



# Guidelines and Process for Biosphere Reserve Periodic Reviews – Canada

---

*May 2020*

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations .....	3
1.0 Purpose & Goals of Periodic Reviews .....	4
2.0 Roles & Responsibilities .....	5
3.0 Principles Guiding the Review Process .....	8
4.0 Resources .....	9
Appendix A: Specific Roles and Responsibilities of Key Actors .....	10
Appendix B: Sample Generic Interview Questionnaire for Reviewers .....	13
Appendix C: Timeline for 2021 Periodic Reviews.....	14

## *Abbreviations*

BR	Biosphere reserve
CBRA	Canadian Biosphere Reserves Association
CCUNESCO	Canadian Commission for UNESCO
IACBR	International Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves
MAB	Man and the Biosphere Programme
MAB-ICC	Man and the Biosphere Programme International Coordinating Council
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

## 1.0 Purpose & Goals of Periodic Reviews

Biosphere Reserves (BRs) are sites designated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO's) Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme that find creative, effective ways for people and nature to thrive together. In order to maintain this prestigious UNESCO designation, BRs must undergo a periodic review every 10 years.

*"Biosphere reserves are areas comprising terrestrial, marine and coastal ecosystems. Each reserve promotes solutions reconciling the conservation of biodiversity with its sustainable use. Biosphere reserves are 'Science for Sustainability support sites' – special places for testing interdisciplinary approaches to understanding and managing changes and interactions between social and ecological systems, including conflict prevention and management of biodiversity".*

*Biosphere reserves have three interrelated zones that aim to fulfil three complementary and mutually reinforcing functions:*

- *The core area(s) comprises a strictly protected ecosystem that contributes to the conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation.*
- *The buffer zone surrounds or adjoins the core areas, and is used for activities compatible with sound ecological practices that can reinforce scientific research, monitoring, training and education.*
- *The transition area is the part of the reserve where the greatest activity is allowed, fostering economic and human development that is socio-culturally and ecologically sustainable."*

[\(http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/\)](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/)

*"The main characteristics of biosphere reserves are:*

- *Achieving the three interconnected functions: conservation, development and logistic support;*
- *Outpacing traditional confined conservation zones, through appropriate zoning schemes combining core protected areas with zones where sustainable development is fostered by local dwellers and enterprises with often highly innovative and participative governance systems;*
- *Focusing on a multi-stakeholder approach with particular emphasis on the involvement of local communities in management;*
- *Fostering dialogue for conflict resolution of natural resource use;*
- *Integrating cultural and biological diversity, especially the role of traditional knowledge in ecosystem management;*
- *Demonstrating sound sustainable development practices and policies based on research and monitoring;*
- *Acting as sites of excellence for education and training;*
- *Participating in the World Network."*

<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/main-characteristics/>

Each BR consists of both a geographically defined area and the people who live in that area. The BR convener organization plays a crucial role in facilitating collaboration between different local stakeholders

and rights holders, including local government and municipalities, regional and federal government, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, academia, Indigenous peoples, etc. They act as the leaders and focal points for the BR governance structure and are integral to fulfilling the mandate of the MAB Programme. The UNESCO designation does not come with any legislative or regulatory authority. The convener organization may, or may not, have regulatory powers depending on whether or not the BR convener organization is also the local authority.

Every ten years, regions designated as BRs undertake a periodic review to provide an overview of their contributions and assess their compliance with UNESCO's MAB programme. The MAB Programme established the need for such reviews to ensure that BRs are meeting criteria outlined in the [Statutory Framework of the World Network of BRs \(1996\)](#). Contributions to the current strategic plans of the MAB programme ([Lima Action Plan \(2016-2025\)](#) and the [MAB Strategy \(2015-2025\)](#)) are also considered. Key criteria for Canadian BRs include demonstrating that they are acting according to the [Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's Calls to Action](#), the [United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#) (UNDRIP), and [UNESCO's Policy on Engaging with Indigenous Peoples](#)<sup>1</sup>.

Periodic reviews are an international requirement for all BRs. They are designed to ensure that the high standards characterizing the UNESCO designation are met and that programme objectives are achieved. In this sense, reviews validate the continuing dynamism and contributions of BRs to the three functions as outlined in the Statutory Framework: conservation, development and logistic support.

