

Q4: In case some of your local administrations have not been able to respond positively for reasons different from financial constraints, please indicate the nature of these reasons.

COMPLETE LIST

Country	Region	Response
Afghanistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Albania	Europe and North America	-
Algeria	Arab States	No response received
Andorra	Europe and North America	0
Angola	Africa	No response received
Antigua and Barbuda	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Argentina	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Armenia	Europe and North America	No entry fee is collected at almost all World Heritage sites in Armenia.
Australia	Asia and the Pacific	<p>If voluntary funds were paid by a property to the World Heritage Centre it would be good to know what the funds would be used for. There would need to be a clear plan on how the funds would be spent.</p> <p>Lord Howe Island is a small isolated community of about 400 residents and tourist beds are capped at 400. It has a low rate base and relies on government assistance to management the property.</p> <p>Most site managers, faced with the option of making an external donation or undertaking conservation projects would opt for conservation or even marketing. In the case of the component Australian Convict Sites, it would be fair to consider that the preferred option over providing funds to the WHC would be for the better funded sites providing financial support for conservation at the less well funded sites. If there were discretionary funds (which there aren't), this would seem a preferable use of site resources.</p> <p>It is difficult to comprehend the transfer of responsibility for engagement with the WHC from the Australian government (as State Party) to the individual sites. There is limited government financial support to Australia's World Heritage sites and what is available is well subscribed. The individual sites within the listing are not in a position to fund the Executive Officer role (which is funded by the Australia government), which is contradictory to a proposal to provide funding externally to the WHC.</p>
Austria	Europe and North America	Financial constraints were the main reason. Further to this there was a majority pointing out that the World Heritage Fund should be supported primarily by the State Parties.
Azerbaijan	Europe and North America	No response received
Bahamas	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Bahrain	Arab States	No response received
Bangladesh	Asia and the Pacific	Local administrations of our country always positive to protect these world heritage sites. Sometimes they are not able to respond positively due to lack of responsible people to work with these issues.
Barbados	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Belarus	Europe and North America	National legislation does not provide for the possibility of such contributions
Belgium	Europe and North America	No response received
Belize	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Benin	Africa	No response received
Bhutan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Europe and North America	No response received
Botswana	Africa	No response received
Brazil	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Brunei Darussalam	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Bulgaria	Europe and North America	The nature of the reasons is only financial
Burkina Faso	Africa	No response received
Burundi	Africa	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Cabo Verde	Africa	Il y a eu des changements politiques récents et tous les Responsables aussi bien, les autorités locales, les membres du gouvernements et que les députés à l'Assemblée Nationale viennent d'être installés (2016), donc il faudra encore attendre quelques mois pour qu'ils soient sensibilisés et que certaines décisions puissent être prises.
Cambodia	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Cameroon	Africa	No response received
Canada	Europe and North America	Some site managers have expressed a general interest in this idea but would like further information on how exactly it would be carried out. There are also World Heritage sites that do not generate revenue (i.e. Historic town centres, for example) and therefore cannot guarantee annual contributions. If those sites administered by Parks Canada were to participate, they would need to work on a unified approach, which would take further time to develop. One Canadian site manager also expressed a willingness to consider specific one-off fundraising events in lieu of committing to an annual contribution.
Central African Republic	Africa	No response received
Chad	Africa	Rien à signaler
Chile	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
China	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Colombia	Latin America and the Caribbean	0
Comoros	Africa	No response received
Congo	Africa	No response received
Cook Islands	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Costa Rica	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Côte d'Ivoire	Africa	0
Croatia	Europe and North America	No response received
Cuba	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Cyprus	Europe and North America	The Department of Antiquities is responsible for costs involved in all World Heritage sites in Cyprus, including maintenance, conservation, improvement works and promotion expenses. There are no reasons other than financial that the Republic of Cyprus has not been able to respond positively to the voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund.
Czechia	Europe and North America	Most of WH Sites in Czech Republic recommended to the State Party to solve such voluntary commitments alternatively on national basis. Moreover, sites which are complex urban/rural structures with many stakeholders depend on local government decisions and might face unexpected situations that might weaken activities necessary for fulfilling their obligations on local level. The Czech Republic covers regularly its mandatory contribution for the WH agenda and pays voluntary fees to the several other funds of UNESCO every year (International Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, International Fund for Cultural Diversity). However, the national program devoted to the WH agenda might be slightly restructured to enable more activities complementary to the national Action Plan in its parts covering capacity building.
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	No response received
Denmark	Europe and North America	No response received
Djibouti	Africa	No response received
Dominica	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Dominican Republic	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Ecuador	Latin America and the Caribbean	The general budget of the State does not allow payments or assignments that are not previously approved by the Ministry of Finance and that appear within the annual program of expenses assigned to the institution.
