

Distribution limited

WHC-99/CONF.209/16  
Paris, 21 October 1999  
Original :French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-third session  
Marrakesh, Morocco  
29 November – 4 December 1999

**Item 12 of the Provisional Agenda : Evaluation of International Assistance :  
Examination of the recommendations of the twenty-third session of the Bureau  
of the World Heritage Committee concerning prioritization in granting  
International Assistance to States Parties**

## SUMMARY

Following the approval of the Bureau at its twenty-third session (July 1999), the World Heritage Centre and the Central Programme Evaluation Unit (BPE/UCE) proceeded with an evaluation of international assistance. A limited tender was launched and a consultant company selected. This document presents the progress of the work since the Bureau session in July 1999 and the programme of the evaluation process.

**Decision required :** The Committee may wish to take note of the progress made and decide to allocate an amount of US\$ 40,000 (forty thousand US dollars) within the framework of the 2000 budget of the World Heritage Fund in order that impact studies may be carried out.

## *Evaluation of international assistance - progress report*

1. During its twenty-second session (Kyoto, Japan, 30 November-5 December 1998) and in the framework of the discussions on the budget and the work plan for 1999, the World Heritage Committee approved a budget of US\$ 40,000 to carry out an evaluation of international assistance. The use of this amount was submitted to the twenty-third session of the Bureau for decision on the basis of a proposal prepared by the Secretariat.
2. Prepared by the Secretariat and the Central Programme Evaluation Unit of UNESCO (BPE/UCE), the terms of reference of the evaluation were presented to and approved by the Bureau during its twenty-third session (Paris, July 1999). The revisions requested by the Bureau are reflected in the final version of the terms of reference (Annex I).
3. Based on this approval, a restricted tender was launched between July and August 1999 by the Central Evaluation Unit. A group comprising a member of the World Heritage Committee (Finland), members of the Central Evaluation Unit as well as of the World Heritage Centre, examined the proposals received and interviewed the candidates in order to take a decision. Based on this examination, the Secretariat has selected as outside consultant the 'Centre européen d'expertise en evaluation (C3E - France)' which has good experience in the field of evaluation, particularly with regard to international organizations (The World Bank, European Commission).
4. The strategy proposed by the C3E will be formative, meaning that it will involve the different parties involved (representatives of States Parties, specialists in heritage matters, beneficiaries, members of the Secretariat), throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation team will attend the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee in Marrakesh, where it will organise, parallel to the official work of the Committee, meetings and discussions with representatives of States Parties, advisory bodies, the Secretariat and all other persons concerned with international assistance. The work plan and its timetable are reproduced in Annex 2.
5. The evaluation report will be presented and discussed during the next Bureau session in June 2000. As requested by the Bureau at its twenty-third session, this report will comprise:
  - a diagnostic of the effectiveness and efficiency of international assistance;
  - a number of operational recommendations to improve it, among which a table analysing impacts.
6. The Committee may wish, at this stage, to envisage including in the budget an extension of this evaluation which would be an in-depth analysis of the impacts of international assistance. Based upon a sample of representative situations according to the region and the form of assistance, some case studies carried out in the field would provide a clear view of the effective impacts. A budget of about US\$ 40,000 should be foreseen for the year 2000.

**Annex I : Terms of reference**

***Evaluation of international assistance provided within the framework of the implementation of the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage***

At its twenty-second session, held in Kyoto (Japan) from 30 November to 5 December 1998, the World Heritage Committee decided, within the framework of the Convention, to implement an evaluation of international assistance in 1999. For this evaluation, a budget of US\$ 40,000 was approved. The utilisation of this budget was submitted to the decision of the Bureau on the basis of the present proposal prepared by the Secretariat in close collaboration with UNESCO's Central Programme Evaluation Unit (BPE/UCE).

**1. Context**

The Convention describes international assistance, its overall goals, its funding and its management principles in Articles 13 and 19 to 26. It stipulates that «the World Heritage Committee shall receive and study requests for international assistance formulated by the States Parties (...) with respect to property forming part of the cultural or natural heritage, situated in their territories, and included or potentially suitable for inclusion in the lists (...). The purpose of such requests may be to secure the protection, conservation, presentation or rehabilitation of such property. The requests (...) may also be concerned with identification of cultural or natural heritage property (...) when preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would be justified.»