Periodic reviews are opportunities to reflect on progress achieved over the past ten-year period, learn, and an opportunity to renew engagement of local government and municipalities, regional and federal government, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, Indigenous peoples, etc.

<p>If a BR does not wish to undertake a periodic review, and therefore does not wish to retain its designation as a BR, it must inform the CCUNESCO that it wishes to voluntarily withdraw from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves, by sending a letter to the Secretary General.</p>
--

Examples of Canadian periodic reviews can be obtained from the Programme Officer at the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCUNESCO).

## **2.0 Roles & Responsibilities**

The key actors involved in every periodic review in Canada are the BR "convener organization", the independent reviewers (experts appointed by the CCUNESCO to visit the BR and produce a report), CBRA, and the CCUNESCO. Each has a different role and responsibility to ensure the success of the exercise. Communication among the three groups and adhering to deadlines is essential. Specific responsibilities of each are outlined in Appendix A.

### Biosphere Reserve "Convener Organization"

The "convener organization" is the steward and administrator of the BR, and as such is expected to have the clearest understanding of the political, social, cultural, economic and environmental context in which it

---

<sup>1</sup> According to articles 41 and 42 of UNDRIP, all specialized agencies of the UN (including UNESCO) shall contribute to the full realization of the [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples \(UNDRIP\)](#). [UNESCO's Policy on Engaging with Indigenous Peoples](#) underlines UNESCO's commitment to implementing UNDRIP across all program areas. The principles of UNDRIP are also embedded in the [Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's Call to Action](#).

functions.

The first step for the BR is to identify the individual who will serve as the BR focal point for the periodic review. This focal point will centralize communication with the other actors involved in the periodic review, including reviewers, CBRA and the CCUNESCO. The name and coordinates of this individual must be communicated both externally and internally within the BR prior to the review.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the BR “convener organization” is the development of a thorough self-study. The self-study serves as the first key contribution to the final periodic review report, which constitutes the self-study and the examiners’ report. We highly recommend that each BR prepares an annual report as these can be very helpful to BRs when compiling the periodic review self-study. They also serve as a means of continually assessing the performance of the BR against the Statutory Framework in the years between periodic reviews.

The BR should contact CBRA members to seek advice on periodic reviews from other BRs that have recently undertaken them and to discuss common issues that can arise, such as zonation and assessing ecosystem services. CBRA also has a number of resources such as recordings of webinars on the periodic review process and other issues.

Ideally, the self-study document represents a collective effort by various groups involved in the BR, including its board members and closest partners. The specific groups involved, and approach used to develop the self-study, are expected to be described as an introduction to the self-study. This document should use the periodic review form as the necessary format, should be detailed (recent high-quality periodic review self-study reports have been between 150 and 200 pages including images, photographs and tables), and should be provided to the reviewers at least two months prior to the site visit (see timeline, Appendix C). In addition to the information requested through the pre-established form, the self-study should be accompanied by support letters by local stakeholders and rights holders, including local government and municipalities, regional and federal government, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, academia, Indigenous peoples<sup>2</sup> (see footnotes), *etc.*, similar to those submitted with the original nomination submission. BR annual reports, media clippings, newsletters and a bibliography of key studies and research on the BR should also be made available to the reviewers.

**An example process:**

1. Collect, process, and analyze data relating to the components of the site (mapping and zoning, ecosystem services, conservation programs, economic activities, resources and logistical support activities, *etc.*),
2. Strategic analysis and review of the biosphere reserve activities,
3. Engage key stakeholders and rights holders to formally renew support for the designation.

In addition to producing the self-study, the “convener organization” plays a central role in preparing and facilitating the reviewers’ site visit by recommending key issues to address, a tentative schedule, and a list of recommended interviewees. These interviewees will include groups originally supporting the BR designation and current partners. While such recommendations should be made by the BR, the reviewers can request to meet with additional people. The date of the site visit is set by the CCUNESCO Programme Officer in consultation with the “convener organization” and the reviewers.

