



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 35 COM

**Distribution Limited**

**WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C**

**Paris, 27 May 2011**

**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-fifth session**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters  
19 -29 June 2011**

**Item 7C of the Provisional Agenda: Reflection on the trends of the state of conservation**

**INF.7C: Report of the expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties (13-15 April 2011, Dakar, Senegal)**

## **SUMMARY**

An expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties (13 –15 April 2011, Dakar, Senegal) was organized by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, in close cooperation with the Ministry of Culture and Leisure of Senegal and with the support from the Australian Government - Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. This expert meeting provided the opportunity for a broad ranging discussion on possible approaches to address the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties, using the experience in Africa as a valuable case study. This document provides a summary of the discussions and recommendations from the expert meeting.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The *World Heritage Convention* is approaching its 40th Anniversary in 2012, the potential inscription of the 1000th property to the World Heritage List, and near universal ratification. In view of this, the World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), decided to initiate a process of reflection on the Future of the *World Heritage Convention*.
2. At its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the World Heritage Committee, in Decision **33 COM 14.A2** Paragraph 15, recognized that challenges exist for States Parties and site-managers in effectively responding to the range of threats that affect inscribed properties. The World Heritage Committee has, over time, had a number of thematic debates on recurrent and emerging issues which are negatively impacting on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of inscribed properties. Strategic policy development resulted on extractive industries, climate change and risk preparedness. At its 33rd session, the World Heritage Committee reviewed two compendia prepared by the Advisory Bodies of key decisions on the conservation of properties on the World Heritage List in Danger. Furthermore, at its 34th session, it reviewed Document WHC-10/34.COM/7C, which provided an analysis of the perceived trends, changes and threats to World Heritage properties and revealed that the two key groups of threats affecting World Heritage properties between 2005 and 2009 were “Development and Infrastructure” and “Management and Legal issues”.
3. As part of this process, and noting the strong results of the Africa 2009 programme, the World Heritage Committee welcomed the offer of the Governments of Australia and Senegal to organise an expert meeting to look at strategies to address the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties, with a focus on Africa (Decision **34 COM 10D**). While all regions face conservation challenges, the African region provides an interesting case study of the factors negatively affecting OUV as well as the difficulties and successes met in addressing them. The African region possesses only 78 properties out of the 911 on the World Heritage List, yet a significant number of African World Heritage properties are regularly examined by the Committee every year due to conservation issues that threaten the values for which they were inscribed. This is largely due to the high number of properties from Africa on the List of World Heritage in Danger (14 of 34 or 41%).
4. Participants agreed that this important meeting was a timely exercise. While there have been many expert meetings to examine issues related to state of conservation issues, this was the first meeting that aimed to take a look at state of conservation issues as a whole, despite the importance of maintaining the state of conservation of inscribed properties in implementing the *Convention*.
5. The participants of the expert meeting appreciated the financial support of the Government of Australia for organizing this important event in collaboration with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and also commended the Government of Senegal for its generous hospitality.
6. The expert meeting was attended by 49 participants: experts from 25 States Parties, representatives of the Advisory Bodies – IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM – as well as representatives of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Participants at the expert meeting came from all regions, representing the *Convention's* geographic diversity and the global coverage of the issues discussed. Two-thirds of the participants were from Africa, many of them in charge of the management of a World Heritage property. A full list of participants is included as Annex 2.

7. The agenda for the expert meeting (available in Annex 1) focused on the following key issues:
  - Monitoring tools and processes
  - Management issues
  - Development and other human activities
  - Capacity building and experience sharing/best practices
  - Drafting recommendations to the World Heritage Committee for its consideration.

