



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

31 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-07/31.COM/14
Paris, 15 June 2007
Original: English/French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty first Session

Christchurch, New Zealand
23 June – 2 July 2007

**Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Implementation of the Global Framework
Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage**

**Implementation of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building
on Natural Heritage**

SUMMARY

This document: (1) outlines key principles for training and capacity building in relation to natural sites; (2) outlines major activities undertaken between 2005 and 2007 by IUCN in relation to training and capacity building; (3) outlines key elements in relation to fundraising for training and capacity building; and (4) includes recommendations for future actions in relation to capacity building and training for natural sites.

Draft Decision: 31 COM 14, see Point V.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The World Heritage Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) allocated an additional amount of US\$40,000 to IUCN under the World Heritage Fund to allow for the acceleration of existing activities in relation to the preparation of training manuals and support for training workshops, in addition to the development and implementation of an action plan for raising extra budgetary funds to support the implementation of natural heritage training and capacity building. Under this decision, **29 COM 10**, IUCN was asked to report on progress to the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007).

II. KEY PRINCIPLES IN RELATION TO TRAINING

2. A number of principles for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage were noted at the time of the 29th World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005). An updated list of these principles is set out below:
 - a) Capacity Development is essential for both natural and cultural World Heritage sites and should be a key priority for the World Heritage Committee. The increasing number of World Heritage properties brings with it many challenges, not the least of which is the need to strengthen the capacity of managers and management agencies responsible for natural and cultural properties;
 - b) Training is just one component of Capacity Development: training by itself cannot solve the management problems faced in natural World Heritage properties. It needs to be combined with targeted capacity building of people and institutions at different levels, and supported by communication, education and public awareness to strengthen the effective implementation of the *Convention*;
 - c) Better partnership is essential for Capacity Building for natural World Heritage properties: there are many governments and NGOs which are actively involved in capacity building and training activities in natural World Heritage properties. It is essential that these efforts are better linked and coordinated. In particular there is much greater scope for coordinating training and capacity development efforts between IUCN and ICCROM, the capacity building organization for cultural World Heritage properties;
 - d) Capacity Building must respond to the challenges of tomorrow: the challenges facing natural World Heritage properties are many and varied. There are increasingly challenges, such as Climate Change, which require new and innovative approaches to capacity development and training: a “business as usual” approach cannot continue. Managers of World Heritage properties must be equipped with the skills needed to adapt and to effectively respond to these challenges. In particular, a proactive and multi-disciplinary approach to capacity building and training is required; and

- e) Increased Financial Support for capacity building and training is essential: the challenge of capacity development requires additional support and resources. In the context of World Heritage it is essential that substantial extra-budgetary resources are secured and to adopt approaches such as those outlined in the Action Plan for Fundraising for natural sites for capacity building and training (see point 4 and Annex 2 below).

III. KEY ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO CAPACITY BUILDING AND TRAINING BY IUCN IN THE PERIOD 2005 – 2007

- 3. The 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005) allocated an additional US\$40,000 to support its efforts in capacity building and training. The following activities have been implemented by IUCN in this area since 2005:
 - a) Preparation of World Heritage Training Manuals: two training manuals have been prepared: one on the preparation of management plans for World Heritage properties and the other on the preparation of nominations for natural World Heritage properties. Copies of both manuals will be made available at the 2007 World Heritage Committee Meeting. Both manuals have been prepared through an extensive process of review and evaluation. In particular, the Management Planning Manual was extensively reviewed at a workshop on the Island of Vilm in Germany, which involved field managers from Eastern and Central Europe. This resulted in a number of changes to the final manual;
 - b) Development of an Action Plan for Fundraising for Capacity Building and Training: this is attached to this paper as Annex 2 and key points are highlighted below in Section IV;
 - c) Incorporation of World Heritage within established Training and Capacity Building activities: where possible IUCN has ensured that components relating to World Heritage have been incorporated within relevant training and capacity building meetings. These have included: (1) a workshop on the Tentative Listing of natural World Heritage sites, held at the Island of Vilm (attended by Bastian Bomhard); (2) a range of regional WCPA and IUCN workshops and meetings, including in Sabah (for southeast Asia) in April, 2007 (attended by Kari Lahti), and in Georgia (for central Asia) held in May 2007 (attended by Josephine Langley);
 - d) Support for on-going training programmes: this has included ensuring effective World Heritage input to the protected areas training course at CATIE, which covers training within the Central American region;
 - e) Ensuring that relevant projects have a clear training and capacity building component: for example, the joint IUCN and UNESCO project on Enhancing Our Heritage has focused on improving management effectiveness of 10 World Heritage properties around the world and, in particular, in applying the IUCN Management effectiveness methodology at these sites. The development of capacity of local staff and institutions has been an explicit objective of this project and has been a key reason behind the uptake and