International assistance, financed by the World Heritage Fund and approved by the Committee could take the following forms:

- (a) «studies concerning the artistic, scientific and technical problems raised by the protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage (...);
- (b) provision of experts, technicians and skilled labour to ensure that the approved work is correctly carried out;
- (c) training of staff and specialists at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage;
- (d) supply of equipment which the State concerned does not have or does not possess or is not in a position to acquire;
- (e) low-interest or interest-free loans which might be repayable on a long-term basis;
- (f) the granting, in exceptional cases and for special reasons, of non-repayable subsidies.»

Paragraphs 94-121 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (WHC.99/2) concern requests for international assistance. They stipulate in detail the principles and conditions for support for the five forms of assistance available:

- preparatory assistance
- emergency assistance
- training
- technical co-operation
- assistance for promotional activities.

Explicit principles also govern the priorities regarding the support for international assistance, the division between cultural and natural heritage, as well as the competence of the respective governing bodies regarding the approval of requests (a summary of these principles: cf WHC-98/CONF.203.14 Rev).

In his *Report to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Study of the Management of the World Heritage Convention* presented in November 1997, the External Auditor makes a certain number of observations and recommendations concerning international assistance (WHC-97 CONF.208/.5, Annex B, paras. 85 to 106). He states that the management of international assistance needs to be further developed and rationalised and recommends the establishment of an efficient data base within a management information system, along with an update of the *Operational Guidelines* which should be supported by a strategic overview. Outlining briefly an evaluation of the different types of international assistance, the External Auditor states that there are no satisfactory answers to the fundamental questions on the pertinence and impact of the projects supported. On this basis, he recommends that the Committee «request the Centre to carry out an external evaluation on the relevance and impact of the international assistance provided». This information, he said, «should serve as a basis for a follow-up evaluation in three years».

## 2. *Background*

After more than twenty-five years of international assistance operations, the World Heritage Committee is confronted with the following difficulty: despite the increase in the amounts allocated under Chapter III of the Fund (see table below) and the present division of amounts allocated to the activities, they are not sufficient to respond satisfactorily to the increasing number of requests. This is largely due to the greater number of sites inscribed on the List and the increasing numbers of requests submitted by States Parties.

Year	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Amounts Chapter III	\$1,380,000	\$1,352,000	\$1,410,000	\$1,945,000	\$2,440,000	\$2,626,000
Growth		-2%	+ 4%	+ 38%	+ 25%	+ 8%

Furthermore, the ponderousness and the shortcomings in the management of international assistance as revealed by the External Auditor, call for more focused strategic and operational action.

Henceforth, the evaluation exercise will be seen as an opportunity to conduct this action and to propose new directions. Rather than a summative evaluation of past activities, this evaluation will be formative, providing valuable information which will be concerned with the appraisal and improvement of the existing elements of efficiency and effectiveness in international assistance. With this in mind, the main questions will refer to:

- the goals and functions of international assistance:  
Are the expected results clear and achievable? Is the use of the amounts allocated within in the framework of international assistance well defined and known?  
In what ways do the operational results contribute towards the goals of the Convention?  
In what way are the mobilized resources in line with the overall goals?
- the existing procedures and structures:  
Are the current submission mechanisms - evaluation - approval - monitoring of requests for international assistance satisfactory, particularly with regard to the quality and the delay in processing of the requests?
- the protagonists:  
Are the roles of the different parties involved (States Parties, Committee, Bureau, Chairperson, Centre, advisory bodies, beneficiary organs) clearly defined and strictly adhered to? To what extent are these protagonists satisfied?
- the regulatory mechanisms:  
How does the submission of project accounts operate? Is there any steering by results? Under what conditions are *a priori* and *posteriori* evaluations of the activities likely to improve the quality of international assistance?
- the cost-effectiveness:  
What is the overall cost related to the management of international assistance?  
Is the current relationship between costs and services rendered the right one?

Based on a systematic approach and taking into account the current dynamics of the present situation, the evaluation will have to propose operational recommendations which will respond to the concerns of the Committee.

A more precise formulation of the questions as well as the detailed methodology, work plan and budget will be prepared jointly by the evaluation steering body and the consultants (cf. infra).

