

ANNEX III

Results of the Monitoring Indicators for the Arab States Region

I. State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties

Five Indicators are used to assess the temporal patterns in the status and the trends of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), including the integrity and authenticity of each site and trends of the factors affecting the properties.

Indicator 1: Status of OUV

This indicator provides information on the number of properties that consider that OUV has been maintained across the Second and Third Cycles.

Data source : Second Cycle Section II Question 5.3.3; Third Cycle Section II Question 12.3.3

Data presentation

Region/ property category	No. of World Heritage properties					
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle		
	Maintained	Impacted, but addressed	Seriously impacted	Maintained	Impacted, but addressed	Seriously impacted
Arab States	47 / 58	10 / 58	1 / 58	61 / 81	13 / 81	7 / 81
Cultural	43 / 54	10 / 54	1 / 54	55 / 73	11 / 73	7 / 73
Mixed	1 / 1	0 / 1	0 / 1	2 / 3	1 / 3	0 / 3
Natural	3 / 3	0 / 3	0 / 3	4 / 5	1 / 5	0 / 5

Indicator 2: Trend of OUV

This indicator has a same data source as Indicator 1 and compares the percentage of properties (of the total) that consider that OUV has been maintained in the Third Cycle compared to the Second Cycle.

Region/ property category	% of World Heritage properties						Percentage point difference 2 nd to 3 rd Cycle		
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle			Maintained	Impacted, but addressed	Seriously impacted
	Maintained	Impacted, but addressed	Seriously impacted	Maintained	Impacted, but addressed	Seriously impacted			
Arab States	81.0	17.2	1.7	75.3	16.0	8.6	-5.7	-1.2	6.9
Cultural	79.6	18.5	1.9	75.3	15.1	9.6	-4.3	-3.5	7.7
Mixed	100	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	-33.3	33.3	0.0
Natural	100	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	-20.0	20.0	0.0

Indicator 3: Trend factors

This indicator compares the increase or decrease in negative and positive factors affecting the properties, comparing the Second and Third Cycles.

Data Source: Second Cycle Section II Question 3.16; Third Cycle Section II Question 4.16

Region/ property category	Current negative factors				
	No. of current negative factors/ total number of factors impacting property		% current negative factors/ total number of factors impacting property		Percentage point difference 2 nd to 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	746 / 4474	1019 / 6724	16.7	15.2	-1.5
Culture	636 / 4094	863 / 6068	15.5	14.2	-1.3
Mixed	11 / 76	47 / 246	14.5	19.1	4.6
Nature	99 / 304	109 / 410	32.6	26.6	-6.0

Indicator 3 (b)

Region/ property category	Current positive factors				
	No. current positive factors/ total number of factors impacting property		% current positive factors/ total number of factors impacting property		Percentage point difference 2 nd to 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	468 / 4474	804 / 6724	10.5	12.0	1.5
Culture	388 / 4094	663 / 6068	9.5	10.9	1.4
Mixed	8 / 76	39 / 246	10.5	15.9	5.3
Nature	72 / 304	102 / 410	23.7	24.9	1.2

Site managers are asked to identify factors affecting their property from a list of 76 factors which can have a positive or negative impact on a World Heritage property. These are grouped under 13 primary factors:

1. Buildings and Development
2. Transportation Infrastructure
3. Services Infrastructures
4. Pollution
5. Biological resource use/ modification
6. Physical resource extraction
7. Local conditions affecting physical fabric
8. Social/ cultural uses of heritage
9. Other human activities
10. Climate change and severe weather events
11. Sudden ecological/ geological events
12. Invasive/ alien species or hyper-abundant species
13. Management and institutional factors

Factors must be classified as negative or positive, current or potential. Tables 3 (a) and 3 (b) show the number of current negative and current positive factors out of the much larger total number affecting the properties.

The overall trend is a valuable measure of the extent to which World Heritage properties are affected by a wide range of processes and events. The number of factors has increased from the Second to Third Cycles which in part reflects the increase in the number of properties reporting. Averaged out across all the reporting properties, there were 12.45 current negative impacts per property in the Third Cycle, compared to 11.45 per property in the Second Cycle, and 9.81 current positive impacts per property for the Third Cycle, compared to 7.2 for the Second Cycle. This is a 9% increase in current negative impacts per property, and a 36% increase in current positive impacts.