application of the methodology by local staff within these natural World Heritage properties.

4. There have been a number of training activities undertaken within IUCN in relation to natural World Heritage properties. However, it is clear that the demand for such activities far outstrips the limited resources available to IUCN in this area. It is also clear that in many cases there are other institutions and organizations which are better placed and equipped to implement training and capacity building initiatives in natural World Heritage properties. It is thus essential that a two track approach is implemented which, on the one hand, is based on linking with and supporting other training institutions which are more directly focused on training and, on the other hand, increasing the overall level of resources available for training and capacity building.

IV. ACTION PLAN FOR FUNDRAISING FOR TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

5. As mentioned above increased fundraising is essential for Training and Capacity Building for natural World Heritage properties. Accordingly, IUCN has prepared a draft Action Plan for Fundraising for Training and Capacity Building in the context of the Global Framework Programme for Natural Heritage and this is outlined in full in Annex 2.
6. This draft Action Plan notes that there has been a recent shift to more strategic, targeted, and coordinated capacity building at the site, national, and international levels. However, to accomplish this shift, more financial resources, better co-operation among stakeholders, and sustained efforts over long periods are required. Many donors, on the other hand, continue to support only individual projects over relatively short timeframes. Thus, an important part of the strategy for capacity building has to be fundraising that will generate steady streams of funding over the long-run. This is what is needed and anything less is only a partial solution.
7. This paper outlines desired funding resources for implementing the Global Framework Programme for capacity building and training for Natural Heritage and a suggested strategy to obtain these resources. Key recommendations and strategic considerations are as follows:
 - a) Strategic Consideration 1: The Action Plan for Fundraising should have as its targets: USD 487,600 for short-term projects, which would be complemented by about USD 200,400 from the WHF; and, USD 300,000 per year for the on-going regional programmes, database, and network;
 - b) Strategic Consideration 2: Give highest priority to fundraising that will create the mechanisms for capitalising a Revolving Fund for Capacity Building;
 - c) Strategic Consideration 3: Be open to a variety of mechanisms to accommodate potential donor's preferences concerning the ways their funding is channelled, administered, allocated, and reported;

- d) Strategic Consideration 4: Launch the fundraising effort around a “Best of the Best” Campaign. Dedicate the campaign to creating partnerships for building the capacity for World Heritage to set a global standard for excellence in management.

V. Draft Decision

Draft Decision: 31 COM 14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined document WHC-07/30.COM/14,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **7 EXT.COM 11**, adopted at its 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004) and **29 COM 10**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Takes notes of the document WHC-07/30.COM/14 and, in particular, the activities undertaken from 2005 to 2007 within the Global Framework Programme for capacity building and training for Natural Heritage;*
4. *Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre in close cooperation with IUCN and ICCROM to implement the key recommendations of this document as well as the Action Plan for Fundraising for Training and Capacity Building on Natural Heritage.*