## **II. DISCUSSION**

8. The expert meeting held an enthusiastic and productive discussion of the challenges affecting the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, as well as possible guidance required to assist both States Parties and the World Heritage Committee in mitigating such threats. The meeting was characterised by a common desire for practical solutions and provided a useful opportunity to “ground-truth” the operations of the World Heritage Committee.
9. Participants at the expert meeting particularly valued the welcome address by the Minister of Culture and Leisure of Senegal, M. Mamadou Bousso Leye. In his address, the Minister noted that Africa has achieved near universal ratification of the *World Heritage Convention*, with 46 States Parties but that conservation issues are, however, of paramount importance on the continent. The Minister therefore welcomed the meeting as a first step towards both clearly identifying and solving the problems faced.
10. The first session on monitoring tools and processes benefitted from presentations on the results of a study on state of conservation reporting trends, the outcomes of the recent second Periodic Report for Africa and the monitoring tools used by the World Heritage system. In the other sessions, case-study presentations enabled participants to identify both common threats and common features for successful management of factors affecting the OUV. Presentations by ICOMOS and IUCN illustrated the range of tools and resources available to assist site managers monitor and protect the OUV and integrity of inscribed sites. Case-study presentations were also invaluable in spurring discussion on how best to respond to development pressures on World Heritage properties. ICCROM reported on a newly developed strategy for capacity building in the field of heritage conservation. Further case-study reports reinforced the idea that multiple tools are needed to build the capacity of a variety of different yet equally critical stakeholders. A full outline of the discussion of the expert reflection meeting and specific conclusions and recommendations arising from each session is included on the World heritage Centre’s website at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/740> .

## **III. SYNTHESIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

11. The reports of the Rapporteurs capture the richness of the expert discussion at the meeting, particularly on conservation challenges as experienced in Africa. These reports also present a range of specific conclusions in response to each thematic discussion. There were a number of recurring issues which emerged throughout the discussion, across the specific themes. The purpose of this synthesis is to draw together these broad issues.

12. Participants addressed these common issues broadly and identified two sets of actors:
  - The World Heritage system, including the World Heritage Committee, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies
  - States Parties, including but not limited to decision makers, government ministries, site managers, local communities and other stakeholders engaged at the site level, as “partners in site management” including other international organisations and NGOs.

**A. Recurrent issues addressed to the World Heritage system**

*Roles and responsibilities*

13. Over the course of the meeting, experts discussed the allocation of roles and responsibilities for the conservation of World Heritage properties. They agreed that the World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies have a critical role to play and, in fact, do provide enormous assistance to States Parties as both guardians of the conservation of the OUV of the properties and enablers of good conservation practice. Participants noted, however, that the World Heritage system does not have the necessary resources to provide the solution to all conservation challenges experienced by the inscribed properties. They in particular noted the limited and stagnant resources of the World Heritage Fund, which was originally envisaged to assist States Parties with conservation operations. While the World Heritage system articulates normative goals and outlines key frameworks for achieving them, it is necessarily limited in the assistance it can provide on the ground.
14. The meeting acknowledged the expertise and methodologies offered by the three Advisory Bodies to the *Convention*. They also noted that national committees of ICOMOS and national and regional offices of IUCN could be better valorised where these exist to provide advice to States Parties, including site managers.
15. Participants reaffirmed the primary responsibility for protection allocated to States Parties under the *World Heritage Convention*. They noted, however, the potential funding and expertise available from other stakeholders, including international institutions and NGOs, in assisting States Parties meet their obligations under the *Convention*. Participants argued that the World Heritage Committee’s decisions on state of conservation issues should both acknowledge and integrate the contributions of these various actors, provided that they have been verified and responded to by the States Parties.

*Challenges of development*

16. Experts noted that while particularly acute in Africa, development pressures are increasing globally. The tension between development and conservation poses particular problems for World Heritage properties, which the global community seeks to preserve for future generations. Case-studies provided by participants illustrated the fact that there are no easy solutions.
17. Participants noted, however, that a proactive approach would enhance the potential synergies between development and conservation. In other words, participants argued that the World Heritage system needs to identify and address problems before the OUV of the properties is negatively impacted. This includes the need to develop policy approaches or general solutions to common development challenges. As an example, some participants suggested that minor boundary changes could be considered in order to avoid conflicts with developments planned on these boundaries. However, participants stressed that such measures could only be justified if such boundary changes were not just

considered to accommodate the development activity but would also result in a net strengthening of the OUV of the property, for example by adding other areas which would strengthen the integrity of the property. Participants noted that care would need to be taken to avoid creating incentives for or rewarding poor conservation and management.