Management and institutional factors account for much of the overall increase in current negative and positive factors impacting the properties. The bulk of the increase comes from five new factors included in the group in the Third Cycle to align better with the State of Conservation system. This

shows the potential distortion that can occur from changes to the factors list. Other significant increases are other human activities (90% increase possibly reflecting the amount of conflict there has been in the Arab States region), and invasive and alien species (66% but based on relatively small numbers of occurrences in each cycle). On the low side are social/cultural uses of heritage (18% increase which is less than half the increase in the number of properties of 38%), and climate change and severe weather events (24% increase).

Indicator 4: **Integrity**: the number of properties considering that integrity is intact

Second Cycle Section II Question 5.3.2; Third Cycle Section II Question 12.3.2

Region/ property category	No. of properties					
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle		
	Intact	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Intact	Compromised	Seriously compromised
Arab States	47 / 58	9 / 58	2 / 58	64 / 81	10 / 81	7 / 81
Cultural	43 / 54	9 / 54	2 / 54	57 / 73	9 / 73	7 / 73
Mixed	1 / 1	0 / 1	0 / 1	3 / 3	0 / 3	0 / 3
Natural	3 / 3	0 / 3	0 / 3	4 / 5	1 / 5	0 / 5

Region/ property category	% of properties						Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles		
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle					
Arab States	81.0	15.5	3.4	79.0	12.3	8.6	-2.0	-3.2	5.2
Cultural	79.6	16.7	3.7	78.1	12.3	9.6	-0.5	-4.3	5.9
Mixed	100	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Natural	100	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	-20.0	20.0	0.0

Indicator 5: **Authenticity**: number of properties considering that authenticity is intact

Second Cycle Section II Question 5.3.1; Third Cycle Section II Question 12.3.1

Natural sites are not assessed for authenticity, although, two natural properties submitted replies to this question, they have not been included in the datasets below. The base number for calculations differs from Indicators 1 and 4.

Region/ property category	No. of properties					
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle		
	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised
Arab States	47 / 56	8 / 56	1 / 56	62 / 76	11 / 76	3 / 76
Culture	45 / 53	7 / 53	1 / 53	59 / 73	11 / 73	3 / 73
Mixed	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 1	3 / 3	0 / 3	0 / 3
Nature	1 / 2	1 / 2	0 / 2	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0

Region/ property category	% of properties						Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles		
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle					
Arab States	83.9	14.3	1.8	81.0	15.2	3.8	-2.9	0.9	2.0
Culture	84.9	13.2	1.9	80.8	15.1	4.1	-4.1	1.9	2.2
Mixed	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nature	50.0	50.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	16.7	-16.7	0.0

Conclusion

The Indicators for the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties focus on the condition of the OUV of individual properties, including authenticity and integrity, and on the scale of the factors which impact on them whether positively or negatively.

The number of properties with severely impacted OUV has risen from 1 in 2010 to 7 in 2019. This is a marked increase, particularly since it occurs entirely within cultural properties, primarily due to conflict areas in the region. The percentage decrease in natural and mixed properties maintaining their OUV is large in percentage terms but represents only one property in each category. Overall, the number of properties with impacted OUV has almost doubled from 11 to 20 properties between the two cycles.

Percentages for intactness of authenticity and integrity are broadly similar for both cycles. They are higher than those for the overall state of OUV. However, for both these aspects of OUV, there are significant increases in properties which have been severely compromised.

The incidence of positive and negative factors is discussed above but the major change here was a large increase in the number of occurrences of management and institutional factors apparently because the number of factors within that group was increased.

II. Management

These Indicators assess the effectiveness of site management, and the adequacy of financial and human resources and budget. The effectiveness of site management is measured through the existence of management plans or management systems and the extent of their implementation. There are questions about communication with other stakeholders, and the positive and negative impacts of management and institutional factors. Monitoring indicators are also covered.

Finance and Human Resources

Objective: adequate financial and human resources for site management

Indicator 6: Percentage of States Parties that consider the **available** budget for World Heritage to be adequate to meet the current conservation, protection and presentation needs

Second Cycle Section I Question 8.4; Third Cycle Section I Question 8.3

Region	% of properties		
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
		Culture	Nature
Arab States	13.3	5.6	5.6

The Second Cycle did not distinguish between cultural and natural properties, so the figures are not directly comparable. In both cycles the number of States Parties considering that the available budget was adequate was small with only one State Party reporting that the budget was adequate respectively for cultural and natural heritage. However, in Section II Question 4.16 (see Indicator 3 above) 48 World Heritage properties (59%) reported financial resources as a positive impact while 27 properties (33%) reported this as a negative factor.