ANNEX 1 – Decision 29 COM 10: Global Training Strategy

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined document *WHC-05/29.COM/10*,
2. Recalling Decision **7 EXT.COM 11**, adopted at its 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004),
3. Notes that the funding to IUCN foreseen in the Proposed Budget 2006-2007 is inadequate to effectively lead on the implementation of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage;
4. Allocates an amount of US\$40,000 to IUCN under the World Heritage Fund budget-line 1.2 for Advisory Bodies' services in addition to the current proposal of US\$65,000 for the biennium 2006-2007, to allow for the development and implementation of an action plan for raising extra-budgetary funds to support the implementation of the Global Framework Programme for natural heritage training and capacity building, by transferring the equivalent amount from the budget-line 3.2.1 for International Assistance for Training and Research;
5. Requests IUCN to report on progress in this regard to the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007;
6. Urges States Parties and NGOs to collaborate with IUCN and provide support to the strategic implementation of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage.

ANNEX 2 – Draft Action Plan for Fundraising for the Global Framework Programme for Natural Heritage Training and Capacity Building

Introduction

At its 25th Session (Helsinki, 2001), the World Heritage Committee adopted a Global Training Strategy. The Strategy was reviewed at the 7th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2004) where IUCN presented a progress report on natural heritage along with a draft Global Framework Programme.

Subsequently, a budget for the Programme was presented at the 29th Session of the Committee (Durban, 2005). The total cost of the Programme for the period 2005-2010 was estimated at USD 688,000, of which USD 200,400 was to come from the World Heritage Fund, and USD 487,600 from other sources. A copy of the Programme and Budget is presented in Annex 3.

The Committee allocated funding to IUCN for the development and implementation of an action plan for raising extra-budgetary funds to support the implementation of the Global Framework Programme. With this funding IUCN initiated Project No. 76725-000, "*Development of a Draft Action Plan for Fundraising for the Global Framework Programme for Natural Heritage Training and Capacity Building*". This report presents a first draft of the action plan that will be circulated for review by IUCN/WCPA and World Heritage Centre Experts. A revised Action Plan will be presented for consultation and feedback to the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in Christchurch, New Zealand.

Background

Training has always been an important part of implementing the *World Heritage Convention*. Grants from the World Heritage Fund (WHF) have funded fellowships, study tours, courses, and training workshops (Ishwaran, 2005). Fellowships for training at the M.Sc. and Ph.D levels were provided for some specialists from less-developed countries in the late 70's and early '80s. Since then fellowships have been limited to 1 to 2 year graduate and post-graduate diploma courses, and short-term training courses (usually 6 to 12 weeks). The diploma courses have been given at the Mweka College of African Wildlife Management (Arusha, Tanzania), and the Garoua School for Training Wildlife Specialists (Cameroon). Since the late 80's protected area management courses have been developed in all parts of the world. Short-term courses have been given at regional training centres such as CATIE in Costa Rica, and travelling seminars organized, especially in Canada, the U.S., and Mexico.

At the request of the World Heritage Committee (Phuket, 1994), the World Heritage Centre undertook an assessment of natural heritage training supported by the WHF. It found that from 1976 to 1994 some USD 2-3 million had been spent on the training of wildlife and protected area specialists. While the study found that the funds had been spent on upgrading the capacities of a large number of individuals, it was not able to measure the impact of that training. Subsequently at its 19th Session (Berlin, 1995) the

Committee endorsed a Strategic Plan for Training Natural Heritage Specialists that sought to better target and improve the curricula in training workshops through standardization of course content and structure. However, this proved difficult to achieve as the planning and design of courses in different parts of the world was carried out independently of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

The Global World Heritage Training Strategy, adopted in 2001, proposed a series of broad principles that would be common to both cultural and natural heritage training. Within that framework, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre developed the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage (see Annex 3) that addresses capacity development at the site, national policy, and international levels.