### **3. Methodology**

In order to implement this evaluation, the following will be undertaken:

- a documentary study<sup>1</sup> of a selected sample of the files of requests for international assistance presented over the last three accounting periods (approved *and* rejected requests). This examination of a limited number of cases will allow a substantial analysis of the quality of the requests and of the processing carried out by the decision-makers, to establish a relationship between the effective utilisation of the funds and the basic orientations as well as an analysis of the pertinence of emergency assistance. The documentary analysis will also be based upon the management review of the External Auditor (November 1997).
- semi-directive interviews with the people in charge of reception, processing and decision-making regarding the requests: members of the Bureau and the Committee, members of the Secretariat and members of the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM). These interviews will elucidate the principle parameters of current practice, the strengths and weaknesses and the threats to and opportunities for the current system.
- group interviews with the key people in the current system. This group work will facilitate the discovery of any dysfunction and the elaboration of solutions.
- a survey by questionnaire of a sample of beneficiaries of requests for international assistance. These outside points of view will make possible an appreciation of the degree of satisfaction with the contributions of the World Heritage Centre in the framework of international assistance.

#### **4. *Sharing of Responsibility***

The World Heritage Committee is the co-ordinator of the evaluation. Once these Terms of Reference have been approved, it will delegate this responsibility to an informal *ad hoc* steering body which will be made up of a member of the Secretariat, a representative of the Bureau and a member of UNESCO's Central Programme Evaluation Unit. The body will be open to all those members of the Committee who may wish to participate. This steering body will see to the smooth progress of the evaluation and act as an interface between the consultants and the World Heritage Centre. As such, it will make recommendations on the choice of consultants and for the precise definition of the tasks, methodology and schedule, but will have no decisional powers with regard to the content of the evaluation.

The co-ordination of the evaluation will be entrusted to a senior consultant who will be competent in, and have significant experience of programme evaluation, following organisational change and multilateral co-operation. A junior consultant, who will work continuously in Paris for a four- to five-month period, will assist him. He will be charged, under the direction of the principal evaluator, with the documentary analysis and the administration of the investigation.

#### **5. *Conditions for Realisation***

---

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to the ongoing computerisation of the dossiers, certain statistical studies will be easy to execute ; the evolution of the type of requests; the evolution of the amounts requested and allocated; the geographical distribution; the rapidity of processing of the requests, etc.

Once the Committee has approved these Terms of Reference, the evaluation can commence.

The Secretariat will give the evaluators all help necessary for the smooth progress of the evaluation: making the dossiers available, provision of a work area and computer facilities, availability, etc.

A provisional version of the evaluation report will be presented to the steering body which will consider it in the light of the quality criteria expected for this type of exercise. In particular, the operational character of the recommendations will be verified within the framework of the steering body. The final report will be presented for debate and decision to the Bureau at its twenty-fourth session.

The provisional budget breaks down as follows:

1. Documentary analysis	US\$ 8,000
2. Semi-directive interviews	US\$ 5,000
3. Group interviews	US\$ 7,500
4. Survey by questionnaire	US\$ 8,500
5. Writing of preliminary report	US\$ 5,000
6. Writing of final report	US\$ 1,500
7. Co-ordination and final presentation	US\$ 2,500
8. Miscellaneous costs	US\$ 2,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>US\$ 40,000</b>

## 7. *Provisional Timetable*

July 1999	Approval of the Terms of Reference by the Bureau
July-August 1999	Choice of consultants
September-October 1999	Documentary analysis
October-November 1999	Individual and group interviews
September-December 1999	Survey by questionnaire
January 2000	Presentation of a provisional version of the report to the steering body
February 2000	Finalization of the evaluation report
June 2000	Presentation to the Bureau for debate

**Annex 2 :Timetable and work plan**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
<b>Meetings and work</b>	O	N	N	N	N	D	D	D	D	Ja	Ja	Ja	Ja	Ja	F	F	F	F	M	M	M	M	M
1 – Documentary analysis																							
2 – Reconstitute the logic of intervention for assistance																							
3 – Describe the organisation of International Assistance																							
4- Meeting of the steering body																							
<b>Framework Note</b>																							
5 – Prepare the focus groups																							
6 –Selection of dossiers																							
7 – Interviews																							
8 –Focus Group No1 and if necessary No 2																							
9 – Analysis of information gathered																							
11 – Cross analyses to formulate conclusions																							
<b>Case Study Report</b>																							
12 – Strategic reflection or Focus Group No3 recommendations																							
13 – Formulate conclusions of this work and finalize																							
<b>Recommendation Note on the pertinence and probable impacts</b>																							
14 – Meeting to present the report to the ad hoc body																							

 Meeting  
 Document