18. Participants noted that buffer zones are a critical tool to avoid developments with a potentially negative impact on the OUV of properties. Participants noted that many sites have been inscribed without a proper buffer zone. This is even the case for sites which were inscribed recently, despite the clear guidance given by Paragraph 106 of the *Operational Guidelines*.
19. Participants further noted the importance of ensuring that proper assessments are conducted to identify possible impacts of proposed developments on the OUV of properties. They noted that Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* would need to be more explicit in requesting Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments (see Paragraph 27 below).

#### *Development and Environmental/Heritage Impact Assessments (EIAs/HIAs)*

20. This subject was a central component of the discussion at the meeting. Participants noted that many conservation issues raised in the state of conservation process are a result of the conflict between protection and development. Seeking a proactive approach, they agreed on the need to integrate World Heritage better into national and local planning processes. The importance of anticipatory planning was emphasised as a means of addressing potential developments with a negative impact on OUV.
21. The meeting reiterated the importance of environmental and heritage impact assessments as a tool to achieve this. However, they noted that while such impact assessments are usually foreseen under national legislation, they often fail to address the potential impacts on the OUV of properties. They discussed the importance of including a consideration of OUV in the terms of reference of EIAs/HIAs.

#### *Traditional management*

22. Discussion at the meeting focused on the need to adequately and appropriately document traditional (community and indigenous) management. Experts agreed that traditional management has both strengths and weaknesses in the management of factors with a potential negative impact on the OUV. Participants noted the need for the World Heritage system to clarify how management systems should be documented and on the use and limits of traditional management. They also expressed the need to review Paragraph 108 of the *Operational Guidelines* to reflect this discussion.

#### *Capacity building*

23. The thematic discussions illustrated the increasing complexity of World Heritage management. Success requires efforts by many actors, including individual States Parties, UNESCO, bilateral engagement, Category 2 centres (including the African World Heritage Fund), NGOs and others. Equally, all of the actors need to be aware of, validate and promote the conservation requirements in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. In this regard, participants noted that capacity building needs to utilise a variety of tools (using both modern and traditional communication methods) to address a multitude of stakeholders at various levels (including particularly youth and decision makers). They insisted on the fact that each tool must be particularly adapted to the target audience.

### *Conflict and post conflict sites*

24. Participants noted the difficulty of accessing accurate and timely information on the state of conservation of properties in conflict zones. It was noted, however, that even during conflict, international support is required and invaluable to the conservation of World Heritage properties (although it was acknowledged that such support may be complex to deliver). Expert experience suggested that ongoing support is also particularly necessary during the post-conflict phase.
25. Participants recognised the considerable personal risks taken by site-managers and rangers protecting heritage sites in conflict and post-conflict areas and noted that United Nations recognition/insignia may offer some level of protection for staff on the ground.

### *World Heritage Committee processes and guidance*

26. A recurrent refrain of the meeting was the need for the World Heritage system to improve access to guidance on best practice. Participants noted that ICOMOS and IUCN have developed a number of tools to assist site-managers in their important conservation tasks, yet this information is not widely known or disseminated. Participants also indicated the usefulness of having access to an integrated online directory of such tools, preferably on the UNESCO website. Similarly, the case-studies at the meeting largely illustrated the vast range of experience and knowledge residing with site-managers. Access to these examples also needs to be improved.
27. Particular needs identified during the meeting were for clearer guidance on Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), in particular how these should address the impact on the OUV. Participants further noted that clear criteria should be established on when impact assessments should be sent for review to the World Heritage Centre. It was reiterated that Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* should be revised in this respect. They noted recent guidance on heritage impact assessments developed by ICOMOS.
28. Participants also noted that an expert meeting on buffer zones, held in Switzerland, made recommendations which are useful as guidance to the States Parties but that some of these recommendations have not yet been fully taken into account (see Document WHC-11/35.COM/7.1).
29. Participants further noted the potential confusion with regard to the Reinforced monitoring mechanism (RMM) and suggested that it was best used as a tool by the Director General of UNESCO to enable the review of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger only, between two sessions of the World Heritage Committee if needed.
30. Finally, the discussion revealed the need to reconsider the World Heritage Committee's approach to state of conservation reporting. Participants considered that both the technical nature of decisions as well as their consistency would be greatly enhanced by considering in addition to the reports on individual properties, a thematic discussion on important factors affecting the OUV of several properties. Such a discussion could result in clearer policy guidance on these factors, which could be applied to the decisions on individual properties. This would avoid the sense that properties or regions are being singled out for challenges which also affect a range of properties across the globe.