The reviewers share a draft version of their report with the BR focal point for fact checking and then it is submitted to the CCUNESCO. The CCUNESCO asks the BR for its final report (the self-study and reviewers’

---

<sup>2</sup> BRs in Canada are expected to demonstrate meaningful engagement and support of First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities on whose territory the BR is located.

report) and then submits its recommendations to the Executive Committee of CCUNESCO for approval. The CCUNESCO submits the final periodic review report along with its recommendations to the MAB Secretariat in Paris. The deadline for submission to the MAB Secretariat is September 30<sup>th</sup> each year. The report is reviewed by the International Advisory Council for BRs (IACBR) (which normally meets in February). The IACBR submits its recommendations to the International Coordinating Committee for MAB (MAB ICC) for a final decision (usually in June). An example timeline is shown in Appendix C.

Following the submission of the report to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat (Paris) by CCUNESCO, the BR “convener organization” facilitates the dissemination of the report, including key findings and recommendations, to its Board or other governance structure, members, and local community. Finally, the BR develops an implementation plan based on both the UNESCO recommendations and its own local reflections resulting from the review.

Progress achieved as follow-up to the periodic review recommendations can be communicated to the CCUNESCO in the form of a voluntary report. Where serious issues have been identified during the periodic review, the CCUNESCO may require a formal report by the BR to CCUNESCO within two years of the review, with an interim report made available 12 months after the review. These reports will be submitted to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat for review.

Failure to meet reporting deadlines prior to or following a periodic review may result in delisting from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves (WNBR) (see Exit Strategy: [http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/SC-17\\_CONF\\_229\\_6\\_Annex-2\\_en.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/SC-17_CONF_229_6_Annex-2_en.pdf), pp. 15-21.)

### Reviewers

Independent external reviewers are selected by CCUNESCO as volunteers. A combination of academic qualifications, practical BR experience and understanding of the MAB programme are sought, either for each individual reviewer or among the reviewers’ team. Such qualifications are deemed to favour constructive insight while also encouraging learning and the sharing of best practices among sites.

The reviewers become familiar with the BR being reviewed, namely by analyzing the self-study submitted by the BR. The purpose of the reviewers’ site visit is to validate the content of the self-study and to reflect on the BRs strengths and weaknesses. Suggested questions can be found in Appendix B.

After the site visit, the reviewers jointly prepare a report. The report assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the BR and provides recommendations on ensuring the successful long-term development of the BR. Reviewers are expected to remain critical thinkers throughout the exercise and refer to the Statutory Framework. The reviewers’ report and recommendations are made available to the BR and to the CCUNESCO, and help the BR achieve the high standards expected of the UNESCO designation.

### Canadian Commission for UNESCO

The CCUNESCO acts as the liaison body and facilitator for the review process: it reminds BRs of their pending review, assigns reviewers, trains reviewers, and provides financial support for the site visit subject to available funds

The CCUNESCO, considering the advice of the reviewers and consulting additional experts (if necessary) makes the final recommendation to its Executive Committee as to whether or not the BR meets the statutory requirements, and submits the final report to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat. Once the report has been reviewed by the IACBR and MAB ICC the recommendations are sent by the UNESCO MAB Secretariat to CCUNESCO, which then communicates the information to the relevant Canadian groups.

The main stages of involvement by CCUNESCO are therefore in the early stages of the process (such as requesting a BR focal point for the review or contacting reviewers) and in the dissemination of the reviewers' findings once the report is completed. In submitting the final periodic review report to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat, CCUNESCO will make a recommendation on the BR's effectiveness in meeting the criteria of the World Network.

See Appendix A for detailed roles and responsibilities during the periodic review process.

### **3.0 Principles Guiding the Review Process**

#### *Clear, Transparent and Fair*

In order to ensure clarity, transparency, and fairness, the BR periodic review focal point, reviewers, CBRA and CCUNESCO are expected to communicate and collaborate before, during, and after the site visit. It is important that procedures, timelines, roles, responsibilities, and opportunities for input and engagement be clearly identified and communicated among the three key groups involved, including local BR communities and review participants. All communications about the periodic review will be directed to CCUNESCO's Natural Sciences Programme Officer.