At the same time, requests for training assistance from the States Parties have in recent years undergone somewhat of a change. There are more requests for short courses that address site-specific management issues and problems. The Mweka and Garoua Colleges are introducing World Heritage / protected area management modules. University courses and sub-regional capacity development projects in many parts of the world are using World Heritage properties as field centres for learning. The UNITAR Series for the Asia and Pacific Regions on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites is a good example of this approach. Innovative partnerships, such as the UNESCO-VOCATIONS PATRIMOINE Co-sponsored Fellowships for World Heritage Site Managers, are providing new opportunities for advanced level interdisciplinary training in World Heritage studies.

Strategy

The background outlined above indicates that there has been an interest over the years in moving from support to ad hoc training events on protected areas management to more strategic, targeted, and coordinated capacity building at the site, national, and international levels. However, to accomplish this shift, more financial resources, better co-operation among stakeholders, and sustained efforts over long periods are required. Many donors, on the other hand, continue to support only individual projects over relatively short timeframes. Thus, an important part of the strategy for capacity building has to be fundraising that will generate steady streams of funding over the long-run. This is what is needed and anything less is only a partial solution.

One-Off Projects

The Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage (See Annex 3) lays out a number of critical, one-off activities that can be funded through traditional short-term project funds and the WHF. The estimated cost of these activities is USD 688,000 of which USD 487,600 is designated for funding through partners, and USD 200,400 for the WHF.

On-going Programmes

However, when it comes to implementing the regional capacity building programmes, maintaining a data base, and energizing a Consortium on Natural World Heritage

Capacity Development (perhaps more aptly called a Network of World Heritage Centres of Excellence), the situation becomes more complex, and sustainable finance becomes much more important. [Note: *it is recommended to change the name from Consortium to Network as “consortium” implies a contractual relationship while a “network” is less formal. “Centres of Excellence” is intended to give the sense that the network is of high-quality institutions that meet prescribed standards.*]

The indicative budget and calendar for these activities presented in the Framework Programme are a good beginning. To be successful over the long-term, however, annual funding streams will be essential. Thus, the USD 90,000 for implementation of the 3 Regional Programmes presented in the Indicative Budget (Annex 3) can be considered as down payments on an on-going process that will cost in the order of USD 150,000 per year. This estimate is based on the actual costs of mobile courses developed in Latin America. A longer and more mobile course presented in the U.S. costs more than double that amount. Likewise, the USD 10,000 for the creation of the Network (previously called Consortium) is a good beginning, but if the Network is to be a dynamic and on-going instrument for encouraging cooperation, standardizing curricula, and catalyzing high standards of excellence in a host of institutions around the world, a similar amount of USD 150,000 will be required. Thus, an additional goal of the Framework Programme should be a minimum annual stream of income of USD 300,000.

It should also be noted that the regional programmes and global cooperation through a network of training institutions are essential aspects of the long-term vision, and thus must be a fundamental part of the case presented to donors.

Strategic Consideration 1

The Action Plan for Fundraising should have as its targets:

- USD 487,600 for short-term projects, which would be complemented by about USD 200,400 from the WHF; and,
- USD 300,000 per year for the on-going regional programmes, database, and network.

Mechanisms for Producing Regular Streams of Income

It has been noted that the on-going regional programmes, database, and network will require regular streams of income so that the activities and processes that are developed can be maintained and improved through adaptive management over time. However, it is exactly this kind of effort that has been somewhat elusive in the past. So how can annual streams of income be produced to support these on-going processes? In very general terms what will be needed are mechanisms such as endowments, successive sinking funds (projects), or revolving funds, and the donors to capitalise them, that will produce reliable streams of income over the long-term.

The Alternatives

Endowments are a useful mechanism when a donor is able to provide a one-off grant of large size. Using conservative estimates of the returns on a capital fund of 5%, an endowment of about USD 6 million would be needed to generate an annual income

stream of USD 300,000. This is an effective way of generating the required income stream, but is considered inefficient by many donors because of the large sum of money that is locked up in the capital fund.

Successive Projects are another way of generating the required income stream, but it is also risky and requires additional investment in continuous fundraising activities. This has been the approach that has been used for most regional programmes to date, but is a difficult model to maintain.

