

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
Twenty-second session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room X (Fontenoy)
22 - 27 June 1998

Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda: Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee

At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee requested that the Consultative Body examine the following four issues and propose concrete recommendations and conclusions to the Bureau and the Committee at their twenty-second sessions in 1998:

- I. **Technical issues** - to include an analysis of the application of cultural heritage criteria (i) and (vi), the test of authenticity, the balance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy.
- II. **Communications and Promotion** and their relationship to the objectives of the Convention - to include an examination of the potential of a cost-recovery policy for World Heritage information products and the need for a balance between the allocation of funds for management and conservation of sites and promotional activities.
- III. **World Heritage Centre** - to examine the recommendations in the Management Review Report that relate to financial and personnel matters.
- IV. **Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.**

The Consultative Body met on 29 and 30 April 1998 and examined discussion papers that had been prepared on each of the four issues (WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11).

This document is the Report of the Rapporteur adopted by the Consultative Body on 24 June 1998. It replaces Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4 which has been withdrawn.

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

MEETING OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room IX (Fontenoy)
29-30 April 1998**

Table of contents

	Page number
INTRODUCTION	1
I. TECHNICAL ISSUES	2
A. <u>An analysis of the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi)</u>	2
Recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi)	3
B. <u>The Test of Authenticity</u>	3
Recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the Test of Authenticity	4
C. <u>The Balance of the World Heritage List and</u>	4
D. <u>The Implementation of the Global Strategy</u>	4
Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the Balance of the World Heritage List and the Implementation of the Global Strategy	6
II. COMMUNICATIONS AND PROMOTION	7
Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning Communications and Promotion	9
III. MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND FINANCIAL AUDIT	10
A. <u>Management Review</u>	10
Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the Management Review	13
B. <u>Financial Audit</u>	16
Recommendation of the Consultative Body	18
Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the Financial Audit	19

IV.	USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM AND FUND-RAISING	21
A.	<u>Use of the World Heritage Emblem</u>	21
B.	<u>Fund-raising</u>	23
	Recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund Raising	24
	CONCLUDING REMARKS	24

ANNEXES

ANNEX I **List of Participants**

ANNEX II **Agenda**

ANNEX III **List of Documents**

INTRODUCTION

1. A meeting of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters from 29 to 30 April 1998. The meeting was chaired by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Professor F. Francioni (Italy) and attended by the following members of the Consultative Body: Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, United States of America and Zimbabwe. At the invitation of the Chairperson a representative of Germany and Greece also attended, as did observers from Ecuador and Hungary, and the Director of the World Heritage Centre. A full list of participants is attached as Annex I.
2. The meeting was opened by the Chairperson who provided participants with a brief overview of the work of the Consultative Body to date. He referred in particular to the decision by the Committee at its twenty-first session for the Consultative Body to examine four main issues and to present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau. The four main issues were:
 - I. Technical issues - to include an analysis of the application of cultural heritage criteria (i) and (vi), the test of authenticity, the balance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy.
 - II. Communications and Promotion and their relationship to the objectives of the Convention- to include an examination of the potential of a cost-recovery policy for World Heritage information products and the need for a balance between the allocation of funds for management and conservation of sites and promotional activities.
 - III. World Heritage Centre - to examine the recommendations in the Management Review Report that relate to financial and personnel matters.
 - IV. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.
3. The Chairperson thanked the Delegates of Australia, Zimbabwe and Malta for their contributions to the preparation of the discussion paper on the technical issues. In thanking Canada for their paper on Communications and Promotion the Chairperson expressed his regret that Ms C. Cameron was not able to attend the meeting. The Chairperson then went on to thank Italy, France and Germany for the preparation of the background document on the Management Review and Financial Audit, and to Japan and the United States of America for their work to prepare a discussion paper on the use of the emblem and fund-raising.
4. The Chairperson then referred to the Provisional Agenda that had been circulated to the Consultative Body prior to the meeting. The Provisional Agenda was adopted by the Consultative Body without modification and is attached as Annex II.
5. The Chairperson asked that a Rapporteur be selected from the Consultative Body. The Delegate of Australia proposed Mr A. Demicoli from Malta as Rapporteur. Following the agreement of the Consultative Body and Mr Demicoli, the Chairperson thanked Mr Demicoli for having accepted this role.

6. Prior to the commencement of discussion of the Technical Issues, the Chairperson asked the Consultative Body whether there were any general points that they wished to make. It was noted that due to illness there would be no representative of the External Auditor present during the meeting.

I. TECHNICAL ISSUES

7. The Chairperson introduced this agenda item by saying that the preparation of the discussion paper (see List of Documents attached as Annex III) had been co-ordinated by Australia with contributions by Malta and Zimbabwe. He invited the Australian Delegate to highlight the main points of the discussion paper.

A. An analysis of the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi)

8. The Australian Delegate, Ms Sullivan, apologised for having taken it upon herself as co-ordinator of this group, to summarise and interpret papers submitted by Malta and Zimbabwe regarding criterion (i) and other technical issues. She also referred to her communication with Dr Cleere of ICOMOS on these issues. She noted that the key thing that the Committee will have to consider in relation to these issues is the report and recommendations of the recent Expert Meeting in Amsterdam attended by experts from Australia, Zimbabwe, the United States of America, Japan, Canada amongst others.
9. Ms Sullivan noted that two important points had emerged:
 - that criterion (i) was being applied too liberally, and
 - that too many nominations were being based on criterion (i).
10. She commented that this is resulting in an imbalance in the World Heritage List in favour of monumental rather than living cultures. On the question of imbalance the Delegates of France and Zimbabwe referred to recommendations of the Amsterdam Expert Meeting, such as, the grouping together of the natural and cultural criteria as a way to redress the imbalances.
11. The paper by the Delegate of Malta had shown two main concerns: that criterion (i) should be more precise to ensure a shift in focus from monumental to intangible heritage. The Australian Delegate recommended that after reaching an agreement upon the Maltese Delegate's paper, that it should be referred to the working group established by the Amsterdam Expert Meeting chaired by Mme Bercé (France) for consideration. Yet the Consultative Body should make it clear that it has agreed on this paper and should show its intent to tighten the concept of "masterpiece of human creative genius". Whilst agreeing with the content of the papers from Malta and Zimbabwe, the Delegate of Italy officially requested to participate in the formulation of the final document on this subject.
12. There was some concern expressed about the uncomfortable situation of having to wait for a final document to be drawn up on this subject. The Ambassador of Benin wished to have this document finished in time for the Global Strategy meeting for Western Africa in August 1998. The Delegate of Mexico fully endorsed this proposal and proposed that Australia, Malta, Zimbabwe and Italy, together with Mme Bercé should collaborate on this

subject. There was agreement on this procedure and on submitting a final document on this subject along with the report of the Amsterdam Expert Meeting to the Bureau.

13. The Director of the World Heritage Centre pointed out that of the 552 properties on the World Heritage List, 175 properties had been inscribed on the World Heritage List using criterion i in conjunction with other criteria. However, criterion i had been used alone only in two cases.
14. The Ambassador of Benin pointed out that the draft Amsterdam report had only been prepared in English which does not enable everybody to understand its legal consequences. The Director of the Centre promised the French translation in time for the twenty-second session of the Bureau in June.
- 15. Recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi)**

With reference to a more stringent interpretation of cultural criterion (i), the Amsterdam Expert Meeting has set up a working group, chaired by Madam Bercé (France) to finalise the wording for a new set of criteria, to operationalize them, and to bring forward recommendations regarding this to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. It is suggested that Mr Demicoli's proposals on wording be referred to this group.