Indicator 7: Percentage of States Parties that consider available **human resources** as adequate to meet the current needs of cultural and/or natural heritage conservation, protection and presentation

Second Cycle Section I Question 8.5; Third Cycle Section I Question 8.6

Region	%		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	0	10.5	10.5

The percentage increase represents two States Parties only, so that the actual allocation of human resources in 2010 and 2019 was in fact closer than the percentages indicate. In Section II Question 4.16, 50 World Heritage properties (61%) reported human resources as a positive impact while 22 properties (27%) reported this as a negative factor.

Management

Objective: Improved management effectiveness of World Heritage properties

These indicators are intended to measure the effectiveness of site management.

Indicator 8: Management systems/plans

8 (a) Number of properties with a management plan or appropriate management system

Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.2

Region	No. of properties	% with management plan
Arab States	64 / 82	78.0

8 (b) Number of properties where the management system is being fully implemented and monitored

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.3.5; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.13

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	15 / 58	17 / 82	25.9	20.7	-5.1

8 (c) Number of properties where management system/ plan is adequate to maintain site's OUV

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.3.4; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.12

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	17 / 58	40 / 82	29.3	48.8	19.5

Indicator 9: Management Coordination Number of properties where there is adequate coordination between all bodies/levels involved in the management of the property

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.3.3; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.11

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	16 / 58	13 / 82	27.6	15.9	-11.7

Indicator 10: Monitoring

Indicator 10 (a) Number of properties with a formal programme of monitoring

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.8.1; Third Cycle Section II Question 10.1

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	21 / 58	21 / 82	36.2	25.6	-10.6

Indicator 10 (b) i Number of properties where indicators have been defined

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.8.2; Third Cycle Section II Question 10.3

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	32 / 58	61 / 82	55.2	74.4	19.2

Indicator 10 (b) ii Number of properties where indicators have been defined and are in use

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.8.2; Third Cycle Section II Question 10.3

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	9 / 58	41 / 82	15.5	50.0	34.5

Indicator 11: Management Impact

Indicator 11 (a) Number of properties where management activities are having a positive current impact

Second Cycle Section II Question 3.13.3; Third Cycle Section II Question 4.13.4

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	40 / 58	64 / 82	69.0	78.0	9.0

Indicator 11 (b) i Number of properties where management activities are having negative current impact

Second Cycle Section II Question 3.13.3; Third Cycle Section II Question 4.13.4

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	4 / 58	9 / 82	6.9	11.0	4.1

Indicator 11 (b) ii Number of properties where management activities are having negative potential impact

Second Cycle Section II Question 3.13.3; Third Cycle Section II Question 4.13.4

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	2 / 58	5 / 82	3.4	6.1	2.6

These figures are taken from the factors analysis (see Indicator 3).

Indicator 12: Management Response: number of properties where actions are being taken to address priority management needs identified in the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

Second Cycle Section II Question 5.2.2; Third Cycle Section II Question 12.2.1

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	44 / 58	74 / 82	75.9	90.2	14.4

Conclusion

This section deals with issues covered in previous Periodic Reports. Many properties have inadequate financial budgets and staff resources which inhibit other management actions.

There has been a large increase in the number of properties with management plans or appropriate management systems, and a smaller but still significant increase in the number of properties with a management plan/ system adequate to protect OUV. Despite this growth, the number of properties with a fully implemented plan has increased by only two, despite the increase of 21 properties in the Region since 2010. While the number of properties with defined indicators has increased, the number of properties with formal monitoring programmes has not grown.

III. Governance

The indicators in this section measure the adequacy of the legal framework for heritage protection, and the level of involvement of key stakeholders, including the transparency of the processes involved, and the adequacy of action plans to promote heritage.

Objective: *improved adequacy of the legal framework for heritage protection*

Indicator 13: Number of States Parties considering that the legal framework is adequate for the identification of the State Party's cultural and /or natural heritage.

Second Cycle Section I Question 5.4; Third Cycle Section I Question 5.5.1

Region	No. of States Parties			% of States Parties		
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle		Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
		Culture	Nature		Culture	Nature
Arab States	13 / 16	8 / 18	8 / 16	81.3	44.4	50.0

Indicator 14: Number of States Parties considering that the legal framework is adequate for the conservation and protection of the State Party's cultural and/ or natural heritage.