#### *Inclusive, Accessible, and Equitable*

To the greatest extent possible, communications and engagement opportunities in the periodic review should reach and include as many key BR-related groups as possible. This includes (but is not limited to) local stakeholders and rights holders, including local government and municipalities, regional and federal government, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, academia, Indigenous peoples, etc. that have been key players and involved with the BR within the ten years covered by the review.

The key to fulfilling this principle is by reconciling time constraints with the multitude of stakeholders involved. Recognizing that site visits by the reviewers are relatively short (normally two to four days), BR convener organizations are encouraged to contribute by organizing interviews and starting the dialogue with Indigenous peoples, rights holders, and stakeholders prior to the visit.

The final reports are public documents which are meant to be cited as credible background documents and shared, especially within the reviewed BR and the WNBR. The BR should publish its final report on its website.

#### *Respectful*

For each periodic review, the BR focal point and reviewers work with the CCUNESCO Natural Sciences Program Officer to jointly determine the most appropriate approach, preferred modes of communication, and specific timeline of the periodic review process. As such, it is hoped that the process reflects the needs, desires and constraints of both the BR and the reviewers, while meeting the established objectives of the review exercise and the reporting timeline to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat. Expectations of the periodic review's outcome are firm, yet the manner in which this outcome is achieved is not. It is understood that the most positive review experience comes out of a process that reflects the BR's specific context, and fulfills the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved.

#### *Meaningful and useful*

While periodic reviews are mechanisms used by UNESCO to determine whether BRs still meet the criteria of the statutory framework of the World Network, they also provide opportunities for critical reflection and learning, improvement, re-alignment of priorities and modernization of approaches. They provide a perspective on how the BR has evolved and strategically sought to implement the goals and objectives that were established in the initial BR designation documents.

***For more information, please contact:***

Eleanor Haine Bennett  
Programme Officer, Natural Sciences, Canadian Commission for UNESCO  
150 Elgin Street, P.O. Box 1047, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5V8  
Tel: 613.566.4414 or 1.800.263.5588, ext. 5517  
[Eleanor.Haine-Bennett@ccunesco.ca](mailto:Eleanor.Haine-Bennett@ccunesco.ca)

**4.0 Resources**

Periodic review form:

[http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/images/Periodic\\_review\\_form\\_english\\_2013.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/images/Periodic_review_form_english_2013.pdf)

Statutory Framework of the World Network:

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001038/103849Eb.pdf>

A new Roadmap for the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme and its World Network of Biosphere Reserves: MAB Strategy (2015-2025), Lima Action Plan (2016-2025) and Lima Declaration:

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002474/247418E.pdf>

A guide to being a Biosphere Reserve: <http://www.biospherecanada.ca/s/BR-Book-ENG-yeaw.pdf>

EuroMAB 2013 Recommendations for Collaboration with Indigenous Peoples:

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5735fdc137013b8eeb217d63/t/5a725a37ec212d3d586de458/1517443650706/2013EuroMAB\\_Indg\\_collab\\_Final\\_Recomm.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5735fdc137013b8eeb217d63/t/5a725a37ec212d3d586de458/1517443650706/2013EuroMAB_Indg_collab_Final_Recomm.pdf)

MAB Exit Strategy: [http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/SC-17\\_CONF\\_229\\_6\\_Annex-2\\_en.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/SC-17_CONF_229_6_Annex-2_en.pdf)

Assessing Ecosystem Services in Biosphere Reserves <https://en.ccunesco.ca/-/media/Files/Unesco/Resources/2019/03/AssessingEcosystem.pdf>