Revolving Funds are the ideal mechanism for producing regular streams of income. Such funds receive periodic income that then is disbursed as required. The WHF is a good example of a revolving fund. The difficulty with developing revolving funds is that a mechanism has to be put in place that is usually more difficult for a donor than is a one-off donation. Thus, the up front cost may be high, but once it is in place it is extremely efficient.

Strategic Consideration 2

Give highest priority to fundraising that will create the mechanisms for capitalising a Revolving Fund for Capacity Building.

Donor Preferences

It should also be recognized that different donors have different preferences regarding the mechanisms by which their donations are channelled, allocated, spent, accounted for, and evaluated. Some donors provide funding directly to the WHF. Others opt to enter into the various kinds of agreements (funds-in trust and bi-lateral agreements, secondments, etc) currently offered by UNESCO. In other cases, donors may wish their funding to be directed to World Heritage activities through other mechanisms, such as:

1. Independent foundations
2. Non-governmental organizations
3. Academic institutions
4. National environmental funds
5. Corporate offices or subsidiaries
6. In-kind products or services

Strategic Consideration 3

Be open to a variety of mechanisms to accommodate potential donor's preferences concerning the ways their funding is channelled, administered, allocated, and reported.

The Case

Making the case to potential donors for supporting World Heritage is facilitated by the *Convention* itself. It seeks to preserve for all mankind the world's natural and cultural

heritage of outstanding universal value. This is a noble effort that relates to the “best of the best” and this key message should be prominent in the approaches made to donors. Another key message is that capacity building is one of the central requirements for effective protection and management of World Heritage properties. Finally, it must be pointed out that the long-term vision for capacity building for World Heritage depends on successfully harnessing the already established competences of a diverse set of academic institutions around the world through a Network of World Heritage Centres of Excellence.

Strategic Consideration 4 Launch the fundraising effort around a “Best of the Best” Campaign. Dedicate the campaign to creating partnerships for building the capacity for World Heritage to set a global standard for excellence in management.

Potentials

The World Heritage brand is a powerful one that has great potential for fundraising. Indeed, the only limitations are imagination and creativity, and the flexibility to accommodate donors’ preferences. Just as natural systems are rendered more stable by diversity, capacity building programmes also become more stable when they have a diverse set of funding sources. Since capacity building programmes require long time horizons, it is essential that a spectrum of funding sources be tapped and a variety of mechanisms established. The States Parties, other inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, foundations, and the corporate sector should all be seen as potential donors. A partial listing of these potential sources is presented in Annex 4.

Recommended Actions

1. Meet with staff of the World Heritage Centre, especially those in charge of the PACT Initiative, to get an update on their experience in fundraising, and see to what extent fundraising for the Global Framework Programme should be integrated with the PACT Initiative.
2. Review with the World Heritage Centre the list of potential donors presented in this report to identify the best prospects in terms of expected costs and benefits, and add new ones. Give special emphasis to identifying potential donors for the revolving fund.
3. Working with the World Heritage Centre and Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, identify representatives of the States Parties, and other leading individuals, who would be willing to identify and assist in making fundraising contacts with potential donors in their countries.
4. Also identify a smaller group from the representatives of the States Parties, and other leading individuals, who would be willing to serve as “World Heritage Ambassadors” by contacting donors directly to present the “Best of the Best” Campaign.