Second Cycle Section I Question 5.4; Third Cycle Section I Question 5.6.1

Region	No. of States Parties			% of States Parties		
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle		Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
		Culture	Nature		Culture	Nature
Arab States	13 / 16	6 / 18	6 / 17	81.3	33.3	35.3

Indicator 15: Number of States Parties where effective cooperation mechanisms between stakeholders are established in the identification, protection, conservation and/or presentation of the State Party's cultural and/or natural heritage.

Second Cycle Section I Questions 6.1, 6.2, 6.3; Third Cycle Section I Questions 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4

Region	No of States Parties								
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle					
	Cooperation between			Cooperation between					
	principal agencies/ institutions	all principal agencies/ institutions and other government agencies	different levels of government	principal agencies/ institutions	all principal agencies/ institutions and other government agencies	different levels of government		different levels of government and all segments of civil society	
					Culture	Nature	Culture	Nature	
Arab States	5 / 16	2 / 16	2 / 16	4 / 19	3 / 19	2 / 17	2 / 17	3 / 17	2 / 17

Region	% of States Parties								
	Second Cycle			Third Cycle					
	Cooperation between			Cooperation between					
	principal agencies/ institutions	all principal agencies/ institutions and other government agencies	different levels of government	principal agencies/ institutions	all principal agencies/ institutions and other government agencies	different levels of government		different levels of government and all segments of civil society	
Culture						Nature	Culture	Nature	
Arab States	31.3	12.5	12.5	21.1	15.8	11.8	11.8	17.6	11.8

The questions in the two cycles are not identical but it is clear that overall levels of cooperation across the region are still low, as perceived by States Parties. World Heritage properties responses in Section II were broadly in line with the perception of the States Parties.

Indicator 16: number of properties with **clear definition of roles and responsibilities** within the management system

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.3.3 *How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property?*; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.11 *Rate the coordination between the various levels of administration (i.e. national/federal; regional/provincial/state; local/municipal etc.) involved in the management of the World Heritage property*

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd & 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	56 / 58	73 / 82	96.6	89.0	-7.5

These questions are the best proxies available since good coordination between different levels of administration indicates that roles are reasonably well defined.

Conclusion

Assessment of changes in governance since the Second Cycle is inhibited by changes in questions between the two cycles. Nevertheless, the responses indicate lower levels of satisfaction with legal provision for both identification and conservation and protection of heritage than during the Second Cycle. Levels of cooperation between various categories of stakeholders and agencies seem to have declined a little.

IV. Synergies

The World Heritage Committee and UNESCO are taking an increasing interest in coordination of the work of UNESCO conservation programmes, and their relevant Conventions, and other natural heritage Conventions, and wish to ensure appropriate coordination and information-sharing between all these various instruments. This is a new theme for Periodic Reporting and the Third Cycle will establish the baseline for measuring the extent of these synergies in the future.

Objective: improved synergies with related conservation Conventions/ Programmes

The other Conventions and programmes considered are listed in Indicator 17

Indicator 17: Of the States Parties, that have ratified/ joined Multilateral Environmental Agreements, UNESCO conventions and programmes, the percentage that maintain communication between World Heritage Focal Points and the focal points of other conventions/programmes.

Third Cycle Section I Question 2.4.1

Convention/Programme	Regional Total (%)
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	61.5
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species in Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES)	46.6
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)	54.5
Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)	66.6
International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)	21.4
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)	23.0
1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	85.7
Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	100
1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property	88.2
2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage	81.8
2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage	88.2
2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions	83.3
Man and the Biosphere Programme	66.6
UNESCO Global Geoparks	0

There is a higher level of contact with other cultural programmes than there is for natural programmes. This may reflect the low number of mixed and natural properties in the region. It may also reflect the extent to which other Conventions and UNESCO programmes are involved with specific sites, since the highest levels of cooperation on natural heritage are for the Ramsar Convention and the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) programme both of which designate sites including some World Heritage properties. Cooperation on the UNESCO Global Geoparks programme is low, but there is currently only one Global Geopark in the Arab States region, compared to 33 MAB reserves and many more Ramsar sites.