## **B. Recurrent issues addressed to States Parties**

### *Responsibility for protection*

31. Participants reaffirmed that the *World Heritage Convention* clearly assigns prime responsibility for the maintenance of the OUV to States Parties and to the international community. They underlined the need for States Parties to be aware of their responsibilities as signatories to the *Convention*, including the need to follow the directives contained in the *Operational Guidelines* and the need to allocate adequate funding to the ongoing conservation of inscribed World Heritage properties. Participants noted the desirability of adequate legislative protection and the need for cooperative efforts by all relevant agencies within the States Parties. Participants also noted the potential synergies of domestic action on World Heritage with other conventions and international instruments, such as the UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage or the Ramsar Convention on wetlands of international importance.

### *Sources of State Party assistance*

32. Meeting participants recognised the variety of sources of assistance for States Parties in complying with their World Heritage obligations. While praising UNESCO's particular strengths in terms of providing guidance and normative practice, participants recognised the limited funding available under the World Heritage Fund.
33. Participants noted the necessity and potential for increased engagement with other multilateral organizations, donors, NGOs and other domestic institutions in providing much needed assistance to States Parties. In the African context, participants recognised the valuable role played by the African World Heritage Fund and called on States Parties, especially those in the region, to contribute to it.

### *Natural disasters and climate change*

34. Participants also emphasised the importance of risk preparedness when addressing the impact of natural disasters and climate change on OUV. In particular, they noted the need for adequate disaster risk planning and the early development of preventative measures, including indicators and early warning systems, which they felt should be reported to the World Heritage Committee. Experts noted that disaster risk planning needs to be adequately linked with other planning and response systems administered by partner agencies.

### *Local communities*

35. A common feature of the thematic discussions at the expert meeting on state of conservation challenges was the critical importance of engaging local communities. Participants advocated the inclusion of local communities in decision-making, monitoring and evaluation of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. Success stories in Africa suggested clear conservation advantages in linking community benefits to the protection of the property. Community benefit could be reduced by a loss of protection and enhanced by effective management and protection. Experts noted that tourism is a key driver for community engagement in protection and conservation, but there are many others.

### C. Recommendations

36. Based on the outcomes of the thematic discussions, the expert meeting agreed to the following recommendations for placing before, as appropriate, the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and/or the Advisory Bodies:
- a) Recognising both the importance of the *World Heritage Convention* and the limited financial assistance available to States Parties under the World Heritage Fund, the World Heritage Committee's decisions on state of conservation issues should invite contributions of relevant expertise and financial assistance from other sources,
  - b) When considering nominations for inscription on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee should ensure that properties not only demonstrate the OUV in line with the criteria for inscription, but also demonstrate compliance with integrity/authenticity and management and legal requirements, as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*,
  - c) The *Operational Guidelines* should be clarified in relation to:
    - i. the uses, limits and documentation requirements for traditional management (Paragraph 108 and following),
    - ii. the need for EIAs/HIAs of potential developments' impact on OUV, the range of proposed activities with a likely impact on OUV to be reported on and the documentation required by the World Heritage Centre (Paragraph 172),
    - iii. Buffer zones, noting the recommendations contained in document *WHC-08/32.COM/7.1*.
  - d) Implement the new capacity strategy for heritage conservation as presented by ICCROM, as soon as possible and as soon as extrabudgetary resources are contributed by State parties to make this possible,
  - e) Consider ways to encourage United Nations recognition for the protectors of World Heritage properties in conflict and post conflict zones through the use of blue/green berets or other appropriate insignia,
  - f) Consider, in addition to the presentation of state of conservation reports on individual properties, a thematic report on significant factor negatively impacting the OUV of the properties. This thematic discussion could be grouped according to the five categories of factors affecting the OUV identified in the Periodic Report questionnaire, Section II, and could provide policy guidance on common factors affecting the OUV, which will ensure a greater coherence in the decision making on individual sites.
  - g) Provide, in the state of conservation reports on individual properties, a link to an integrated online database compiling all relevant background information concerning the property (previous state of conservation reports and Committee decisions, Desired state of conservation, corrective measures, International assistance requests, etc...) necessary for well-informed decision-making procedures. This data base would be hosted on the World Heritage Centre's website.
  - h) Develop a centralised database of existing guidance on key factors negatively impacting on the OUV of World Heritage properties and tools for best management practice,
  - i) Reiterate that the Reinforced monitoring mechanism should only be activated by a request of the Director General of UNESCO, in consultation with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, to send a mission and report