B. The Test of Authenticity

16. The Delegate of Greece informed the Consultative Body that a document had been prepared and distributed on the question of authenticity in relation to the restoration works on the monuments of the Acropolis which have been debated and investigated since the 18th century. The Delegate of Zimbabwe commented that the paper from Greece did not differ in substance from his and Malta's paper. The Delegate of Australia felt that with these three papers an accepted view has been reached. However, there are other types of sites that ask for revision of the "concept of authenticity". Living places need another test of authenticity without in any way negating the Venice Charter.
17. The Delegate of Japan commented that whilst the Venice Charter is an important document, it had been intended for the conservation of European stone structures. The concept of authenticity could secure credibility, both at the moment of inscription on the World Heritage List and for future preservation, by taking into account other types of structures such as wooden structures which in Japan are ritually replaced every twenty years in a certain Shinto shrine, namely the Ise shrine. The Delegate of Greece agreed that, while in the case of European monuments reference is made to the Venice Charter, there are still no scientific principles approved by the international community which could be applied for all non-European monuments. Yet she questioned the right of the World Heritage Committee to establish new charters. The Chairperson noted that, while the question raised by the Greek Delegate was legitimate, the Nara Document on Authenticity which is not a Charter but a step beyond, is recognised by the Committee.
18. The Delegate of France warned against the misinterpretation of documents: on page 7 of the French language version of the "Operational Guidelines" mention is made to the "critère d'authenticité", while *test* of authenticity appears in the English version.

19. The Delegate of Malta noted that many sub-groups and types are going to result from the tests of *authenticity* and of *integrity* for *Cultural, Natural, Mixed Heritage* and *Living Cultures*. This could be simplified by the amalgamation of *authenticity* and *integrity* into one criterion. The Delegate of Australia said that this was consistent with the Amsterdam Expert Meeting proposal for new conditions of integrity to include authenticity in a combined set of ten criteria.
20. The Chairperson agreed that authenticity should be verified by a test related to the living community but without falling into infinite subjectivity. The Delegate of Lebanon noted that in this way there was going to be a shift from authenticity as being an exceptional universal value, to that of a relative value. He hoped that the right balance would be struck. He also asked for a clarification from experts on the application of the test of authenticity to natural sites. The Australian Delegate answered that integrity is usually applied for natural sites, but there has been some movement forward in the Amsterdam Expert Meeting. She commented that the distinction between natural and cultural heritage is generally an artificial one.

21. Recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the Test of Authenticity

The Consultative Body concluded by asking that the text on criteria, including integrity and authenticity, prepared as a result of the Amsterdam expert meeting be referred to the Bureau. The Delegate of Australia noted that the final contribution should refer to the papers submitted by Malta, Zimbabwe and Greece.

C. The Balance of the World Heritage List and

D. The Implementation of the Global Strategy

22. The Delegate of Australia noted that these issues had been discussed in Amsterdam and also in the ICOMOS paper that had received, in turn, robust criticism by the UNESCO Culture Sector. However, there was absolutely no disagreement about the imbalance of the World Heritage List - Delegates in this meeting are very much aware and concerned about it. Meetings in Africa and the Pacific have started bearing fruit: nominations which deal with themes that had previously been ignored are coming forward. The Delegate of Australia summarised the discussion which had taken place at the Expert Meeting in Amsterdam on these topics. The experts analysed how cultural themes tend to group around monuments rather than around historic themes such as, slavery. So themes should be broken down into sub-themes. They spoke of the inseparability of cultural and natural heritage. The approach should be an anthropological breakdown rather than a breakdown of monuments: of people and not of things that people left behind. This is why the main imbalance is between culture in different parts of the world. The Australian Delegate proposed that the Committee should publicise under-representation and over-representation to illustrate which themes and which places are not well represented. She referred to the paper provided by ICOMOS and highlighted its proposal for “twinning” between State Parties that are well represented on the List, and those requiring assistance to bring forward nominations. The former could pass on their experience and provide expertise to the latter.

23. In paragraph 43 of their report, the Management Review Workshop held in Paris in October 1997, had asked the World Heritage Centre to prepare a strategy for redressing current imbalances. The Delegate of Australia proposed that the Centre should ask the Amsterdam experts to bring their work forward. The Italian Delegation insisted that it was the World Heritage Centre that should prepare this strategy and forward it to the Bureau. Italy expressed its regret that no Italian expert had participated in the Amsterdam meeting although a list of experts had been notified to the Centre. The Delegate asked that Italy participate in the work of the working group established in Amsterdam.
24. The Director of the Centre noted that there was not enough time to present this strategy at a Bureau meeting prior to the November one. So the Chairperson suggested that it should be submitted to the Bureau with a view for the Committee to adopt it in December. The Delegate of Lebanon pointed out that no text could be forwarded to the Committee without involving the Bureau. The Italian Delegation suggested that the Centre could circulate the document two months prior to the November Bureau meeting.
25. The French Delegation was of the opinion that ICOMOS suggestion for the “twinning” of well represented States Parties with under represented ones should be limited to the highest level, that is, to those States Parties that have the highest number of sites on the List. A French Delegate pointed out that a number of countries, especially in Africa do not forward nominations because they know that procedures regarding the management of natural sites are extremist in that they do not consider traditional management by the local population.
26. The French Delegation did not agree with the first two proposals put forward by ICOMOS, namely:
 - (a) limitation of new nominations from States Parties already well represented on the List, and
 - (b) limitation of the total number of new nominations accepted for consideration by the Committee each year.
27. The Delegate of Canada noted that the Consultative Body was therefore being asked to accept a recommendation on which there was no consensus. The Ambassador of Benin commented that (a) and (b) should be read together. In this way traditional domains will be limited and consequently new domains would emerge. Benin’s interpretation was acceptable to the French Delegation which, therefore, asked only for re-phrasing without making reference to States Parties. Reference to States was also unacceptable to the Italian Delegation.
28. The Delegate of Lebanon pointed out that, if World Heritage protection was to be encouraged, no mention of quotas could be made. The question should be more of resources for the preparation of nominations. The idea of quotas should, according to the Lebanese Delegate, be set aside. The Chairperson noted that this question had a political dimension. He advised a procedure which was not radical, that is without mentioning quotas and ceilings too explicitly and without running the risk of contradicting the intention of the Convention itself.

29. The Delegate of Australia supposed that if (b) were to be left out completely, (a) could simply become an invitation which, after all is already contained in the Guidelines. Therefore she suggested to include (a) to re-stress the invitation as a voluntary thing, and (c), “twinning”, to enhance the implementation of the Global Strategy. Recommendation 4 of the discussion paper would therefore read: “*that ICOMOS suggestions (a) and (c) are considered in conjunction with the above*”. In this way, States Parties that are highly represented on the World Heritage List will be asked to limit their future nominations, while those that possess experience and resources will be asked to assist those with a lack of them.
30. The Delegate of Mexico exhorted the Consultative Body to make recommendations in a positive rather than a restrictive way. He suggested a mechanism by which over represented States Parties would assist two nominations from under represented States for each of their new nominations. The Chairperson warned against devices that could erode either consensus or the sovereignty of States Parties.
31. The Delegation of the United States of America asked for a rewording of proposal (b) of ICOMOS. The Chairperson explained that we could not reword ICOMOS suggestions but only support or reject them.
32. The Delegate of Zimbabwe reflected upon the fact that ICOMOS suggestions had not been made in isolation, but were based on the fifty or more nominations that were coming in this year. He interpreted them as an appeal to the conscience in presenting nominations. He noted that, once criterion (i) and the notion of *Masterpiece* are amended as has been suggested by the Delegate of Malta, current imbalances would be remedied without applying any mechanical means. He noted also that certain procedures were inhibiting the balance of the World Heritage List. They are so demanding that many States Parties were giving up. The Ambassador of Benin shared this same opinion and asked to redress this problem by devoting additional financial resources for the management of sites.
33. The Chairperson concluded this discussion by asking the Delegates of Australia, Benin and France to find an agreeable language which could substitute and amalgamate Recommendations 4 and 5, asking for a prioritised action plan for under represented regions and suggesting a better system for channelling available resources.
34. The Delegate of Canada felt that the word “*Targets*” in the revised Recommendation 4 (ii) would put States Parties under pressure and proposed its substitution by the milder term “*objectives*”. Agreement was reached on the revised texts of Recommendations 3 and 4 and all four recommendations were endorsed.

35. Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the Balance of the World Heritage List and the Implementation of the Global Strategy

Noting that it had, in general, endorsed the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts, the Consultative Body referred them to the Bureau;

The Consultative Body recommended that:

- in particular, in line with the discussions at the meeting of experts, that further work be undertaken on breaking down the cultural themes outlined at the 1994 Global Strategy Experts Meeting into sub-themes that would assist identification of those types places that are over- or under-represented on the World Heritage List. This work should recognise the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage;
- that when considering ways of improving the balance and representativeness of the World Heritage List, the sovereign rights of the States Parties be fully respected and reference is made to Paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines.
- that the World Heritage Centre prepare a prioritised action plan to ensure an acceleration in the implementation of the Global Strategy. The action plan should include reference to (i) methods for communicating the objectives and regional and thematic approach of the Global Strategy to all States Parties, (ii) objectives to be set in relation to regions and sub-themes currently underrepresented in the World Heritage List, and (iii) ways of channelling and increasing resources available to States Parties to ensure the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties in the long term. The preparation of an action plan, which should be submitted to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee, is in line with Paragraph 43 of the report of the 1997 Management Review.

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND PROMOTION

36. The Delegate of Canada presented the discussion paper on Communications and Promotion, reminding the Consultative Body that during the World Heritage Committee in Naples many Delegates had expressed concern about the amount of expenditure on communications compared to site conservation and the Committee requested that the Secretariat propose a policy based on cost recovery.
37. It was mentioned that communications may be outside the scope of the Convention. There had also been concern about target audiences, such as populations living around World Heritage sites, and about the most effective media that should be used. The Delegate of Canada expressed her concern with the great number of errors found in much of the promotional material published under the World Heritage emblem.
38. The Chairperson questioned whether communications and promotion was an additional activity which was not entirely within the scope of the Convention. He felt the need to establish whether promotion was UNESCO's job. He said that promotion should not be financed at the expense of other priorities. The Director of the World Heritage Centre confirmed that the constituting States of UNESCO are in duty bound to protect and publicise World Heritage. Furthermore, he stated that the promotion of the adherence to the Convention and its implementation cannot be enhanced without promotional materials.
39. The Director stated the importance of providing at least a brief description (to be provided by States Parties at the time of nomination), statement of significance (to be prepared by IUCN and ICOMOS and then adopted by the Committee with any necessary changes) and an image of each World Heritage site at the moment of its inscription in order to define its World Heritage value at that stage. This had not always been done in

the past. However, he felt the need of devising an economic and efficient promotional strategy. The Centre is prepared to present a strategy to the Committee this year.

40. The Delegate of Lebanon noted that the text of the discussion paper produced by Canada was simple and precise. Moreover, it was not in contradiction with the paper on the use of the emblem produced jointly by Japan and the United States of America. So he proposed retaining and agreeing upon the Canadian text for Principles, then procedures could follow.
41. The Delegate of Japan pointed out that the main problem was how to control the quality of all the material published under the World Heritage Emblem. Practical procedures for quality control should be introduced. The Director of the World Heritage Centre suggested assessing each proposal individually on the basis of its particular merit and use of the emblem. The Centre could refer to individual States Parties to check promotional material related to sites on their own territory and concerning the quality of the company involved. When it came to something general or world-wide, the Centre could refer to ICOMOS and/or IUCN. Regarding the trustworthiness of private companies, the Centre refers to the relevant State Party for advice.
42. The Delegate from the United States of America made it clear that it would be impossible for it to advise the Centre on the trustworthiness of private companies, since this practice was not constitutionally possible in the United States of America. Other Delegates agreed on this point.
43. The Delegate of Canada brought up the question of duplication of material published about World Heritage sites. She stressed the fact that it was always more or less the same product, reaching the same public. She admitted that no one could interfere with the freedom of writers, but retained that duplicated and incorrect work should not be published under the emblem. The Delegate of Lebanon insisted on producing something valid rather than too many things hastily. The Delegate of Greece agreed with both the Delegate of Canada and of Lebanon.
44. The Chairperson analysed this situation which could be resolved either by leaving it to the community of academics, or by leaving it to the market. Yet this solution was not acceptable because of the use of the emblem. Therefore there was the need of a procedure entailing several steps which involve the relevant States Parties.
45. Ms. Minja Yang from the World Heritage Centre agreed on the need to control the quality of publications, but at the same time identified a human resource problem within the Centre to deal with the situation. Given that UNESCO is an inter-governmental organisation, it was also difficult for the Centre to refuse requests coming from States Parties. Ms. Yang said that pressures made on the Centre do not come from commercial companies, but from States Parties. The Centre examines requests once they have been endorsed by the official authorities concerned (National Commissions). In many cases proposals from commercial or non-commercial entities are not approved or do not receive support because they do not meet UNESCO or State Party standards. Ms. Yang assured that the Centre always tries to bring partners together, although many times it turns out to be difficult.

46. The French Delegation felt that the Secretariat cannot accept pressure from Member States. It is the Committee that has to decide which initiatives to support, and not the other way round. To the Delegate of Australia it seemed that the Centre had no control over this situation. She insisted that the World Heritage Committee should have exclusive control in the use of the emblem.
47. The Delegate of Mexico strongly stated that errors on the Internet were unacceptable and that the Centre had to develop the web-site text further. While affirming the freedom of speech and the fostering of research, he insisted that these could not, however, be sustained by the World Heritage Fund. He commented that State Parties have to know where the money generated from sites through media activities is being spent.
48. The Delegate of Germany asked for a clarification of proposed Principle 6: whether revenues flowing from communications and promotion activities should benefit World Heritage Sites or the World Heritage Fund. The Delegation of the United States of America admitted that it was unaware of the size of these revenues and asked for information on income over time. Subsequently the Centre circulated the requested document (see List of Documents in Annex III). Ms. Yang informed the Consultative Body that this revenue appeared in the financial account presented to the Committee for the past two years. However, she promised to hand them out the next day.
49. It was agreed that Recommendation I of the discussion paper be endorsed with reservation on the question of the use of the World Heritage Emblem which would be discussed within the paper prepared by Japan and the United States of America.
50. The Delegate of Lebanon proposed adding the word “*scientific*” after the word *cultural* in Principle 4. This was approved by consensus.
51. The Delegate of Mexico proposed adding “*in agreement with the relevant States Parties*” at the end of Principle 6, and “*and requires the States Parties’ approval*” at the end of Guidelines 3. These amendments were meant to strengthen reference to the need of seeking State Party’s approval for specific promotional information about World Heritage sites on its territory. Both amendments were approved and “Principles” and “Guidelines” were endorsed. There were no objections for Recommendations II and III which were also endorsed.

52. Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning Communications and Promotion

Recommendation I

The World Heritage Committee should adopt a set of principles and guidelines for the future governance of the communications and promotion activities. While any individual, organization or enterprise is free to publish or produce products associated with World Heritage, any authorization to do so in formal association with UNESCO and use of the emblem is the prerogative of the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO and will therefore adhere to the following principles and guidelines. These would apply to States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, the UNESCO Publishing Office and the UNESCO Office of Public Information.

Principles:

- States Parties retain full control over the content of texts and images related to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories
- Quality of content takes precedence over the quantity of products
- Communications and promotion products respect the values and objectives of the Convention
- Priority is given to products of educational, cultural, scientific or artistic value
- Authorized products do not exploit or endanger World Heritage sites
- Revenues flowing from communications and promotion activities benefit World Heritage Sites or the World Heritage Fund in agreement with the relevant States Parties

Guidelines:

- Standard texts and images are updated regularly by States Parties and then disseminated by the World Heritage Centre on demand without further approval from States Parties
- Texts and images for World Heritage communications and promotional products are reviewed and approved in writing by States Parties, with respect to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories, before authorization is granted to use the emblem
- The choice of external partners to sponsor communications and promotional products follows annex 5 of the UNESCO Internal Guidelines and requires the States Parties' approval; doubtful cases are referred to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee

Recommendation II

The World Heritage Committee should review and approve a strategic plan for communications and promotion activity, including target markets, anticipated reach, cost implications (including potential for cost recovery) and performance measures. Performance against this plan should be reviewed annually and adjustments made as required. The Committee should evaluate periodically the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.

Recommendation III

A Business Case for the quarterly *World Heritage Review* should be tabled for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, since it has never received formal approval. The Business Case should include information on circulation, readership, quality, sustainability, cost (financial and staff time), policy on corporate sponsorship and options.

III. MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND FINANCIAL AUDIT**A. Management Review**

53. The Delegate of France presented the first part of the discussion paper which had been prepared by France and Italy. He stated that no new recommendations had been added, but an analysis of the Report of the External Auditor had been made:
- The functioning of the WHC, which has been itemised in three categories;
 - The technical capacities of the WHC;
 - Human Resource management.
54. The French Delegate commented that the Report was extremely thorough and dealt with many day-to-day difficulties at the Centre. Yet he recalled that the World Heritage Committee, convened in Naples in December 1997, held the view that the auditors had gone beyond their terms of reference in expecting the role of the World Heritage Committee and Centre to be redefined. On this point several Delegates insisted that it was equally important for the Management Review to have considered and commented on the role of the Committee and of the Centre.
55. The French Delegate added that the Centre is the Secretariat of the World Heritage Convention; it is its Executive Body. It was the Centre's relation with other bodies within UNESCO that had to be defined. He noted that there was need for World Heritage Centre activities to be better defined, for indicators to be used to measure performance, for respect for and complete follow-up of the Committee's decisions.
56. The French Delegate referred to the need of strengthening the technical capacities of the Centre so as to be able to help States Parties, and to clarify its relationship with the Advisory Bodies. He noted that the Centre had been asked to be more flexible regarding the administration of International Assistance.
57. Regarding the management of human resources, the Delegate of France concluded that, once the functions of the Centre were identified, it had to have the right personnel. Hence the Centre would be able to define its own priorities.
58. The Delegate of Italy took the floor to introduce the section of the discussion paper that dealt with the Financial Audit of the World Heritage Centre. He asked on what basis does the Centre decide on financial matters. He also questioned whether the Centre should act as the Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee or perform also other activities. He appealed for some reflection to be devoted to Recommendation 5 on page 11 of the discussion paper concerning co-ordination between the Secretariat which is at the disposal of the Committee, and the other units of UNESCO responsible for activities closely connected with heritage.
59. The Delegate of Canada questioned whether some of the ambiguities presented could be clarified by the Committee. The Delegate of France thought that the Financial Audit took up issues which the Committee should deal with. He pointed out that the Audit had shown that there was a technical and administrative tool which was in difficulty.
60. The Delegate of Italy interpreted these difficulties as being caused by the dual role of the Centre. It was important to find the most efficient way of co-ordinating the Convention and the General Conference. It was necessary to distinguish between the General Conference and the Committee.

61. The Delegate of Canada asked the Director of the Centre whether the responsibility of intangible heritage was being passed on from UNESCO to the World Heritage Centre. The Director explained that this was not the case.
62. The Director noted that there was still room for improvement in the co-ordination mechanism with other Conventions such as the Hague Convention on the protection of cultural property during armed conflict, the negotiations for the Convention on the Protection of the underwater heritage, or the Convention on Illicit Traffic of cultural property. Such co-ordination requires greater legal support. There are various rules governing sites of remembrance and historical sites, but there is nothing for Industrial Architecture yet. The Centre would benefit from additional legal advisors. The Director commented that, the Centre should remain in its original form while consolidating itself so as to compensate for its shortcomings.
63. The Chairperson called for synergy and co-ordination. It has become essential to establish whether the Centre is the World Heritage Centre or a World Culture Centre; whether it is the Secretariat of the Convention or a legal institution. The Centre should not work at cross-purposes with what is going on elsewhere.
64. The Delegate of Italy was quite eager on how to articulate the work of the Centre with other Conventions, as long as things were clear. He accepted that the Centre needs a more flexible structure as long as it would not become unduly diversified. However, he envisaged the future action of the Centre as depending on the Director-General's response.
65. The members of the French Delegation stated that the Centre had worked on all the issues raised by the Audit. They said that, in preparing the discussion paper, the Director of the Centre had responded to each comment raised by the Audit. So they proposed that the recommendations they were forwarding be sent to the Bureau.
66. The Delegate of Italy clarified that the proposal was about two issues: the functional relations of the Centre with other bodies within UNESCO, and the terms of reference of the Convention.
67. The Chairperson commented that the main issues appearing on pages 10 and 11 of the discussion paper had been clearly identified in Naples and that the proposed recommendations were precise solutions to those issues.
68. The Delegate of Italy held however, that the wording should be changed to: **“The Director-General should make recommendations or proposals as regards amounts allotted to the World Heritage Fund under Article 15 of the Convention.”** The General Conference could then give indications as to how the money should be used.
69. The Ambassador of Benin asked why should the Director-General decide the amounts to be allotted to the World Heritage Fund once the amount had already been listed in the C/5 (Programme and Budget of the Organisation). Furthermore, UNESCO's contribution is not the only contribution.

70. The Director of the Centre stated that, since the World Heritage Committee comprised many countries that were on the Executive Board, they themselves could help to harmonise the planning of World Heritage activities in UNESCO.
71. The Delegate of Australia stressed that the functions of the Centre should not be diluted for there were still sites which nobody was taking care of and which were to be identified and managed. The Centre had been bringing up issues on natural and cultural heritage in Africa, Asia and the Pacific. Review and monitoring should follow so as not to lose what has already been achieved. She invited the Consultative Body to approve the first Recommendation dealing with the functioning of the Centre.
72. The Delegate of France pointed out that these recommendations were meant for the Committee to approve and pass on to the Director-General of UNESCO. The Director-General should produce a clear statement to define the role of the Centre which would, in turn, be submitted for approval by the signatories to the Convention. Financial mechanisms had to be clearly identified, according to the French Delegate, so as to be approved by the General Assembly of States Parties.
73. The Ambassador of Benin commended the views expressed by the French Delegate which in his opinion were very relevant. He added that the Centre had a Secretariat which was fulfilling very important tasks. It had to state what these tasks were.
74. The Delegate of Lebanon pointed out that the Centre was accountable to UNESCO and is in no way independent of UNESCO.
75. The Chairperson noted that the response from the Director-General would depend on the way in which questions were framed. He called for the avoidance of friction. Questions should be practical; in the light of what actually happens. He admitted that there had been ambiguities relating to the status of the Centre. So he suggested a very pragmatic approach. He proposed to include the phrase: **“In the light of the ambiguities raised in the past five years .”**
76. The Delegate of France pointed out that, notwithstanding the fact that Article 14 of the Convention stated that the World Heritage Centre was appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO, the Audit still stated that tasks overlapped. The Delegate of Italy confirmed the French Delegate’s views regarding resource management.
77. The Delegate of Australia proposed to endorse the straightforward Recommendations 1 and 2 and not to endorse for the moment Recommendation 3. This proposal was seconded by Benin and both Recommendations 1 and 2 were approved.

78. Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the Management Review

That a detailed internal UNESCO document be prepared and submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee that:-

- defines the tasks of the world Heritage Centre;
- defines the modalities of co-ordination of the other sectors of UNESCO.

79. Recommendation 1: Verification of the content of each nomination file

As the Operational Guidelines clearly state, it is the responsibility of the WHC staff to check the content of the files in order to assist the States Parties, while preserving the neutrality of the Secretariat.

The technical capacity of the WHC to ensure this function will strengthen its image as a structure in the service of the Parties, while allowing the ICOMOS and IUCN experts to concentrate on evaluating the properties as soon as the inscription files are received.

80. Recommendation 2: Evaluation of the properties

Together with the advisory bodies responsible for evaluating the nominations (ICOMOS and IUCN), the WHC will define clear rules governing their collaboration in order to further involve the Centre's staff in the procedure, with a view to providing better information to the Committee and assistance to the Parties.

The Delegate of Lebanon rejected completely references to "flexibility" in the allocation of international assistance and to "external experts" contained in Recommendation 3. The Chairperson asked for a firmer stance on this point, declaring if necessary, that the Consultative Body wanted to stop here. The Delegate of France felt that flexibility already existed.

81. Recommendation 3: International Assistance

The Consultative Body decided not to approve the Management Review recommendation concerning the use of external expertise or the allocation of funds for International Assistance and an external evaluation of the appropriateness and impact of the assistance provided.