5. Work with the World Heritage Centre to refine the contact list, identify priorities, and develop specific fundraising assignments for each World Heritage Ambassador.
6. Develop a focused strategy document for the “Best of the Best” fundraising campaign including priority targets, timelines, roles and responsibilities (especially World Heritage Ambassador assignments), and reporting requirements.
7. Review the strategy with the World Heritage Centre and Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, and launch it at the next World Heritage Committee Meeting with full media coverage.
8. Based on the strategy, develop quality fundraising materials, including a case statement, PowerPoint presentation, and basic project concept papers, both for one-off donations and for development of a revolving fund.
9. Work with the World Heritage Ambassadors to be sure that they have the materials they need for fundraising visits to potential donors; to answer any questions that might arise; to provide support when needed for writing full proposals; to make follow-up visits; or to work out new mechanisms for receiving and channelling donor funds.
10. Keep the World Heritage Ambassadors regularly informed of the targets, progress towards them, potentials for matching funds, new mechanisms being set up, etc.
11. Report on progress quarterly to the World Heritage Centre and Bureau of the World Heritage Committee and adjust the strategy to reflect experience gained and lessons learned.
12. Close out the campaign at a World Heritage Meeting, fully recognizing the work of the World Heritage Ambassadors, and the donors who contributed.

Final Thought

Fundraising campaigns have a large number of fixed costs that are independent of the magnitude of the grants being sought. Thus, there may be value in considering whether the “Best of the Best” Campaign should be expanded to include all types of international assistance for natural heritage such as preparatory assistance (especially for tentative lists); technical cooperation; education, information, and promotion; and emergency assistance.

References

Corcoran, Brent and Thomas Petermann, 2003. *Building capacity amongst Protected Areas agency staff in East and Southern Africa: lessons learned from InWEnt's Seminars on Sustainable Tourism*. Vth World Parks Congress, September 2003, Durban South Africa: Sustainable Finance Stream; Applications Session – Learning from concrete successes of sustainably financing protected areas, Workshop 12: Financial Issues and Tourism.

<http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/management/international/mpa.html>. *International MPA Management Capacity Building Training*.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/235>. *Co-sponsored Fellowships for World Heritage Site Managers*.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/300>. *Launch of New Cycle of UNESCO-VOCATIONS PATRIMOINE Co-Sponsored Fellowships for World Heritage Site Managers*.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/380>. *UNITAR Series on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites*.

<http://www.oceanservice.noaa.gov/topics/coasts/training/welcome.html>. *Training and Capacity Building*.

<http://www.protected-landscapes.org/Darwin.html>. *Darwin Initiative: Africa Program, Conservation Management Training and Capacity Building in Sub Saharan Africa*.

http://www.wcmc.org.uk/capacity_building. *Capacity Building Programme*.

Hough, John. *Developing Capacity*. In Lockwood, Michael; Graeme L. Worboys and Ashish Kothari, editors. 2006. *Managing Protected Areas: a Global Guide*. Earthscan.

UNESCO, 2001. *Progress Report on Global Training Strategy*. WHC-01/CONF.208/14.

UNESCO, 2002. *Investing in World Heritage: past achievements, future ambitions*. World Heritage Papers, No. 2.

UNESCO, 2004. *Progress report on the Global Training Strategy*. WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/11.

UNESCO, 2005. *Budgetary provisions for the implementation of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage*. WHC-05/29.COM/10.

Progress report on World Heritage PACT. WHC-05/29.COM/13.

Capacity Building in World Heritage at the Vth IUCN World Parks Congress, Durban (South Africa), 8-17 September 2003. World Heritage Papers, No. 16.

UNESCO, 2006. *The World Heritage Centre's Natural Heritage Strategy*. WHC-06/30.COM.INF.6A.

Annex 3 – Global Framework Programme for Natural Heritage Training and Capacity Building