to Committee members between sessions on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

37. Based on the outcomes of the thematic discussions, the expert meeting agreed to the following recommendations addressed to States Parties:
- a) Recalling that being a signatory to the *World Heritage Convention* entails certain responsibilities, including a requirement to follow the *Operational Guidelines* and allocate adequate funding for the protection of World Heritage properties, recommend that States Parties develop adequate legislative frameworks to ensure compliance with the *Operational guidelines* and set up a collaborative framework between agencies for the conservation of properties, including agencies in charge of the follow up of other conventions and international agreements,
  - b) Sources of assistance and support should be sought beyond what is available under the UNESCO World Heritage Fund. Tools, methodology and guidance are available both internationally and nationally from ICOMOS and IUCN and additional support should be sought from other donors, NGOs and international organisations,
  - c) Be proactive in relation to development and conservation of World Heritage properties by conducting a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) at the time of nomination to anticipate the impact of any potential development on the OUV,
  - d) Ensure that EIA/HIA are conducted for development projects which could affect properties and that these specifically assess the impact on the OUV of properties.
  - e) Involve local communities in decision making, monitoring and evaluation of the state of conservation of the properties and their OUV and link the direct community benefits to protection outcomes.

#### **IV. ANNEXES**

**Annex 1:** Agenda of the expert meeting

**Annex 2:** List of participants

**Experts meeting on the global challenges  
to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties**

**13-15 April 2011**

**Dakar, Senegal**

**TIMETABLE**

**TUESDAY 12 APRIL**

Arrival of the participants

**WEDNESDAY 13 APRIL**

**10.00 – 11.30**

**OFFICIAL OPENING**

10.00 Address by Mr. Greg Terrill, Representative of the State Party of Australia

10.15 Address by Mr. Kishore Rao, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre

10.25 Address and official opening of the meeting by H.E. Mr. Serigne Mamadou Bousso Leye, Minister of Culture of the Republic of Senegal

10.35 – 10.50 Coffee break

**GENERAL INTRODUCTION OF THE MEETING**

10.55 Presentation of the background documentation available by Mr. Lazare Eloundou-Assomo (Chief, WHC/AFR Unit)

11.00 Presentation on the current conservation trends, with a special focus on the main results of the Africa Periodic Report, jointly presented by Mr. Lazare Eloundou-Assomo (Chief, WHC/AFR Unit) and Mr. Richard Veillon (WHC/POL)

11.20 Introduction round by the participants

**11.30 – 13.00**

**THEME 1 – “Monitoring tools and processes”**

**Chairperson1:** (*Kishore Rao*)

**Rapporteur 1:** (*Youssouph Diedhiou*)

- Current monitoring and reporting procedures (requirements, deadlines, drafting, mission reports, States Parties State of conservation reports,...): need for improvement? why? how?
- “Desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger”: definition? purpose? drafting?
- Linkages between the different monitoring tools (Reactive, Reinforced, Periodic Report, List in Danger): are they clear enough? why? what to do?
- Role and limits of the *World Heritage Convention* in conservation?