82. The Consultative Body moved on to discuss the monitoring of sites. The Delegate of the United States of America asked whether, this recommendation would be in conflict with the request made by the General Assembly of States Parties in October for monitoring to be within the domain of States Parties.

83. For this reason the Chairperson proposed to include reference to the sovereignty of States Parties. Following this suggestion, the Delegate of Australia proposed the following version: "*.....will allow the Centre to co-ordinate the preparation of concise, thematic monitoring reports on the state of the properties by the relevant States Parties.*" The Chairperson felt that this version reflected perfectly what the Consultative Body wanted to express. This proposal was approved.

84. Recommendation 4: Monitoring of sites

As the Audit proposes, the Centre could strengthen its competency in this domain - systematic and reactive monitoring - (Recom. 72 and following), while respecting the sovereignty of States Parties, particularly in view of the decision of the General Assembly of States Parties for the monitoring of sites.

The draft for the periodic reporting requested in Naples, on harmonising the reporting (and the frequency of the reports) will allow the Centre to co-ordinate the preparation

of concise, thematic monitoring reports on the state of the properties by the relevant States Parties.

85. The Consultative Body then proceeded to discuss the proposed recommendation on the promotion and information to the public. The Director of the Centre pointed out that the term in the French text that could be translated as “*profitability*” does not make sense in educational matters. So he proposed “*efficiency*” or “*effectiveness*” instead. The Ambassador of Benin shared the same view. The Delegate of the United States of America pointed out that “*cost-effectiveness*” in the English version does not connote profitability, but instead refers to measurement standards.
86. The Delegate of Lebanon proposed: “*to periodically assess the performance in the field of education.*” He urged the Consultative Body to give some thought to the methodology of assessment. The Chairperson found it very important to establish this principle of evaluation.
87. The Director of the Centre declared that assessment was only possible once objectives, both quantitative and qualitative, were established. Only planning could lead to assessment. So one should also speak of the quality of planning. The Director concluded that the actions of the Centre had not always been targeted well enough.
88. The Delegate of Mexico pointed out that Recommendation II of the paper prepared by Canada and which had already been approved, spoke of planning and periodic evaluation and assessment of Communications and promotion. The Chairperson therefore proposed to make reference to Canada’s paper in this recommendation. This proposal was approved.

89. Recommendation 5: Promotion and information to the public

- to control the quality of information with UNESCO’s competent services,
- to harmonise this information with the States Parties,
- to evaluate periodically its information and education activities.

The Consultative Body noted that this recommendation should be viewed with reference to Recommendation II in section II above (Communications and Promotion).

The Consultative Body then proceeded to discuss Human Resource Management. The Delegate of the United States of America asked whether there were any provisions for the Centre to hire additional staff in certain circumstances. The Delegate of Italy saw that the wording of the recommendation did not exclude this possibility. The Italian Delegate said that the main idea behind this recommendation is to create a clearer human resource structure. To the proposal of the Lebanese Delegate for an additional provision in this respect, the Italian Delegate suggested to add that new staff could be obtained “through” or “from” UNESCO.

90. Recommendation 6: Human resource management and organisation of the World Heritage Centre (Recom. 164-174)

The World Heritage Centre must:

- ensure that all the permanent posts are clearly identified with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public.
- fill all the permanent posts:

With regard to temporary assistance, the Audit noted a strong recourse to supernumeraries and contractual consultants, who in some cases have assumed the functions of permanent staff.

However, if the tasks are clearly defined and distributed amongst the permanent staff and if the posts are filled rapidly, there will be a correspondence between the objectives of the centre and the tasks that are assigned to it.

If, in addition to associate experts made available through agreements, the Centre feels the need to recruit temporary staff for permanent tasks, it will be necessary to either review the job descriptions and distribution of tasks, or obtain additional permanent staff, which, under the present circumstances is not authorised by UNESCO.

B. Financial Audit

91. The Director of the Centre introduced Mrs Josette Erfan who had been appointed Administrator of the Centre in September 1997. He said that she had already obtained very positive results in carrying out the recommendations of the Financial Audit.
92. The Delegate of France presented the second part of the discussion paper prepared by Italy and France. He recalled that the Financial Audit had been examined by the Bureau during its meeting in June 1997, and that the Bureau had adopted the recommendations of the Consultative Body on the financial management contained in Annex VIII, 4. This Report also contained the response of the Director-General of UNESCO to the recommendations of the Financial Audit. The Bureau in particular had requested the World Heritage Centre to set up control procedures with regard to financial activities in accordance with the recommendations of the Auditor General.
93. The French Delegate also put forward a proposal to the Committee to request the Director of the World Heritage Centre to respond (as had been proposed in the case of the Management Audit), item by item to the recommendations of the Financial Audit, and in particular, to the more relevant items. The Chairperson proposed that the recommendations demand precise and urgent responses.
94. The Director of the Centre circulated a synoptic table showing point by point the implementation of the External Auditor's recommendations to date (see List of Documents in Annex III). He noted that in both audits the common denominator had been the need for improvement in the information management system. He proposed the establishment of a biennial planning and financial period for the Committee in line with that of UNESCO. This had been one of the recommendations of the Management Review. He suggested that plans be prepared and approved by the Committee a year in advance, so that planning by UNESCO would then reflect the wishes of the Committee.

Streamlining, according to the Director of the Centre, would eliminate political difficulties.

95. The Chairperson recalled that the past had witnessed some confusion of roles. In attempting to move forward, roles have to be clarified, in a spirit of participation and not of conflict.
96. The Delegate of Canada asked for clarification on whether UNESCO's contribution to the World Heritage Centre included salaries. The Delegate of Italy said that expenditure on personnel was listed in the budget of UNESCO.
97. The Canadian Delegate analysed the topic of finance as a very complex one. She invited the Consultative Body to study it but not to adopt recommendations right away. The Chairperson suggested the setting up of a group made up of the Director of the Centre, together with the Italian and the French Delegations, to formulate a better recommendation.
98. The Director of the Centre suggested that this recommendation should state the determination of both the Consultative Body and the Committee to clarify roles and create streamlining.
99. The Chairperson made the point that much of the implementation of the Convention depended on the financial situation. The problem existed, that is why it had been forwarded to the Consultative Body for consideration.
100. The Ambassador of Benin said that, according to Article 15, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the whole of UNESCO's contribution to the World Heritage Fund was earmarked for the protection of World Heritage. The Chairperson asked, therefore, which were the activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre that did not fall within World Heritage protection.
101. The Director of the Centre answered that there were many types of general expenses related to the overall functioning of the World Heritage statutory bodies and its Secretariat which are only indirectly linked to World Heritage protection but which are indispensable to backstop such protection. According to the Director of the Centre, the World Heritage Fund should not be used to fund the Secretariat.
102. The Delegate of Mexico noted that last year US\$ 4 million had to go mainly for services rendered by the Centre, while another US\$ 4 million went into the World Heritage Fund to be managed by the World Heritage Committee. If money from extra-budgetary sources had gone into the World Heritage Fund, it would have been all clear and there would have been no point in having a recommendation on this question. The Delegate of Lebanon asked what happened to income resulting from, for example, promotion.
103. The Delegate of France explained that what was being discussed was in view of what had been said in the Audit. The Consultative Body was fulfilling a task resulting from the Audit Report with which it was stuck.
104. Regarding the utilisation of funds, the Deputy Director of the Centre explained that, According to Article 15, paragraph 4 of the Convention, it depended on the decisions of

the Committee or the General Assembly of States Parties. The Chairperson agreed. Therefore the principle had to be re-stated that, once a budget is given, its spending should depend on decisions taken by the General Assembly of States Parties or by the Committee. The Delegate of Lebanon proposed putting what the Chairperson had said in writing.