**Appendix A: Specific Roles and Responsibilities of Key Actors**

Timing	Biosphere Reserve “Convener Organization”	Reviewers	Canadian Commission for UNESCO
<p><b>Before site visit</b></p>	<p>Designation of the Biosphere Reserve (BR) focal point for the review (liaison with CCUNESCO, reviewers and local groups).</p> <p>Submission of self-study to CCUNESCO as indicated on timeline, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Filled out periodic review form</li> <li>- Support letters from Indigenous Peoples, other rights holders, and stakeholders (similar to designation requirements)</li> <li>- BR annual reports</li> <li>- BR media clippings</li> <li>- Bibliography of key studies and research on the BR</li> </ul> <p><b><i>N.B. Failure to provide a self-study by the due date will be interpreted as indicating that the BR is not meeting the Statutory Framework and wishes to be withdrawn from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.</i></b></p> <p>Notification to local community of upcoming review and solicitation of involvement by key groups (Indigenous peoples, businesses, individuals, stakeholders etc.).</p> <p>Provision of recommendations to reviewers for the site-visit including list of potential interviewees, tentative schedule, logistical support for accommodation and transportation, liaising with CCUNESCO regarding costs.</p>	<p>Upon receiving self-study by BR (as indicated on timeline), initial assessment of information completeness and determine key areas of focus during site-visit.</p> <p>Consultation with BR to establish timing of site-visit, tentative schedule and list of interviewees and schedule (there is no obligation for the reviewers to be limited by BR recommendations for the site visit).</p> <p>Upon consultation with BR focal point, submission of proposed site-visit budget to CCUNESCO (for approval).</p>	<p>Oversees the timelines for periodic reviews, and notification to BRs.</p> <p>Establishes contact with BR convener organization to discuss the envisioned review process and clarify expectations. Selection and contacting of reviewers; provision of background and process information; facilitation of initial contact between BR focal point and reviewers.</p> <p>Approval of pre-established site-visit budget and tentative schedule as submitted by reviewers in consultation with BR.</p>

Timing	Biosphere Reserve “Convener Organization”	Reviewers	Canadian Commission for UNESCO
<p>During site visit (approximately 2-4 days)</p>	<p>BR acts as a host to the reviewers: facilitating travel and accommodation within the BR, introducing reviewers to key groups and individuals representing a variety of perspectives, being available to support reviewers during the site visit.</p>	<p>Reviewers validate sources and reliance of information provided in self-study.</p> <p>Highlight gaps in data and perspectives.</p> <p>Conduct interviews with consideration and appreciation of BR’s specific context (see Sample questions in Appendix B).</p> <p>Reflect on specific contributions of BR “convener organizations” compared to actions of stakeholders which may take place without the BR.</p>	<p>If needed, CCUNESCO clarifies the recommended process and desired outputs.</p>

Timing	Biosphere Reserve “Convener Organization”	Reviewers	Canadian Commission for UNESCO
<p>After site visit (6 months maximum)</p>	<p>After site visit and upon receipt of draft report by reviewers, BRs are invited to comment on their recommendations, limiting their comments to overall reaction, and to flag any factual inconsistencies (within one month).</p> <p>The BR responds to any requests for additional information from the CCUNESCO in a timely manner.</p> <p>If the CCUNESCO determines that the BR meets the statutory requirements, the BR will be invited to voluntarily inform the CCUNESCO, through a letter, of progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the periodic review within one year.</p> <p>BR disseminates key findings and recommendations to the local community and develops implementation plan addressing reviewer recommendations (within 1-4 months of receipt of recommendations).</p> <p>Where major issues are identified by the CCUNESCO the BR will be asked to provide CCUNESCO with a progress report 12 months after the site-visit and a final report a year after that, addressing the recommendations for improvement communicated by the CCUNESCO.</p> <p>The BR may also be required to provide follow-up information, requested by the IACBR and ICC, which must be submitted to the MAB Secretariat by the September 30<sup>th</sup> following the receipt of the feedback.</p>	<p>Based on the self-study and findings of the site-visit, writing of the PR report following the provided templates.</p> <p>Before submitting final version of the PR report to CCUNESCO, reviewers share draft version with BR focal point requesting verification for factual inconsistencies or inaccuracies.</p>	<p>CCUNESCO reviews the self-study and reviewers’ report and coordinates review of the draft reviewers’ report with the BR.</p> <p>Once the report is judged to be satisfactorily complete, the CCUNESCO Secretariat provides recommendations as to whether the BR satisfies the statutory requirements, consulting additional experts if necessary, and briefs the CCUNESCO Executive Committee, who approves the recommendation(s).</p> <p>The CCUNESCO submits the final report and a final recommendation to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat <i>via</i> an official letter of the Secretary-General of CCUNESCO by September 30<sup>th</sup></p> <p>The CCUNESCO provides recommendations on any follow-up reporting required of the BR, and reviews follow-up reporting (where applicable)</p> <p>The Commission serves as the official communication channel between UNESCO and the BR to share results of the IACBR and MAB ICC comments on the review and on the progress of the implementation of any recommendations.</p>