11.30 – 11.50 Presentation on the *Current statutory monitoring processes (including the List of World Heritage in Danger, Reinforced monitoring mechanism, ...)* presented by Mr. Guy Debonnet (Chief, WHC/SPU)

11.50 – 13.00: Debate

**13.00 – 15.00**  
LUNCH BREAK

**15.00 – 18.30**  
Including coffee break

**THEME 2 – “Management” issues**

**Chairperson 2:** (*Greg Terrill*)

**Rapporteur 2:** (*Birgitta Ringbeck*)

- Assessing Management effectiveness: why? how?
- Management and/or Planning tools: how to develop new ones or improve existing ones?
- What are the required basic standards and guidelines for the preparation of Management Plans
- Legislation, financing and governance issues: their impact? how to address them?

15.00 – 15.30 Presentation on the Cultural and Natural World Heritage properties of Senegal and their conservation issues, presented by Mr. Hamadi Bocoum (Cultural Heritage Director, Senegal) and by Mrs. Fatou Samb Ndiaye (Direction of National Parks)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

16.00 – 16.25: Thematic presentation on Management of World Heritage properties in Civil unrest and armed conflicts context – example of Natural properties (DRC properties)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

17.00 – 17.30: Thematic presentation on Management effectiveness assessments (by ICOMOS and IUCN)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

18.00 – 18.15: Thematic presentation on a good Management practice – example of a Natural property (Bwindi Forests)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

18.15 – 18.30: Wrap-up

**18.30:** Departure for a Reception and cultural event hosted by the State Party of Senegal at IFAN; Opening of an exhibition on World Heritage properties of Senegal

**THURSDAY 14 APRIL**

**09.00 – 13.00**  
Including coffee break

**THEME 3 – “Development and other human activities” issues**

**Chairperson3:** (*Hamady Bocoum*)

**Rapporteur 3:** (*James Wakibara*)

- Main issues encountered to mitigate the threats? why? how to improve it?
- Best way to provide leadership to wider efforts to address threats
- What are the most needed/efficient policy approaches to common threats ?

09.00 – 09.15: Thematic presentation on Natural resources extraction – example of a Natural property (Selous)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

10.00 – 10.15: Thematic presentation on Development issues – example of a Cultural property (Timbuktu)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

10.45 – 11.00: Thematic presentation on Challenges with the local communities – example of Cultural properties (Mijikenda Kaya Forests)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

11.30 – 13.00: Debate / Wrap-up

Report of the expert meeting on the global state of conservation challenges of World Heritage properties (13-15 April 2011, Dakar, Senegal)

WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C, p. 10

**13.00 – 14.30**  
LUNCH BREAK

**14.30 – 18.00**  
Including coffee break

**THEME 4 – “Capacity Building and Experience sharing / Best Practices”**

**Chairperson 4:** (*Guy Suzon Ramangason*)

**Rapporteur 4:** (*John Makombo*)

- Awareness of the local communities on World Heritage: importance? How to improve it?
- Training of site-managers/local authorities on World Heritage issues: who needs training? On what? Needs? How to make capacity building programmes more efficient?
- Experience sharing/Best practices: in which fields? How to identify them? how to best share them

14.30 – 14.50: Thematic presentation on the awareness of local communities on World Heritage (Cliff of Bandiagara)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

15.40 – 15.55: Thematic presentation on building capacity in the field of heritage conservation (by ICCROM)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

16.30– 18.00: Debate / Wrap-up

**18.00 – 19.00:**

Drafting Group on Recommendations with Chairpersons and Rapporteurs

**FRIDAY 15 APRIL**

**09.00 – 13.00**

Including coffee break

09.00 – 09.20: Presentation on the African World Heritage Fund activities (by AWHF)  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

**ADOPTION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Chairperson:** (*Kishore Rao*)

09.45 – 10.00: Presentation by the Rapporteur of Theme 1  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

10.20 – 10.30: Presentation by the Rapporteur of Theme 2  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

10.50 – 11.00: Presentation by the Rapporteur of Theme 3  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

11.20 – 11.30: Presentation by the Rapporteur of Theme 4  
→ Follow by Questions and answers