105. The Director of the Centre explained that some States Parties make their major contribution towards the conservation of specific sites by contributing through Funds in Trust arrangements in preference to making contributions to the World Heritage Fund. This is despite the fact that contributions to the Fund may avoid payment of 13% overhead costs to UNESCO. He stated that it would be in the interests of the Committee to encourage use of the World Heritage Fund by States Parties for multi-lateral support.
106. The Delegate of Mexico questioned why should a State Party spending money on its sites pass that same money through the World Heritage Fund. He was of the opinion that such a debate should only be made in relation to money coming from promotional activity. The Chairperson answered that duplication of efforts and competition might however result.
107. The Delegate of the United States of America noted that there was no consensus. So the Consultative Body should give more time to the whole question and postpone it. The Chairperson agreed as long as the report would highlight the different points of view. In this connection, the Delegate of Japan recalled that its delegate had stated clearly in Naples: that Japan is opposed to the idea that all financial contributions concerning the activities related to cultural heritage be credited to the World Heritage Fund and be submitted for the approval of the Committee. Funds-in-Trust of the States Parties, other than those provided to the World Heritage Centre, should not be restricted by the Committee.
108. The Delegate of Italy proposed asking the Director-General of UNESCO to apply what was laid down in the Convention.
109. The Delegate of France concluded that the key-point of the Audit was that there were too many ambiguities. He suggested asking delegations to come up with proposals in June and formulate a more precise text which would be submitted to the Bureau. The problem had been identified. The principle was that there must be a clearer definition of funds.

110. Recommendation of the Consultative Body

*

The Consultative Body unanimously adopted part of the following recommendation prepared by Italy and France:

* *The following text was extensively discussed but did not find consensus:*
 «The Consultative Body proposes that the World Heritage Committee adopt the following recommendations :
 In view of Article 15, para. 3, al. (b)(ii) and Article 14 of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Committee :
Recommends to the Director-General of UNESCO that all financial contributions concerning the activities related to cultural heritage be credited to the World Heritage Fund and that the global amount of these contributions be submitted for the approval of the General Conference as of its thirtieth session. Furthermore, this amount should be accompanied by the recommendations of the Committee regarding the activities to be undertaken».

The Consultative Body,

Sharing the view that ambiguities exist in the way in which decisions were adopted and applied, on the use of the funds related to the programme and projects relevant to the 1972 Convention.

Reaffirm that this concern should form the subject of an urgent and scrupulous examination.

*Noted the first part of the recommendation formulated by Italy and France *, which, although useful, requires a careful review, asks Italy and France, in co-operation with other members of the Consultative Body, to continue their efforts to present to the next session of the Bureau a text that would be more likely to reach consensus.*

Furthermore, the Consultative Body approved a second part of the Italian/French recommendation by consensus, as follows:

«Recommends to the Director-General to clearly redefine :

- *the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention ;*
- *the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialised sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage ;*
- *the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre*

This clarification should concern the administrative and scientific tasks as well as the financial activities.

The document prepared by the Director-General is submitted for approval by the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention».

111. The Delegate of Australia reminded the Consultative Body that the Auditors had also offered a number of recommendations in relation to the World Heritage Committee (see Annex VII, page 4 of the Report of the twenty-first session of the Bureau June 1997), and requested that the Consultative Body examine those recommendations at a future meeting. The Delegate of Canada supported this proposal.

112. Recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the Financial Audit

“BACKGROUND

The Financial Audit was examined by the Bureau during its meeting in June 1997, and the Bureau adopted (cf. its Report) the recommendations of the Consultative Body on the financial management contained in Annex VIII.4. This Report also contained the Director-General of UNESCO's response to the recommendations of the Financial Audit.

The Bureau in particular requested the World Heritage Centre to set up control procedures with regard to financial activities in accordance with the recommendations of the Auditor General.

The Committee may request the Director of the World Heritage Centre to respond (as was proposed for the Management Audit) item by item to the recommendations of the Financial Audit and more particularly to the following items:

- **General recommendations**

Ensure optimal co-ordination between the Bureau of the Comptroller and the Secretariat of the World Heritage Centre in the preparation of financial information on the World Heritage Fund, notably the:

- elaboration of a **detailed accounting table for the Fund**,
- retaining, in the accounting records, detailed justification of the financial activities relating to funds, at all stages of the accounting procedure, in order to provide a record of expenses and income, thus allowing a regular control (unless it is confirmed that, in principle, all resources intended for the protection of World Heritage are paid into the Fund).

- **Rules pertaining to the disbursement of funds:**

- each WHC contract must contain a clause clearly defining its duration, the manner in which the **income or expenses are divided between the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and other funds-in-trust**;
- the WHC should establish written **guidelines** to assist the administrative personnel in determining how the costs should be **divided** between the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and other funds-in-trust;
- the accounting of obligated expenses relating to the World Heritage Fund must be **recorded** in the accounts of the Fund and not in those of the UNESCO Regular Programme or other funds-in-trust;
- if, for exceptional reasons, obligated expenses have to be recorded under the UNESCO Regular Programme to be later transferred to the accounts of the World Heritage Fund, an account record must clearly mention the expenses obligated in this instance;
- each project depending upon the Fund must have a separate financial code. The overall coding structure must be in conformity with the Work Plans of the Fund.

- **Expected income**

The WHC must improve its system for the identification of expected income so as to ensure that the income is deposited rapidly and that the Treasury Division of the Bureau of the Comptroller is provided with the requisite information on expected

income, the expected date of receipt and the financial codes to be used for the funds.

- **Unliquidated funds**

They must be analysed regularly throughout the year. Adjustments must be made on a regular basis for those obligations which no longer represent legal valid obligations.

In general, the Centre must improve the quality of the information provided to the World Heritage Committee through the provision of full explanations which justify the financial proposals for each budgetary line which allow comparison with the figures of the preceding year, and to be able to make an evaluation concerning the activities undertaken.

It should be recalled that, in conformity with Article 4 of the Financial Rules of the World Heritage Fund, the resources of the Fund (of all nature) can only be used for **activities defined by the Committee.**

The UNESCO Rules of Procedure, concerning external revenue from the private sector, must apply to resources received in this manner in the frame of the World Heritage Fund.

- **General conclusions of the two Audits**

The Consultative Body decided to approve the above-mentioned recommendations, and requests the Committee to adopt them and obtain their recognition by the Director of the WHC and their implementation by the Director-General.”

THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM AND FUND-RAISING

Use of the World Heritage Emblem

113. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Delegate of the United States of America who summarised the contents of the discussion paper on guidelines and principles governing the use of the World Heritage Emblem which had been jointly prepared by Japan and the United States of America.
114. The Chair then gave the floor to the Japanese Delegate who made no further comment on the contents of the paper but stressed the importance of two major aspects:-
 - Authority,
 - Quality Control.
115. The Delegate of Germany expressed concern regarding the issue of authority, specifying that responsible national authorities needed to be identified. He suggested identifying a national authority as the focal point for site management and another authority for

promotional activities. However, the German Delegate specified that Federal governments require the national authorities responsible for decision making to have a specific legal basis supporting their decisions.

116. The Chairperson proposed having the Emblem registered at least with the World Intellectual Property in order to control its illegal market.
117. The Director of the World Heritage Centre had already drawn the attention of the Consultative Body to the fact that the World Heritage Emblem was a very precious commodity and that the problem was that of managing such a commodity. He assured that all producers of multi-media material asked permission for the use of the Emblem. However, since the Committee had never devised ways of protecting it, unauthorised promotional use of the Emblem takes place, except in Canada and in the United States of America. The Director felt that this problem has to be submitted to a legal advisor. He asked the Consultative Body to formulate the principles and to harmonise them within the context of UNESCO.
118. The Chairperson gave a brief summary of the background and legal status of the World Heritage Emblem, noting that the Emblem is the property of the World Heritage Convention and that the Director-General of UNESCO is a trustee. In registering the World Heritage Emblem, the Director-General was acting on behalf of the Convention to protect the Emblem.
119. The Chairperson also stressed the need for national authorities to be contacted to ensure the controlled use of the Emblem. He said that the new guidelines proposed by Japan and the United States of America would provide a basis for a contractual arrangement.
120. The Delegate of Zimbabwe raised two points:
 1. whether the recommendations contained in the proposed document, if adopted, will be retrospective;
 2. regarding Article 7 of the proposed Guiding Principles, whether the use of the Emblem would be allowed to appear together with the logo of another commercial entity on a particular World Heritage Site as a means of recognising the financial contribution of that commercial entity to the site.
121. The Chairperson confirmed that such recommendations were not retrospective unless specifically requested.
122. Regarding the second point raised by the Delegate of Zimbabwe, the Delegate of Canada explained that logos and emblems other than their own could be used by World Heritage sites to recognise a partnership for a specific project. However, it is not legitimate for commercial entities to use the World Heritage Emblem directly on their own material, advertising their support for World Heritage.
123. The Ambassador of Benin proposed the following amendments:

1. to include the word “*scientific*” together with “*educational, cultural, or artistic value*” in Article 2 of the proposed “Guiding Principles for the authorisation of the use of the Emblem”;
 2. to remove the word “*free*” from Article 7, paragraph 2, which would otherwise create a contradiction. Both these amendments were approved.
124. The Delegate of Canada noted that the proposed document discussed restrictions on the use of the World Heritage Emblem, but made no comments or recommendations to enforce the use of the same Emblem for projects that have been already approved and adopted, in order to promote the Convention.
 125. The Chairperson asked Japan and the United States of America to draft a new recommendation to this effect. Both Delegations agreed.
 126. The Ambassador of Benin expressed his concern about the control of the quality of promotional material in the case of States Parties who have no operating National Commissions.
 127. The Chairperson recommended that all State Parties should identify a national authority to validate the content and quality of promotional material and that a list of these responsible bodies be published. He also proposed that the fourth paragraph of the “Summary of recommendations” should reflect the different types of authorities a State Party could identify.
 128. The Delegate of Lebanon asked for a clarification of the term “third parties” in Article 5 of the proposed “Guiding Principles”. The Delegate of the United States of America explained that parties other than UNESCO or States Parties were considered as third parties. The Delegate of Lebanon proposed therefore that use of the Emblem by third parties should not be possible.
 129. The Delegate of the United States of America noted that only two States Parties (USA, Canada) had taken steps to protect the World Heritage Emblem from illegal use, and invited all States Parties to the Convention to take such steps.
 130. This paper was approved by the Consultative Body and its Recommendations were endorsed.

B. Fund-raising

131. The Delegate of the United States of America presented a discussion paper proposing guidelines for external funding and fund-raising which had been jointly prepared by Japan and the United States of America. He reminded the Consultative Body that its members, convened in Naples in December 1997, had agreed that the “Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in favour of UNESCO” could be recommended to the Committee in relation to fund-raising by the Centre in favour of the World Heritage Fund. However, he commented that these “Guidelines” could be further tightened.
132. The Delegate of Lebanon asked for an explanation of the term “contracting out” in Paragraph 8 on page 4 of the discussion paper. The Delegate of the United States of

America assured the Consultative Body that the term in question did not mean retraction.

133. The Delegate of Lebanon commented also that the same Paragraph 8 contained too many things. The Delegate of France held the same opinion. Moreover, while recognising the importance of regionalisation, the French Delegate questioned the reference to regional “satellite” heritage site offices in Paragraph 8. He held that if the financial structure were to become regionalised, difficulties would surely arise.
134. The Delegate of the United States of America explained that Paragraph 8 had not been intended as a Recommendation. In fact the “Summary Recommendation” included only Paragraphs 1, 2, and 6.
135. The Delegate of Italy said that the Bureau or the Committee could think about the options offered in Paragraph 8. However, he warned that one should be careful about “regional”, especially in the French text.
136. The Delegate of Canada proposed deleting the options contained in Paragraph 8. This proposal was accepted.
137. The Delegate of Lebanon proposed replacing “...that need to be evaluated” with “...*that need to be investigated more thoroughly*”.

138. Recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund Raising

Whilst the guidelines concerning the use of the emblem, quality control and Fund Raising were endorsed in-principle, the Delegates of Japan and the United States of America proposed to amend them, in co-operation with the Centre, to reflect the decisions reached in the discussions. The amended guidelines will be prepared for the World Heritage Bureau prior to submission to the Committee.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

139. In concluding the meeting, the Chairperson noted that due to the very intense pace of the work of the Consultative Body over the previous two days, the draft Report of the Rapporteur distributed in English at the end of the meeting would require a lot of amendments. It was agreed that the Centre, working with the Rapporteur, would work to finalise the report and send it to all members of the Consultative Body for their approval as soon as possible.
140. The Delegate of Japan asked about the future of the Consultative Body – would it meet in Kyoto at the time of the twenty second session of the World Heritage Committee? The Chairperson indicated that this would not be necessary unless a decision to this effect were adopted at the Bureau meeting in June.
141. The Delegate of Australia thanked the Rapporteur for his work and the Delegate of the United States of America thanked the Chairperson and the World Heritage Centre.
142. Finally, the Director of the World Heritage Centre thanked the Consultative Body for their work and noted that the Centre would follow-up on its decisions to the extent possible.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Meeting of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room IX (Fontenoy) 29-30 April 1998

ITALY

Professor Francesco FRANCIONI (Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
Professor of International Law and of the Consultative Body)
Siena University
Piazza S. Francesco
SIENA
Italy
Phone: 39 577 29 83 51
Fax: 39 577 29 82 02
Email: FRANCIONI@unisi.it

Monsieur Giovanni ARMENTO
Attaché pour les affaires financières et administratives
Délégation permanente d'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO

Madame le Conseiller Lucia FIORI
Bureau de la Coopération Culturelle Internationale
Direction générale des relations culturelles
Ministère italien des Affaires Etrangères

AUSTRALIA

Ms Sharon SULLIVAN
First Assistant Secretary
Australian and World Heritage Group
Environment Australia
GPO Box 1567
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Australia
Phone: 61 2 6217 2111
Fax: 61 2 6217 2000
Email: sharon.sullivan@dest.gov.au

Mr David WALKER
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO
UNESCO House
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
France
Phone: 01 40 59 33 40
Fax: 01 40 59 33 53
Email: david.walker@dfat.gov.au

BENIN

His Excellency Mr Nouréini TIDJANI-SERPOS
Ambassador and Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Benin to UNESCO
UNESCO House
1 rue Miollis
75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
France
Phone: 01 45 68 30 62
Fax: 01 43 06 15 55

Mr. Isidore MONSI
Premier Conseiller
Permanent Delegation of Benin to UNESCO

CANADA

Gisele CANTIN
Chef, International Affairs
Parks Canada
Department of Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy Street
HULL QUEBEC KIA OM5
Canada
Phone: 1 (819) 994 50 97
Fax: 1 (819) 953 59 74
Email: gisele_cantin@pch.gc.ca

FRANCE

M. Alain MEGRET
 Directeur adjoint
 Direction de la Nature et des Paysages
 Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire de de l'Environnement
 20 Avenue de Ségur
 75302 PARIS 07 SP
 France
 Phone: 01 42 19 19 02
 Fax 01 42 19 19 77

His Excellency Mr. Jean MUSITELLI
 Ambassador Permanent Delegate
 Permanent Delegation of France to UNESCO
 UNESCO House
 1 rue Miollis
 75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
 France
 Phone: 01 45 68 35 47/48/49
 Fax: 01 47 34 55 05

Mme Aimée DUBOS
 Adjoint au Sous-Directeur des monuments Historiques
 Direction du Patrimoine
 Ministère de la Culture
 3, rue de Valois
 PARIS 75001
 France
 Phone: 01 40 15 82 46

GERMANY

Mr Henrik WASSERMANN
 Federal Foreign Office
 BONN
 Germany

His Excellency Mr. Christoph DERIX
 Ambassador and Permanent Delegate
 Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO
 UNESCO House
 1 rue Miollis
 75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
 France
 Phone: 01 53 83 46 60
 Fax: 01 53 83 46 67

GREECE

Mme Hélène METHODIOU
Conseiller pour la Culture
Délégation de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
France
Phone: 01 45 08 29 85

JAPAN

Mr Tomoyuki ONO
Attaché
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO
UNESCO House
1 rue Miollis
75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
France
Phone: 01 45 68 34 25
Fax: 01 47 34 46 70
Email: smbjpune@micronet.fr

Mr Yuichi ISHII
Director
Multilateral Cultural Division
Ministry of foreign Affairs
Tokyo
Japan