Egypt	Arab States	No response received
El Salvador	Latin America and the Caribbean	N/A
Equatorial Guinea	Africa	No response received
Eritrea	Africa	No response received
Estonia	Europe and North America	No response received
Ethiopia	Africa	No response received
Fiji	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Finland	Europe and North America	No response received
France	Europe and North America	No response received
Gabon	Africa	No response received
Gambia (the)	Africa	No response received
Georgia	Europe and North America	0

Country	Region	Response
Germany	Europe and North America	<p>1. The budget of many institutions running World Heritage sites, i.e. foundation, is limited to statutory purposes.</p> <p>2. It is not possible to predict funding in an ongoing budget year. Such voluntary contributions have to be identified in the budget of the upcoming years according statutory provisions.</p> <p>3. In the short time available it was not possible to inform and to involve all the stakeholders of transboundary and serial World Heritage sites with several components in and outside Germany like the Prehistoric Pile Dwellings around the Alps, the Frontiers of the Roman Empire and the Ancient Beech Beech Forests.</p> <p>4. Instead of the sites, voluntary contributions of the Länder are under consideration and marked by the answer "Yes, but amount not determined at this stage". Funding of projects (bilateral or via the World Heritage Fund) as well as voluntary contributions to the German World Heritage Foundation are taken into consideration.</p>
Ghana	Africa	No response received
Greece	Europe and North America	No response received
Grenada	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Guatemala	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Guinea	Africa	No response received
Guinea-Bissau	Africa	No response received
Guyana	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Haiti	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Holy See	Europe and North America	No response received
Honduras	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Hungary	Europe and North America	There are no other reasons than financial constraints.
Iceland	Europe and North America	No response received
India	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Indonesia	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Iraq	Arab States	0
Ireland	Europe and North America	Both monuments are in State Care and owned by the State party.
Israel	Europe and North America	No response received
Italy	Europe and North America	Some site managers referred they would need high level political decisions in order to give a positive answer
Jamaica	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Japan	Asia and the Pacific	0
Jordan	Arab States	No response received
Kazakhstan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Kenya	Africa	No response received
Kiribati	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Kuwait	Arab States	No response received
Kyrgyzstan	Asia and the Pacific	Only limited budget
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Latvia	Europe and North America	-
Lebanon	Arab States	No response received
Lesotho	Africa	No response received
Liberia	Africa	No response received
Libya	Arab States	No response received
Lithuania	Europe and North America	There is a lack of consistent national strategy for financing World Heritage Sites in Lithuania.
Luxembourg	Europe and North America	/
Madagascar	Africa	No response received
Malawi	Africa	n/a
Malaysia	Asia and the Pacific	Site manager, after contributing to the Heritage Fund consider as not be getting direct benefit from the contribution.
Maldives	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Mali	Africa	No response received
Malta	Europe and North America	No response received
Marshall Islands	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Mauritania	Arab States	No response received
Mauritius	Africa	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Mexico	Latin America and the Caribbean	Economiques
Micronesia (Federated States of)	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Monaco	Europe and North America	No response received
Mongolia	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Montenegro	Europe and North America	No response received
Morocco	Arab States	Le constat est que le label du patrimoine mondial, une fois acquis par un bien quelconque, il engendre une augmentation du flux touristique et donc une nette augmentation des recettes. Ce constat étant plus ou moins vrai pour un certain nombre de sites, il demeure cependant difficilement vérifiable et justifiable par des chiffres et des statistiques dans l'absence de structures dédiées à cette fonction de veille et de prospective. C'est ce qui explique par exemple qu'aucune des conservations régionales n'a répondu à notre requête. C'est dire l'importance cruciale de doter obligatoirement un bien-patrimoine mondial d'une structure ou d'un comité de gestion qui soit en mesure d'assurer la mise en oeuvre du plan de gestion. La réalité pour le Maroc est que seulement deux biens dispose d'un plan de gestion (Ksar d'Ait Ben Haddou et Rabat), les sept biens restant n'en dispose pas, et pour les neuf biens marocains inscrits aucun ne dispose d'une structure de gestion qui soient opérationnel et représentative de tous les acteurs concernés. Cette carence de taille ne permet pas évidemment d'avoir une vision d'ensemble sur leur gestion et leur développement. Pour cette enquête, il est pratiquement impossible de fournir des chiffres exactes sur les recettes générés suite à acquisition du label "patrimoine mondial". Ce dernier n'étant pas bien mis en exergue au niveau du périmètre d'inscription et de sa zone tampon (Signalétique, point de vente, affichages, événements...).
Mozambique	Africa	No response received
Myanmar	Asia and the Pacific	Nowadays, Myanmar has been transitional stage in politic and socioeconomic conditions. Concerned with conservation measure in cultural heritage, it is mainly resonable in union or central government. There has been tried to prepare for power-sharing in union government to regional authorities. It is a still carrying on and functioning in respective stages. These administrative processes have been occurred in somewhat constraint in decision making and financial supporting. We hope that these administrative procedures will be major issue and reason for responsible for what you query us.
Namibia	Africa	N/A
Nepal	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Netherlands	Europe and North America	No response received
New Zealand	Asia and the Pacific	0
Nicaragua	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Niger	Africa	No response received
Nigeria	Africa	None
Niue	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Norway	Europe and North America	Local administration at the WH sites is organised in boards with political representation from local and regional level. These Boards do not have authority delegated from the political authorities, nor do they have their own budget, however they act as a coordinating forum and spokesman for the WH property. The Boards will seek consensus when discussing matters, however they cannot commit its individual members. Political decisions will have to be made separately on an independent basis in every authority concerned, and hence the results may differ. Also it is raised concern on complicated administrative consequenses around.