11.25 – 12.15: Debate and adoption of the Report and the Recommendations

12.15 – 12.45: Closure of the meeting

**12.45 – 13.45**

LUNCH BREAK

**Afternoon**

Site-visit to the Island of Gorée

## ANNEX 2

### List of participants

| <b>Name / Nom</b>                                 | <b>Country / Pays</b>            | <b>Property / Bien</b>   | <b>Position / Fonction<br/>Institution</b>   |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <b><i>African experts / Experts africains</i></b> |                                  |  |  |
| M. Leonard Ahonon                                 | Bénin                            | Palaix royaux d'Abomey   | Ministère de la Culture  |
| Mr. Anthony Ngaca Githitho                        | Kenya                            | Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests  | Site Manager, Coastal Forest Conservation Unit                                       |
| Mr. Revocatus W. Bugumba                          | Tanzania                         | Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani  | Site Manager, Conservator, Antiquities Department                                    |
| Mrs Maro E. Eliwasa                               | Tanzania                         | Stone Town of Zanzibar   | Principal Conservator of Antiquities, Department of Antiquities                      |
| Mr. John F. Mbwiliza                              | Tanzania                         | Selous Game Reserve  | Site Manager   |
| Mr. Ephraim Mwangomo                              | Tanzania                         | Kilimandjaro National Park   | Site Manager   |
| Mr. James Wakibara                                | Tanzania                         | Serengeti National Park  | Site Manager   |
| Mr. Remigius Kigongo Mugerwa                      | Uganda                           | Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi                                     | Site Manager, Heritage and Monuments Department                                      |
| Mr. John Makombo                                  | Uganda                           | Bwindi Impenetrable National Park / Rwenzori Mountains National Park | Chief Conservation Area Manager Uganda Wildlife Authority                            |
| M. Tshibasus Georges Muamba                       | République démocratique du Congo | Réserve de Faune à Okapis  | Directeur en charge de la Coopération internationale et de la Planification, DG-ICCN |
| M. Norbert Mushenzi Lusenge                       | République démocratique du Congo | Parc national des Virunga  | Directeur et Chef de site Adjoint Parc National des Virunga                          |
| M. Pasteur Cosma Wilungula Balongelwa             | République démocratique du Congo | Parc national de Garamba   | Administrateur Délégué Général (ICCN)  |
| M. Joseph Mapilanga                               | République démocratique du Congo | Réserve de Faune à Okapi   | Directeur et Chef de site  |
| M. Jean-Baptiste Mamang Kanga                     | République Centrafricaine        | Parc national de Manovo-Gounda St Floris                             | Directeur de la Faune et des Aires Protégées   |

|   |                                      |   |   |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Mr. Sékouba Camara                                    | Guinée                               | Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve         | Chef service Etudes et Planification du CEGENS  |
| M. Guy Suzon Ramangason                               | Madagascar                           | Forêts humides de l'Atsinanana            | Directeur Madagascar - Parcs nationaux  |
| M. Lassana Cisse                                      | Mali                                 | Bandiagara                                | Conservateur du Patrimoine, Chef de la Mission Culturelle Bandiagara                                |
| M. Ali Ould Sidi                                      | Mali                                 | Tombouctou                                | Chef de la Mission Culturelle de Tombouctou, Site Manager   |
| Mr Fareed Chuttan                                     | Mauritius                            | Apravasi Ghat                             | Principal Assistant Secretary, Culture Division, Ministry of Education, Culture and Human Resources |
| M. Salissou Ali Siddo                                 | Niger                                | Réserves naturelles de l'Air et du Ténéré | Gestionnaire de site  |
| Ms Paballo Mohafa                                     | South Africa                         | Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape             | Site Manager  |
| Ms Lebogang Diale                                     | South Africa                         | Vredefort Dome                            | Site Manager  |
| Mr Arnold Moyo  | Zimbabwe                             | Mana Pools National Park                  | National GIS Databases Technician - Planning, Parks and Wildlife Management Authority               |
| Mr. Kagosi Mwamulowe                                  | Zambia                               | Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls              | Chief Natural Heritage Officer National Heritage Conservation Commission                            |
| <b>International experts / Experts internationaux</b> |                                      |   |   |
| M. Nicolas Mathieu                                    | Suisse                               |   | Secrétaire général adjoint / Commission suisse pour l'UNESCO  |
| Ms Orachart Suebsith                                  | Thailand                             |   | Deputy Permanent Delegate of Thailand to UNESCO   |
| Mr. David Measketh                                    | Cambodia                             |   | Counsellor Permanent Delegation of Cambodia to UNESCO   |
| Ms Eglal Mohamed Osman Elmalik                        | Sudan                                |   | Director of the Conservation Department NCAM  |
| Mrs Bolette Lehn Pedersen                             | Denmark                              |   | Architect - Ministry of Culture   |
| Mrs Birgitta Ringbeck                                 | Germany                              |   | Head of division - Permanent conference of the German - Ministry of Culture                         |
| Ms Urve Sinijärv                                      | Estonia                              |   | Co-chair of Estonian delegation in the World Heritage Committee                                     |
| M. Ivan José Avila-Belloso                            | République Bolivarienne du Venezuela |   | Ministre conseiller délégation du Venezuela   |
| M. Mouhcine El Idrissi El Omari                       | Maroc                                |   | Inspecteur des monuments historiques et des sites, Région de Fès-Boulemedenane                      |