Indicator 18: Number of World Heritage properties with multiple designations

Indicator 18 (a) percentage of such properties with communication on a regular basis between the World Heritage site manager and the Focal Points of other designations/ programmes

Third Cycle Section II Question 2.7

Region	1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)	Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	UNESCO Global Geoparks
Arab States	42.9	50.0	25.0	25.0	100.0

The figures for membership of the various programmes/ conventions is taken from the responses to the questionnaire, and do not necessarily match UNESCO's records of designations under other Conventions and programmes. In any case, the percentages of properties with regular communication are low, apart from UNESCO Global Geoparks of which there is only one in the Arab States region, though not inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Indicator 18 (b) percentage of such properties with an integrated management plan combining World Heritage and any other designations

Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.2

Region	An integrated management plan combining World Heritage and any other designations
Arab States	22.0

18 properties stated that they had an integrated management plan combining World Heritage and another designation(s). These figures must be treated with caution as the number of sites under other designations in UNESCO records does not tally with the responses of individual properties.

Indicator 19: Number of States Parties using the provisions of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape to set policies or strategies for the protection of their cultural and natural heritage.

Third Cycle Section I Question 2.5.1

Region	No. of States Parties	% of States Parties
Arab States	14 / 19	73.7

The adoption by 74% of States Parties of the Recommendation is significant. Section II Question 5.3.5 records that 8 of the properties in the region have policies for dealing with development proposals based on the Recommendation while another 17 properties make some use of it.

Indicator 20: Number of States Parties using the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties to set national policies or strategies for the protection of their cultural and natural heritage.

Third Cycle Section I Question 5.14.1

Region	No. of States Parties	% of States Parties
Arab States	9 / 19	47.4

In addition to States Parties use of this Strategy, Section II Question 5.3.9 shows that 4 properties have risk management plans based on the Strategy while another 28 properties have made some use of it. Thus 39% of properties are using the Strategy to some extent.

Indicator 21: Number of States Parties using the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage to set national policies or strategies for the protection of their cultural and natural heritage.

Third Cycle Section I Question 5.14.1

Region	No. of States Parties	% of States Parties
Arab States	5 / 19	26.3

26% of States Parties are using the World Heritage Policy Document to set policies to protect their cultural and natural heritage. Section II Question 5.3.7 records that 5 properties have set policies for dealing with climate change and another 10 have made some use of the Policy (18% in all).

Conclusion

The 2011 Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation, the risk reduction strategy, and the climate change policy are all key guidance documents for States Parties and for individual World Heritage Properties. The responses show that nationally around 74% of governments have followed up the 2011 Recommendation, just under half have used the Risk Reduction Strategy, and about one quarter the climate change policy. At property level, the pattern of take up is different with 25 properties (30%) making some use of the 2011 Recommendation, 32 properties (39%), the risk reduction strategy, and 15 (18%) the climate change policy.

V. Sustainable Development

Most questions in this section were introduced in the Third Cycle, so that it is not possible at this stage to develop much trend information. This cycle will set the baseline to measure the extent of States Parties implementation of the 2015 World Heritage Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention (henceforth World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy)¹.

Objective: Sustainable tourism and benefit to local communities

Indicator 22: Number of properties where the management system/plan for the World Heritage property includes a **strategy with an action plan, to manage visitors, tourism activity** and its derived economic, socio-cultural and environment impacts

Third Cycle Section II Question 9.7

Region	No. of properties	%of properties
Arab States	35 / 82	42.7

Of the 35 properties, 8 have a fully implemented strategy and action plan for managing visitors, tourism activity and its derived impacts on their property. The remaining 27 properties have a strategy in place but it is not fully implemented.

Indicator 23: Number of properties where the **benefits of tourism are shared with local communities**

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.4.5; Third Cycle Section II Question 9.16

Region	No. of properties		% of properties		Percentage point difference
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	45 / 58	29 / 82	77.6	35.4	-42.2

There is an apparent decrease in the number of properties sharing the benefits of tourism with local communities, but the questions in the two questionnaires are different.

Objective: Effective Contribution of the Convention to environmental sustainability, inclusive social development, and inclusive economic development, as well as the fostering of peace and security

Indicator 24: Number of States Parties considering that inscription of properties on the World Heritage List contributes to **achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.**

Third Cycle Section I Question 4.4

Objectives of World Heritage Sustainable Development Strategy and 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda	No. of States Parties	% States Parties
Protecting biological and cultural diversity and providing ecosystem services and benefits	17	89.5
Strengthening resilience to natural hazards and climate change	15	78.9
Contributing to inclusion and equity	11	57.9
Enhancing the quality of life and well-being	11	57.9
Respecting, protecting and promoting human rights	10	52.6
Respecting, consulting and involving indigenous peoples and local communities	12	63.2
Achieving gender equality	10	52.6
Ensuring growth, employment, income and livelihoods	14	73.7
Promoting economic investment and quality tourism	17	89.5
Strengthening capacity-building, innovation and local entrepreneurship	16	84.2