Level of Implementation	Priority Activities	Indicative Budget (USD)
<p>1. Site level – Oriented to provide tools and knowledge on how to maintain the integrity of sites.</p> <p>Key Target audiences: (a) On-ground site managers (b) Community groups and key local stakeholders. (c) Private sector and key resource use institutions.</p>	<p>1.1. To develop and test in at least 10 sites a module on management planning building upon WCPA Best Practice Guidelines on this issue. <i>Timeframe: 2006-2007.</i></p> <p>1.2. To develop and test in at least 10 sites a module on co-management, including participatory processes and conflict resolution, in World Heritage sites. <i>Timeframe: 2006-2010.</i></p> <p>1.3. To develop and test in at least 10 sites a module on sustainable finance for site management, including building broader support through marketing of the “WH label”. <i>Timeframe: 2006-2010</i></p> <p>1.4. To develop a set of simple guidelines with check lists for use by site managers on “How to use World Heritage status to strengthen site management”</p> <p>1.5. To prepare, based on the experience from the “Enhancing our Heritage” project, a module on how to assess management effectiveness to be applied in at least 20 sites. <i>Timeframe: 2005-2008.</i></p> <p>1.6. To monitor and assess the effectiveness in using these modules in enhancing the management of World Heritage sites and report to the Committee on progress achieved. <i>Timeframe: 2007-2010</i></p>	<p>USD 60,000 (for development and testing of training modules under priority activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4)</p> <p>USD 250,000 (for pilot testing of all modules)</p> <p>USD 10,000 (for on-going monitoring, assessment and reporting to WH Committee)</p> <p>Sub-total - USD 320,000 From WHF – USD 90,000 From other sources – USD 230,000</p>

<p>2. National Policy Level – <i>Oriented to develop the capacity of State Parties to effectively implement the Convention</i></p> <p>Key Target Audiences: (a) Agencies responsible for managing World Heritage sites. (b) Policy and decision makers. (c) National training institutions. (d) Media organizations and journalists.</p>	<p>2.1 To develop and widely distribute (including to local governments and NGOs) a module on how to prepare quality nominations using the new <i>Operational Guidelines</i>. <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>2.2 To develop and widely distribute (including to local governments and NGOs) a module on how to prepare global comparative analysis. This module would be useful not only in preparing nominations but also in reviewing national tentative lists and harmonizing them at the regional level. The development of this module would be linked to the Periodic Reporting exercises. <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>2.3 To develop and widely distribute the information kit “10 things to know on the UNESCO <i>World Heritage Convention</i>”. This information kit would include: (a) <i>tools for public awareness; (b) tools for media campaigns, and; (c) tools to use in getting politicians’ attention.</i> <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>2.4 To develop and distribute an information kit on how to prepare International Assistance Requests for designing and implementing national capacity development activities. <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>2.5 To develop and widely distribute a module on integrating World Heritage site management into land/sea use planning. <i>Timeframe: 2006-2007.</i></p> <p>2.6 To pilot test the application of the module on integrating World Heritage site management into land/sea use planning in 3 countries (to be determined). <i>Timeframe: 2008-2010.</i></p> <p>2.7 To monitor and assess the effectiveness in using these modules in enhancing the implementation of the <i>Convention</i>. <i>Timeframe 2007-2010.</i></p>	<p>USD 30,000 (for development of 3 training modules under priority activities 2.1, 2.2, and 2.5)</p> <p>USD 10,000 (to implement priority activity 2.3)</p> <p>USD 5,000 (to implement priority activity 2.4)</p> <p>USD 90,000 (to implement priority activity 2.6)</p> <p>USD 10,000 (for on-going monitoring, assessment and reporting to WH Committee)</p> <p>Sub-total - USD 145,000 From WHF – USD 43,500 From other sources – USD 101,500</p>
---	--	--