| <b>Organizers / Organismes</b>  |                             |  |  |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Ms Katharine Feros  | Australia                   |  | Assistant Director, International Heritage Section; Australian Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities            |
| Mr. Greg Terrill  | Australia                   |  | Assistant Secretary, International Heritage and Policy Branch; Australian Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities |
| M. Aboubakry Ba   | Sénégal                     |  | Représentant de la Délégation du Sénégal auprès de l'UNESCO  |
| M. Hamady Bocoum  | Sénégal                     | Island of St Louis   | Directeur du patrimoine culturel   |
| M. Eloi Coly  | Sénégal                     | Island of Gorée  | Gestionnaire de site   |
| Mme Fatou Samb  | Sénégal                     | Sanctuaire des oiseaux du Djoudj / Parc national du Niokolo Koba | Chargée de suivi des sites naturels - Direction des Parcs nationaux  |
| Mme Aminata Diarra  | Sénégal                     |  | Direction du Patrimoine Culturel   |
| M. Aly Sine   | Sénégal                     |  | Bureau du patrimoine, Mairie de St-Louis   |
| M. Amadou Faye  | Sénégal                     |  | Direction du Patrimoine Culturel   |
| M. Abdoul Aziz Guisse   | Sénégal                     |  | Chef Division des sites et monuments classés   |
| M. Al Ousseynou Ndiaye  | Sénégal                     |  | Inspecteur général du Patrimoine Bâti de l'État et des Palais nationaux  |
| M. Théophile Turpin   | Sénégal                     |  | Administrateur de la Fondation du Patrimoine   |
| <b>African World Heritage Fund / Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain</b> |                             |  |  |
| Mr. Jacob Nyangila  | African World Heritage Fund |  | Programme Specialist   |
| <b>Advisory Bodies / Organisations consultatives</b>                      |                             |  |  |
| Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya   | ICCROM                      |  | Director of Sites Unit   |
| Ms. Charlotte Karibuhoye  | IUCN                        |  | IUCN WCPA Vice Chair for West and Central Africa   |
| Mr Youssouph Diedhiou   | IUCN                        |  | Protected Areas Officer  |
| Mr Karel Bakker   | ICOMOS                      |  | Advisor  |
| <b>UNESCO</b>   |                             |  |  |
| Mr Kishore Rao  | UNESCO WHC                  |  | Director, World Heritage Centre  |
| Mr Lazare Eloundou-Assomo   | UNESCO WHC                  |  | Chief of Africa Unit   |
| Mr Guy Debonnet   | UNESCO WHC                  |  | Chief Special Projects Unit  |
| Mr Richard Veillon  | UNESCO WHC                  |  | Assistant Programme Specialist   |
| Mr. Dame Dieng  | UNESCO Dakar Office         |  | Assistant Programme Specialist   |
| Mr Christian Ndombi   | UNESCO Dakar Office         |  | Programme Specialist for Culture   |