¹ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sustainabledevelopment/>

Ensuring conflict prevention	9	47.4
Protecting heritage during conflict	11	57.9
Promoting conflict resolution	9	47.4
Contributing to post-conflict recovery	12	63.2
Other(s)	0	0.0

This table records the number of States Parties reporting that such inscription made a high or some contribution to particular policy elements. The highest scores were for protecting environmental and cultural diversity and ecosystem services and benefits and promoting economic investment and quality tourism. The lowest scores were for respecting, protecting and promoting human rights, the contribution of World Heritage properties to gender equality, ensuring conflict prevention, and promoting conflict resolution.

Indicator 25: Number of States Parties that effectively integrate the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage as a strategic element in national sustainable development policies and strategies.

Third Cycle Section I Question 5.11.1

Integration of the conservation and protection of cultural and natural heritage as a strategic element in national sustainable development policies and strategies	No. of States Parties	% of States Parties
	Total	Total
Protecting biological and cultural diversity and providing ecosystem services and benefits	12	63.2
Strengthening resilience to natural hazards and climate change	10	52.6
Contributing to inclusion and equity	12	63.2
Enhancing the quality of life and well-being	14	73.7
Respecting, protecting and promoting human rights	13	68.4
Respecting, consulting and involving indigenous peoples and local communities	15	78.9
Achieving gender equality	11	57.9
Ensuring growth, employment, income and livelihoods	14	73.7
Promoting economic investment and quality tourism	15	78.9
Strengthening capacity-building, innovation and local entrepreneurship	13	68.4
Ensuring conflict prevention	10	52.6
Protecting heritage during conflict	9	47.4
Promoting conflict resolution	9	47.4
Contributing to post-conflict recovery	9	47.4
Other(s)	0	0.0

This question deals with the integration of cultural and natural heritage policies into national policies and strategies, not individual World Heritage properties. Not all States Parties responded to all elements of the question. The policy areas with the highest level of integration across the region are respecting, consulting and involving indigenous peoples and local communities, and promoting economic investment and quality tourism (both 15 States Parties), followed by enhancing the quality of life and well-being, jointly with ensuring growth, employment income and livelihoods (14 States Parties each). The lowest ratings were those dealing with conflict, and with strengthening resilience to natural hazards and climate change.

Promotion of economic investment and tourism tops both tables, while policies to do with limiting and resolving conflict come near the bottom. Apart from that, the ranking differs. The involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, for example, is seen as the most common integrated policy area in 15 States Parties, while only 12 considered that placing a site on the World Heritage List would contribute to this.

Objective: Monitoring Development Indicator 11.4.1 of Sustainable Development Goals

Indicator 26: Percentage of total annual public expenditure on the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of cultural/ natural heritage.

Third Cycle Section I Question 8.4

Region	Cultural heritage	Natural heritage
Arab States	4.1	3.4

This indicator measures expenditure on cultural and natural heritage as a percentage of **all** public expenditure on all types of activities. More is spent on cultural heritage than on natural.

Indicator 27: Percentage of total annual expenditure spent on the identification, conservation, protection and presentation of cultural/ natural heritage allocated from national/ federal, provincial/ regional and local levels.

Third Cycle Section I Question 8.5

Region	Cultural heritage			Natural heritage		
	National/ Federal	Regional/ Provincial	Local	National/ Federal	Regional/ Provincial	Local
Arab States	58.9	29.6	11.4	45.4	42.2	12.4

14 States Parties replied for cultural heritage expenditure, and only 11 for natural. Provincial/regional authorities provide more support for natural heritage than they do for cultural heritage, while national/federal authorities provide nearly 60% of funding for cultural heritage.

Indicator 28: Number of States Parties where an explicit gender balanced contribution has been considered in the entire process (Tentative Lists, nominations, inscriptions).

Third Cycle Section I Questions 3.7, 4.2

Region	Number of States Parties		Total number of States Parties	Percentage of States Parties	
	Tentative List	Nominations		Tentative List	Nominations
Arab States	7	8	19	36.8	42.1

Indicator 29: Number of properties with a management system comprising a formalised framework for women's participation

Third Cycle Section II Question 8.3.5

Region	Number of properties	Total number of properties	Percentage of properties
Arab States	57	82	69.5

Indicator 30: Number of properties with education and awareness programmes targeting women.