Mrs Nobuko INABA
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Affairs
3-2-2- Kasumigoseki
Chinyadoka
Tokyo
Phone: 81 3 3581 4012
Fax: 81 3 3591 0278
Email: ninaba@bunka.go.jp

LEBANON

Mr Noël FATTAL
 Conseiller, Délégué Permanent adjoint du Liban à l'UNESCO
 1, rue Miollis
 75732 Paris Cedex 15
 France
 Phone: 01 45 68 33 72
 Fax: 01 45 67 34 88
 Email: liban01@francophonie.org
 fattal@easynet.fr

MALTA

Mr Anthony DEMICOLI
 Director of Studies
 Centre for Restoration studies
 Maltese Ministry of Education and National Culture
 FLORIANA
 Malta
 Phone: 356 24 98 78
 Fax: 356 24 98 78
 Email: anthony.demicoli@magnet.mt

MEXICO

Mr Jorge Carlos DIAZ DUERVO
 Secretario Administrativo
 National Institute of Anthropology and History
 (INAH)
 CORDOBA # 45, Col. Roma
 04700 MEXICO D.F.
 Mexico
 Email: sadmin@inah.gob.mx

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Ms Sharon CLEARY
 Chief
 Office of International Affairs
 National Parks Service
 Department of Interior
 1849 C Street, NW
 WASHINGTON, DC 20249

Unites States of America

Mr William McILHENNY
 United States Observer to UNESCO
 American Embassy to France
 PARIS
 France
 Phone: 01 43 12 20 29
 Fax: 01 42 66 97 83
 Email: bill.mcilhenny@dos.us-state.gov

ZIMBABWE

Mr Dawson MUNJERI
 Executive Director
 The National Museums and Monuments
 Penrose Hill
 107 Rotten Row
 PO Box CY 1485
 Causeway
 HARARE
 Zimbabwe
 Phone: 263 4 75 28 76
 Fax: 263 4 75 30 85 / 77 42 08
 Email: natmus@boabab.cszim.co.zw

OBSERVERS:

ECUADOR

Mr. Mauricio MONTALVO
 Délégué permanent adjoint
 Permanent Mission of Ecuador to UNESCO
 1, rue Miollis
 75732 Paris Cedex 15
 France
 Phone: 01 45 68 33 19
 Fax: 01 43 06 49 06
 Email: ecuador.dl@unesco.org

HUNGARY

Mr. Mihaly ROZSA
 Secretary General
 Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO
 H-1363 Budapest PF. 34
 Hungary
 Phone: 36 1 269 17 23
 Fax: 36 1 33 1 35 26
 Email: mihaly.rozsa@mkx4000gw.itb.hu

Ms. Marta SZABO
Counsellor/Observer
Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO
H-1363 Budapest PF. 34
Hungary
Phone: 36 1 269 17 23
Fax: 36 1 33 1 35 26
Email: mihaly.rozsa@mkkm.x4000gw.itb.hu

WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE

Bernd VON DROSTE
Director
World Heritage Centre

Josette ERFAN
Leonie KERINS
David MARTEL
Joanna SULLIVAN
Sarah TITCHEN
Minja YANG
Georges ZOUAIN

World Heritage Centre
7, Place de Fontenoy
75352 PARIS 07 SP
France

Phone: 01 45 68 1571
Fax: 01 45 68 55 70

AGENDA

Meeting of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room IX (Fontenoy) 29-30 April 1998

Wednesday 29 April 1998

10.00 - 11.00 Opening of meeting

- Welcome and introduction by Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Professor F. Francioni
- Adoption of the Agenda
- Election of Rapporteur(s)
- General discussion

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee Break

11.30 - 13.00 Technical Issues

- Brief outline of Background Paper
- Discussion
- Recommendations to the World Heritage Committee

13.00 - 15.00 Lunch

15.00 - 16.30 Communications and Promotion

- Brief outline of Background Paper
- Discussion
- Recommendations to the World Heritage Committee

16.30 – 17.00 Coffee Break

17.00 - 18.00 Examination of the Management Review Report

- Brief outline of Background Paper

- Discussion

18.00**Cocktail**

To be hosted by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Bernd von Droste (Venue: Room 217, Building III)

Thursday 30 April 1998**10.00 - 11.00****Examination of the Management Review Report
(continued)**

- Discussion (continued)
- Recommendations to the World Heritage Committee

11.00 - 11.30**Coffee Break****11.30 - 13.00****Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines**

- Brief outline of Background Paper
- Discussion
- Recommendations to the World Heritage Committee

13.00 - 15.00**Lunch****15.00 - 16.30****Overview of recommendations to be presented to the World Heritage Committee****16.30 - 17.00****Coffee Break****17.00 - 18.00****Closing session**

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Meeting of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room IX (Fontenoy) 29-30 April 1998

Discussion papers

Provisional Agenda

Agenda Item 1: Technical Issues

Discussion paper prepared by Sharon Sullivan, Australia

The question of authenticity in relation to the restoration of ancient Greek monuments, especially the current restoration work on the monuments of the Athenian Acropolis. Paper prepared by the Delegation of Greece.

Set of documents circulated by Sharon Sullivan (Australia) to members of the Technical Issues group of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee

Agenda Item 2: Communications and Promotion

Discussion paper prepared by Christina Cameron, Canada

Agenda Item 3: Examination of the Management Review Report

Document de travail pour soumission à l'organe consultatif du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Réunion des 29 et 30 avril 1998, Paris, UNESCO. Italie-France

Working Document for submission to the meeting of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee, 29 - 30 April 1998, Paris, UNESCO. Italy-France

Agenda Item 4: Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising

Guidelines

Proposed Guidelines for Use of the World Heritage Emblem. A Discussion paper submitted to the Consultative Body to the World Heritage Committee by Japan and the United States of America

Directives proposées pour le financement extérieur et les appels de fonds. Document de travail présenté à l'organe consultatif du comité du patrimoine mondial par le Japon et les États-Unis

Proposed guidelines for External Funding and Fund-Raising. A Discussion paper submitted to the Consultative Body to the World Heritage Committee by Japan and the United States of America

Directives proposées pour l'utilisation de l'emblème du patrimoine mondial. Document de travail présenté à l'organe consultatif du comité du patrimoine mondial par le Japon et les Etats-Unis

Background documents

1992

DG/Note/92/13
30 April 1992

Establishment of a "UNESCO World Heritage Centre"

Création du "Centre de l'UNESCO pour le patrimoine mondial"

1993

Extract of
the Report of the seventeenth session of the World
Heritage Committee, December 1993. Section VII
"MANAGEMENT, ADMINISTRATION AND
STAFFING OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE"

Extrait du Report de la dix-septième session du comité
du patrimoine mondial, décembre 1993. Section VII
"GESTION, ADMINISTRATION ET RESSOURCES
EN PERSONNEL DU CENTRE DU PATRIMOINE
MONDIAL"

1996

WHC-96/CONF.201/21

Report of the twentieth session of the World Heritage
Committee, Merida, Mexico 2-7 December 1996
(see Section XIII.12, "Management Review of the World
Heritage Centre ")

1997

WHC-97/CONF.204/11

Report of the twenty-first session of the Bureau of the
World Heritage Committee, Paris, 23-28 June 1997
(see Section VII, Progress report by the Consultative
Body; Annex VIII.1, Report of the External Auditor;
Annex VIII.2, Written comments of the Director-
General of UNESCO; Annex VIII.3, Report of meeting
of Consultative Body, 1 - 2 April, 1997; Annex VIII.4 ,
Report of meeting of Consultative Body, 20 June 1997)

WHC-97/CONF.208/5

Report of the work of the Committee's Consultative
Body on the overall management and financial review of
the administration of the World Heritage Convention

WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.17 Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO, and Content Validation and Quality Guidelines

1998

Draft Report of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, 25-29 March 1998, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Examples of project proposals involving the use of the World Heritage Emblem presented to the World Heritage Centre in 1997 & 1998

Report of Findings: Expert Group Review of the World Heritage Centre Data and Information Infrastructure

External Auditor recommendations following the financial audit of the WHC, DG comments and Actions taken or to be undertaken

Recommendations de l'Audit financier du CPM, réponse du DG et actions à entreprendre