them, and identify the required resources;
5. Considering the need for more systematic monitoring of threats, calls upon the States Parties to the *Convention* to support the establishment of a comprehensive "state of conservation information system" to support analytical studies and assist all stakeholders in site-management, with the target to make this system available, on the World Heritage Centre's website, before the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013;
6. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to prepare clear modalities and guidance for the drafting and adoption of the Desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;
7. Decides to amend paragraph 183 of the *Operational Guidelines* to read: "When considering the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee shall develop, and adopt, as far as possible, in consultation with the State Party concerned, a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and a programme for corrective measures";
8. Also requests the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to prepare a progress report on the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

Decision 35 COM 12E adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011)

12E. Global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties

Decision: 35 COM 12E

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 10** adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), Decision **33 COM 14A.2** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), **34 COM 12** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) and Resolution **17 GA 9** adopted at the 17th General Assembly of States Parties (UNESCO Headquarters, 2009),
3. Expresses its appreciation to the States Parties of Australia and Senegal and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre for organising the expert meeting on global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties (Dakar, Senegal, 13-15 April 2011);
4. Notes the report provided by the participants at the above-mentioned expert meeting;
5. Invites contributions of relevant expertise and financial resources to assist States Parties implement decisions on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties;
6. Reiterates that nominations of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List must demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value in line with the criteria for inscription and comply with integrity/authenticity, protection and management requirements, as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*;
7. Requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to develop guidance, for consideration at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, to clarify:
 - a) The uses, limits and documentation requirements for traditional management (paragraphs 108 and following),
 - b) The need for Environmental Impact Assessments/Heritage Impact Assessments of potential developments' impact on Outstanding Universal Value, the range of proposed activities with a likely impact on Outstanding Universal Value to be reported on and the documentation required by the World Heritage Centre (Paragraph 172), and
 - c) Buffer zones or other protection mechanisms, noting the recommendations contained in document WHC-08/32.COM/7.1;
8. Requests that aspects concerning partnerships should be dealt with after the report of the external auditor on PACT at the 18th General Assembly of States Parties;
9. Requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to develop options to strengthen and improve the state of conservation reporting process, in particular to increase dialogue with States Parties about World Heritage properties facing challenges;
10. Also requests the World Heritage Centre to formally notify States Parties of the state of conservation reports on World Heritage properties on their territory which will be the subject of examination by the Committee at the session indicated;
11. Also requests the World Heritage Centre to report at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee on possible ways to encourage United Nations recognition for the protectors of World Heritage properties in conflict and post conflict zones, including through the use of blue/green berets or other appropriate insignia, and reminds States Parties to include details of

Disaster Risk Reduction/Emergency Planning arrangements in their nomination dossiers and management plans;

12. Further requests the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, in addition to the presentation of state of conservation reports on individual properties, to prepare a thematic report on significant global and regional factors negatively impacting the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties, grouped according to the five categories of factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value identified in the Periodic Report questionnaire, Section II, to ensure a greater coherence in the decision making on individual sites;
13. Requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to provide, in the state of conservation reports on individual properties, a link to an integrated online database compiling all relevant background information concerning the property (previous state of conservation reports and Committee decisions, desired state of conservation, corrective measures, International Assistance requests, etc.) necessary for well-informed decision-making, to be hosted on the World Heritage Centre's website;
14. Also requests the Advisory Bodies to develop a database of existing guidance on key factors negatively impacting on the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties and tools for best management practice;
15. Recalling that being a signatory to the *World Heritage Convention* entails certain responsibilities, including a requirement to follow the *Operational Guidelines*, management of World Heritage properties according to the highest international standards, promotion of good governance and allocation of adequate funding for the protection of World Heritage properties, encourages States Parties to:
 - a) Develop adequate legislative frameworks to ensure compliance with the *Operational Guidelines* and set up a collaborative framework between agencies for the conservation of properties, including agencies in charge of the follow up of other conventions and international agreements,
 - b) Source assistance and support beyond what is available under the UNESCO World Heritage Fund, noting that tools, methodology and guidance are available both internationally and nationally from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and additional support should be sought from other donors, NGOs and international organizations,
 - c) Be proactive in relation to development and conservation of World Heritage properties by conducting a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) at the time of nomination to anticipate the impact of any potential development on the Outstanding Universal Value,
 - d) Ensure that EIA/HIA are conducted for development projects which could affect properties and that these specifically assess the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of properties,
 - e) Involve indigenous peoples and local communities in decision making, monitoring and evaluation of the state of conservation of the properties and their Outstanding Universal Value and link the direct community benefits to protection outcomes,
 - f) Respect the rights of indigenous peoples when nominating, managing and reporting on World Heritage sites in indigenous peoples' territories;
 - g) Establish and promote horizontal cooperation and understanding among various institutions that have an impact on cultural and natural heritage, also including governmental institutions responsible for UNESCO programmes implementation on national level, economy, finance, regional development/ planning, tourism, social welfare as well as local authorities,
 - h) Follow the Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted simultaneously with the *World Heritage Convention*, by the General Conference of UNESCO on 16 November 1972.