Third Cycle Section II Question 8.3

Region	Number of properties	Total number of properties	Percentage of properties
Arab States	48	82	58.5

48 properties target women for education and awareness programmes, compared with 72 for children and youth, and 73 for local communities.

Objective: Improved involvement of communities and indigenous groups

Indicator 31: Number of States Parties recording effective involvement of communities and indigenous peoples in the whole process (tentative lists, nominations, inscriptions).

Indicator 31 (a) effective involvement of communities

Second Cycle Section I Questions 3.3, 4.2; Third Cycle Section I Questions 3.6, 4.1

Region	No. of States Parties				% States Parties				Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles	
	Tentative List		Nominations		Tentative List		Nominations			
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Tentative List	Nomination
Arab States	2 / 16	7 / 19	3 / 16	5 / 19	12.5	36.8	18.8	26.3	24.3	7.6

Indicator 31 (b) effective involvement of indigenous peoples

Second Cycle Section I Questions 3.3, 4.2; Third Cycle Section I Questions 3.6, 4.1

Region	No. of States Parties				% States Parties				Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles	
	Tentative List		Nominations		Tentative List		Nominations			
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Tentative List	Nomination
Arab States	2 / 16	7 / 19	3 / 16	5 / 19	12.5	36.8	18.8	26.3	24.3	7.6

Involvement of both communities and indigenous peoples has increased to some extent since the Second Cycle but the number of occasions on which this happens is still low.

Indicator 32: Number of properties with a Management Plan comprising a **formalised framework for community participation**

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.3.7; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.3.15

Region/Sub-Region	No. of properties		% properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	54 / 58	79 / 82	93.1	96.3	3.2

The questions used as proxies for this Indicator do not actually address whether a formal mechanism for community participation does exist. Despite this, there appears to be some improvement from the Second to the Third Cycles.

Indicator 33: Number of properties where the **boundaries are clearly known** by the authorities and the local communities.

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.1.4; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.1.2

Region	Number of properties with known boundaries		% properties with known boundaries		Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	44 / 58	64 / 82	75.9	78.0	2.2

Indicator 34: Number of properties where the **buffer zones are clearly known** by the authorities and the local communities.

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.1.5; Third Cycle Section II Question 5.1.4

Region	Number of properties with known buffer zone boundaries		% properties with known buffer zone boundaries		Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	26 / 58	43 / 82	44.8	52.4	7.6

Awareness of the boundaries of World Heritage properties and their buffer zones has increased among those taking decisions affecting them, and among those affected by them because they live in or near one.

VI. Capacity development

Capacity development is important for workers and decision takers in the World Heritage system, and for those affected by World Heritage because they live in or near properties. For all these groups, it is important to understand the needs for the protection and conservation of World Heritage properties and the ways in which they may contribute to sustainable development, particularly of local communities, including indigenous and marginalised groups. These indicators are intended to measure the existence, effectiveness of, and participation in capacity building strategies and programmes.

Objective: Capacity building

Indicator 35: Number of properties having site-specific capacity building plans or programmes that develop local expertise and that contribute to the transfer of skills for the conservation and management of the World Heritage property

Second Cycle Section II Question 4.4.15; Third Cycle Section II Question 6.1.12

Region	No. of properties		% properties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	36 / 58	40 / 82	62.1	48.8	-13.3

The proportion of properties with such plans or programmes has declined by 13%, and many of these programmes are not fully implemented.

Indicator 36: Number of States Parties having a **national capacity building strategy** for World Heritage conservation, protection, presentation and management.

Third Cycle Section I Question 10.8

Region/Sub-Region	No. States Parties	% States Parties
Arab States	8 / 19	42.1

Indicator 37: Number of States Parties having an implemented national strategy for capacity development.

Second Cycle Section I Question 9.3; Third Cycle Section I Question 9.4

Region/Sub-Region	No. of States Parties		% States Parties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	7 / 16	10 / 19	43.8	52.6	8.9

Almost half the States Parties now have a Capacity Building Strategy, and these are mostly wholly or partially implemented.