## ***Appendix B: Sample Generic Interview Questionnaire for Reviewers***

### ***Suggested generic questions to ask when requesting community input***

Considering that BRs are meant to promote conservation and sustainable development / livelihoods (e.g., forestry, fisheries, tourism, etc.) through research, education, training, and collaboration:

1. What have been the greatest successes with regards to conservation:
  - a. Accomplished by the BR organization?
  - b. By others in the region?
  - c. Because of the designation?
2. What have been the greatest successes with regards to sustainable development:
  - a. Accomplished by the BR organization?
  - b. By others in the region?
  - c. Because of the designation?
3. What have been the greatest successes with regards to logistic support/capacity building:
  - a. Accomplished by the BR organization?
  - b. By others in the region?
  - c. Because of the designation?
4. What are the key past, present and future challenges to fulfilling the BR functions:
  - a. Faced by the BR organization?
  - b. Faced in the region?
  - c. Of the designation (concept, operationalizing on the ground)?
5. What have you learned over the past ten years?
  - a. Concerning the BR organization?
  - b. In the region?
  - c. Concerning the BR designation (concept, operationalizing on the ground)?
6. What are your perspectives on future directions for fulfilling BR functions:
  - a. For the BR organization?
  - b. For the region?
  - c. In terms of 'living up to' the designation?

### ***Additional questions for Biosphere Reserve staff and board members***

7. What have been the changes to your BR zones (core, buffer, transition areas)?
8. With whom have you partnered with over the past 10 years?
9. With whom have you done the most work? Please provide information about how your organization collaborates with others.
10. Partnerships and collaboration
  - a. Who (NGOs, government, research institutions, other) would you like to work with?
  - b. Why, and what do you envision?
11. How are you engaging with Indigenous Peoples and traditional knowledge systems?
12. What contributions has your BR made to the WNBR?

### Appendix C: Timeline for 2021 Periodic Reviews

Date	Item
May 2020	CCUNESCO informs the biosphere reserve (BR) about the periodic review and provides timeline and other information documents
Summer/Fall 2020	The BR completes its Self-Study.
Fall 2020	CCUNESCO recruits two external reviewers (two reviewers per BR), and provides reviewer training
January 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2021	Self-study due to be sent to the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCUNESCO). Self-study is analyzed by the reviewers and CCUNESCO.
March/April, 2021 The site visit will be conducted over 2-4 days within this time period.	Site visit conducted by the two external reviewers. Reviewers make a summary of the BR's strengths and weaknesses. Before submitting the final version of their report to CCUNESCO, reviewers share a draft version with BR focal point and CCUNESCO, requesting verification for factual inconsistencies or inaccuracies.
April / May, 2021	Reviewers' final report due 30 days after end of site visit and sent to the BR and CCUNESCO. The BR finalizes its Periodic Review Final Report to CCUNESCO to include the Reviewers' report, and any additional information they request
End June, 2021	The BR sends its Periodic Review Final Report to CCUNESCO. . The CCUNESCO reviews the reviewers' recommendations.
End July, 2021	The CCUNESCO delivers its recommendations to the BR.
End August, 2021	CCUNESCO recommendations are submitted to the Executive Committee (by CCUNESCO - a memorandum will be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval).
September, 2021	Deliberations of the CCUNESCO Executive Committee and approval of recommendations to be sent to the MAB Secretariat
September 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2021	Deadline for Periodic Review Final Report to be submitted to the MAB Secretariat in Paris.
February, 2022	IACBR meets and makes recommendations on periodic review
April, 2022	IACBR recommendations are sent to CCUNESCO and BR is informed. Additional information may be requested for the MAB-ICC
June, 2022	MAB-ICC meets and makes its final recommendation on the status of the BR
August, 2022	MAB-ICC recommendations are sent to CCUNESCO and BR is informed.