<p>3. International Level – <i>Oriented to enhance the work of the Convention as a mechanism for international Cooperation</i></p> <p>Key Target Audiences: (a) States Parties. (b) Regional Training Centres. (c) Advisory Bodies. (d) World Heritage Centre.</p>	<p>3.1. To adopt as an Annex to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> the criteria prepared by the Advisory Bodies for reviewing International Assistance Requests on training and capacity development. <i>Timeframe: 2005.</i></p> <p>3.2. To develop criteria and performance indicators for the World Heritage Committee to assess the implementation of the Global Training Strategy and to prioritise the allocation of the limited resources available from WHF for this activity. <i>Timeframe: 2005.</i></p> <p>3.3. To develop a “business case” for ensuring the long-term financial sustainability of a World Heritage Capacity Development Programme. <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>3.4. To develop, based on results from Periodic Reporting, regionally tailored capacity development programmes for 3 regions (to be determined). <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>3.5. To implement the regional capacity development programmes developed under priority activity 3.4 above. <i>Timeframe: 2007-2010.</i></p> <p>3.6. To create a web-based database on existing training and capacity development programmes and modules that can contribute to develop the core competencies of World Heritage site managers. <i>Timeframe: 2005-2006.</i></p> <p>3.7. To translate into at least 4 languages (to be determined) and widely distribute (including on the web) the full kit of IUCN-WCPA Best Practice Guidelines to be used as reference materials for the capacity development programmes. <i>Timeframe: 2006-2010.</i></p> <p>3.8. To create a Consortium on Natural World Heritage Capacity Development formed by key institutions that can contribute to the promotion and implementation of this Framework Programme and that would be guided by the World Heritage Committee under agreed Terms of Reference and work plan. <i>Timeframe: 2006-2008</i></p>	<p>USD 5,000 (to implement priority activity 3.2)</p> <p>USD 20,000 (to implement priority activity 3.3)</p> <p>USD 45,000 (to implement priority 3.4).</p> <p>USD 90,000 (to implement priority activity 3.5).</p> <p>USD 8,000 (to implement priority activity 3.6).</p> <p>USD 45,000 (to implement priority activity 3.7).</p> <p>USD 10,000 (to implement priority activity 3.8).</p> <p>Sub-total - USD 223,000 From WHF – USD 66,900 From other sources – USD 156,100</p>
		<p>TOTAL – USD 688,000 From WHF – USD 200,400 From other sources – USD 487,600</p>

Source: UNESCO, 2005 (1)

Annex 4 – Potential Funding Sources

1. States Parties

The States Parties have over the years demonstrated their commitment to World Heritage and many have contributed in a variety of ways. Indeed, each country has a wealth of institutions and funding mechanisms that could be tapped for the Capacity Building Programme for natural World Heritage. These include the following:

- Earmarked voluntary contributions (such as those earmarked for capacity building in recent years by Belgium, Italy, and the Netherlands)
- Existing bi-lateral development assistance programmes (such as the contributions to capacity building for protected areas by USAID, the U.K.'s Darwin Initiative, Germany's InWEnt Seminars, and Japan's JICA)
- National budget allocations (such as the allocations for international assistance through national resource management agencies; for example the International Marine Protected Area Management Capacity Building Programme of NOAA in the USA)
- National capacity building programmes that could incorporate World Heritage site managers from developing countries
- National lotteries that support relevant capacity building programmes (such as the U.K. Heritage Lottery Fund and the Netherlands Postal Code Lottery)

The Committee may wish to invite the States Parties to consider ways they might contribute to the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on World Heritage through any of the mechanisms mentioned above, or others.

2. Other Intergovernmental Organizations

- UNITAR (Series on the Management and Conservation of World Heritage Sites)
- GEF (through inclusion of capacity building components in national GEF projects)
- UNEP (such as the World Conservation Monitoring Centre and the Regional Seas Programmes)
- European Union
- Projects for protected areas of the World Bank, and Regional Development Banks
- Regional educational institutions such as CATIE, Mweka, and Garoua

3. Non-Governmental Organizations

- Big International NGOs with on-going protected area programmes (WWF, CI, TNC, WCS, FFI, etc.)
- National environmental NGOs

4. Foundations

- United Nations Foundation, USA
- The MacArthur Foundation, USA
- The Moore Foundation, USA
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, USA
- Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, USA
- Seimenpuu Foundation, Finland
- The Diageo Foundation, UK

- WorldFish Center, Malaysia
- others

5. Corporate Sector

All corporations that fall within the partnership guidelines established by the World Heritage Committee should be considered. Given the need for long-term funding for the Framework Programme, particular attention should be given to identifying mechanisms with the corporate sector that will generate regular streams of income.