Indicator 38: Top five capacity building needs identified by States Parties for conservation, protection and presentation of cultural heritage

Second Cycle Section I Question 9.2; Third Cycle Section I Question 9.1

No.	Top 5 capacity building needs identified by States Parties for conservation, protection and presentation		
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
		Culture	Nature
1	Conservation	Conservation and management of heritage sites	Conservation and management of heritage sites
2	Community outreach	National/federal	National/federal
		Sustainable development	Sustainable development
3	Interpretation	Statutory processes: Tentative Lists	Statutory processes: Tentative Lists
		Statutory processes: Nominations	Statutory processes: Nominations
		Risk preparedness and disaster risk management	Risk preparedness and disaster risk management
		Development of inclusive, equitable and effective management systems: enhancing quality of life and well-being through heritage	
4	Education	Management approaches and methodologies (including HUL)	Protection and integration of biological and cultural diversity in management systems
	Promotion		Development of inclusive, equitable and effective management systems: enhancing quality of life and well-being through heritage
	Visitor management		
	Risk preparedness		
5	Administration	Technical and scientific issues	Sustainable resource utilisation and management
		Sustainable resource utilisation and management	
		Interpretation/ communication of World Heritage properties	Sustainable tourism use and management
		Impact assessment tools (environmental, heritage and social)	
		Sustainable tourism use and management	Management approaches and methodologies (including HUL)
		Inclusive social development in World Heritage management systems	
Inclusive economic development in World Heritage management systems			

Allowing for a large number of equal scores, the table shows the top five high priority needs identified across the whole Arab States region out of the 26 choices provided. The list is similar for nature and culture in the Third Cycle, except that protection and integration of biological and cultural diversity in management systems scores within the top five only for natural heritage. The Second Cycle did not differentiate between cultural and natural heritage, and there were only 10 choices.

Objective: Harnessing benefits of heritage for society through effective communication

Objective: Sustainability of educational programmes on heritage ensured

Indicator 39: Top five perceived benefits by States Parties from the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List

Second Cycle Section I Question 4.3; Third Cycle Section I Question 4.3

No.	Top 5 perceived benefits by States Parties from the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List	
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle
1	Strengthened protection of sites (legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional)	Strengthened protection and conservation of heritage (legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional)
	Enhanced conservation practices	Enhanced conservation practices
2	Improved presentation of sites	Enhanced honour/prestige
		Increased number of tourists and visitors
3	Enhanced honour/prestige	Promoted environmental sustainability, valuing places which are essential for human well-being
	Increased recognition for tourism and public use	Improved presentation of sites

4	Catalyst for wider community appreciation of heritage	Enhanced wider community appreciation and participation in heritage processes
5	Increased funding	Increased funding
	Additional tool for lobbying/political influence	
	Stimulus for enhanced partnerships	

The lists of possible benefits from inscription on the World Heritage List in the Second and Third Cycles are similar but not identical. The top perceived benefits are very similar in both cycles.

Indicator 40: Number of States Parties with heritage education programmes implemented

Third Cycle Section I Question 12.3

Region	No. of States Parties	% States Parties
Arab States	10 / 19	52.6

No State Party has a heritage education programme which is effectively implemented, though 10 have programmes with deficiencies in their implementation. Nearly half the States Parties in the Region have no heritage education programme in place and being used.

Indicator 41: Number of States Parties participating in the World Heritage in Young Hands programme.

Second Cycle Section I Question 11.2.3; Third Cycle Section I Question 12.5

Region	No. of States Parties		% States Parties		Percentage point difference between 2 nd + 3 rd Cycles
	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	Second Cycle	Third Cycle	
Arab States	5 / 15	6 / 19	33.3	31.6	-1.8

There has been little change in the adoption of the World Heritage in Young Hands programme since 2010, though 9 States Parties now plan to introduce it compared to 3 then.

Indicator 42: Number of properties with (a) an education and awareness programme and (b) an education and awareness programme directed towards children/ youth.

Indicator 42 (a) Number of properties with an education and awareness programme,

Third Cycle Section II Question 8.2

Region	No. of properties	% properties
Arab States	27 / 82	32.9

Indicator 42 (b) Number of properties with an education and awareness programme directed towards children/ youth.

Third Cycle Section II Question 8.3

Region/Sub-Region	No.	%
Arab States	73 / 82	89.0

Indicator 42 (a) asks about the existence of an actual programme while 42 (b) which merely asks if children/ youth, along with 12 other groups, are targeted as an audience. Children/ youth are the second highest group, exceeded only by local communities, targeted by 73 properties.