Oman	Arab States	No response received
Pakistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Palau	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Palestine	Arab States	No response received
Panama	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Papua New Guinea	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Paraguay	Latin America and the Caribbean	Paraguay is going to propose again trough meetings with the Main Authority te proposal of Decision 40 COM
Peru	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Philippines	Asia and the Pacific	Increased income to the World Heritage status of these sites come mostly from tourism which is managed and regulated by local stakeholders (e.g. private owners, local government units). Many of these sites have not instituted mechanism to fully measure tourism-related financial statistics.
Poland	Europe and North America	Local administrations explained that they were not able to respond positively because they we aware of beeng acused for unproper/unexplained expenditure of public money, for the purposes being external to their authority.
Portugal	Europe and North America	No reasons were presented by the sites that did not respond positively
Qatar	Arab States	0
Republic of Korea	Asia and the Pacific	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Republic of Moldova	Europe and North America	No response received
Romania	Europe and North America	The legislation in Romania does not fit the concept of "voluntary contribution" when public funds are involved. In order for a public body to be able to contribute from the public budget to the World Heritage Fund, it would be more clear if a national law would specifically include such a provision.
Russian Federation	Europe and North America	No response received
Rwanda	Africa	No response received
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Saint Lucia	Latin America and the Caribbean	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Samoa	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
San Marino	Europe and North America	No response received
Sao Tome and Principe	Africa	No response received
Saudi Arabia	Arab States	All being governmentally funded.
Senegal	Africa	No response received
Serbia	Europe and North America	No response received
Seychelles	Africa	In the case of the UNESCO WHP Aldabra Atoll the funds generated are not even sufficient to ensure the basic operation of the property. In addition, the Seychelles Islands Foundation (SIF) responsible for the management of this property does not receive any funds from the local, regional or national government. The operation is fully subsidised from the operation of the UNESCO WHP Vallée de Mai In the case of the UNESCO WHP Vallée de Mai the fees generated are divided between the two WHP in Seychelles. Presently the local community is even rejecting to use the funds generated in the Vallée de Mai for the operation of Aldabra Atoll. There is a request that funds should be returned to the community whilst funding community projects.
Sierra Leone	Africa	No response received
Singapore	Asia and the Pacific	To explain that SG's position, in principle is that we support unesco with capacity building. Each agency - the heritage sector as well as National Parks Board faces its own tight budgetary issues.
Slovakia	Europe and North America	Most of the cultural world heritage properties in Slovakia have responded negatively because of their limited budget. Concerning the natural world heritage properties, they are both managed by the same governmental institution. Unless significant changes in national legislation are made, this institution is not allowed to pay any voluntary fees. The institution should be a regular member of e.g. an association, organization etc., which has such a rule in its statute or founding document. In such case the institution managing natural world heritage properties could pay an annual member fee.
Slovenia	Europe and North America	No response received
Solomon Islands	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
South Africa	Africa	No response received
South Sudan	Africa	No response received
Spain	Europe and North America	No response received
Sri Lanka	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Sudan	Arab States	No response received
Suriname	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Swaziland	Africa	No response received
Sweden	Europe and North America	The World Heritage Fund and its sustainability is considered to be a State Party responsibility at the national level. Moreover, World Heritage properties are not single, legal entities that can be represented by local authorities. Income from various sources, for example tourism, goes to tourism companies, hotels, shops, museums etc. and not to the local authorities. Systems to collate income would need to be put in place. Local actors can make voluntary contributions to the Fund, but the World Heritage Fund is not considered to be a local and regional responsibility.
Switzerland	Europe and North America	v. Question 2: En général les sites ne voient pas la possibilité de contribuer au Fonds, cela étant une prérogative des Etats.
Syrian Arab Republic	Arab States	No response received
Tajikistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Thailand	Asia and the Pacific	Thailand is in the process of collecting information from the local administration.
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Europe and North America	0
Timor-Leste	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Togo	Africa	0
Tonga	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Trinidad and Tobago	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Tunisia	Arab States	No response received
Turkey	Europe and North America	Local administrations cannot make foreign donations without positive approval/decision of city councils
Turkmenistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Uganda	Africa	N/A
Ukraine	Europe and North America	0
United Arab Emirates	Arab States	No response received
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Europe and North America	n/a
United Republic of Tanzania	Africa	At this level there is no any reason determined, but still if discussed big obstacle might be financial
United States of America	Europe and North America	The great majority of properties in the United States are owned and funded wholly or largely by the federal government. They are thus bound by the same law that currently prevents the State Party from making its voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund.
Uruguay	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Uzbekistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Vanuatu	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Viet Nam	Asia and the Pacific	- Limited budget. - Need budget for infrastructure at the site, for the staff
Yemen	Arab States	No response received
Zambia	Africa	No response received
Zimbabwe	Africa	No response received