



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 37 COM

**WHC-13/37.COM/INF.5D**

Paris, 17 May 2013

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-seventh session**

**Phnom Penh, Cambodia  
16 – 27 June 2013**

**Item 5 of the Provisional Agenda: Reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies**

**5D: Revised PACT Initiative Strategy**

**INF. 5D: Report of the second meeting of the open-ended working group on the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative**

## **SUMMARY**

In the framework of the Progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the evaluation of the Global Strategy and the Partnership for Conservation Initiative (PACT), the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session took note of the Implementation Plan concerning the Global Strategy prepared by the first meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group established by the 18th session of the General Assembly in 2011.

By its Decision **36 COM 9A.6** the Committee also took note that a second meeting focusing on the PACT Initiative was scheduled to take place prior to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The second meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group took place on 1 February 2013, and adopted an implementation plan for the recommendations of the External Auditor on the PACT Initiative. The report of the Rapporteur of the Working Group is provided in this document.

All documents of the open-ended working group are posted on the World Heritage Centre website at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/open-ended-working-group>.

## **I. BACKGROUND**

1. The General Assembly at its 17th session requested the World Heritage Centre to provide at its 18th session in 2011 “with a summary of the work undertaken in relation to the reflection on the future of the Convention, including an independent evaluation by UNESCO’s external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011 and the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT), based on indicators and approaches to be developed during the 34th and 35th sessions of the World Heritage Committee”.
2. The 18th session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2011) endorsed the recommendations of the External Auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy and on the Partnership for Conservation Initiative (PACT). It decided (Resolution **18 GA 8**) to establish an open-ended working group to examine the report of the External Auditor, in order to produce an implementation plan for the recommendations and to present a final report to the 19th session of the General Assembly.
3. The General Assembly also recommended that this open-ended working group meet “before the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, in order to report to the Committee on the work undertaken”.
4. The open-ended working group which met from 15 to 16 May 2012 at UNESCO debated the Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the external auditor on the Global Strategy and decided to meet again prior to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee to discuss the recommendations on the PACT Initiative.
5. The second meeting of the open-ended working group took place on 1 February 2013. Chaired by Mr David D. Hamadziripi (Zimbabwe) and with Ms Kristien Dubois (Belgium) as Rapporteur, the Working Group adopted an implementation plan for the recommendations of the External Auditor on the PACT Initiative.
6. The Implementation Plan indicates the modalities and the timeline for implementing each recommendation, specifies whether there are financial implications and allocates the responsibility for implementing the recommendations. The Plan lists the nine recommendations in order of priority (from the highest priority to medium priority).

## **II. REPORT OF THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP**

7. The Working Group commended the work of the external auditor on the Evaluation of the implementation of the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT). It was pointed out that the recommendations formulated are mainly of an administrative kind and that these do not reflect some of the other important findings from the full report of the external auditor. Since it was not found opportune to create new recommendations, the Working Group decided that these findings would be integrated in the action plan to the extent possible. Other important recommendations would be integrated in this narrative report, which introduces the Action Plan. Therefore the recommendations of the Working Group which will be

Report of the second meeting of the open-ended working group on the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative

proposed in this narrative report need to be seen as an inherent part of the Action Plan so that they are taken into account in the implementation of the Action Plan as well as in the new proposal of the PACT strategy.

8. The Working Group identified 6 main areas for improvement of the PACT initiative:
  - a) The Working Group clearly indicated that **Conservation of World Heritage sites** needs to be at the core of the objectives of private sector partnerships. PACT was established with this objective, but the external auditor pointed out that between 2005 and 2010, the income generated by PACT partnerships only served to a limited extent the World Heritage conservation. The income was mostly used to cover running costs of the World Heritage Centre, therefore its contribution to World Heritage conservation was mainly indirect. The Working Group therefore insisted that the funds received through PACT should, as far as possible, go into the World Heritage Fund and serve more directly the conservation of World Heritage sites. It was suggested that this could be done by linking donations directly to the conservation of specific sites, especially sites on the danger list. This would permit these sites to be more rapidly removed from this list. Another recommendation of the Working Group to the World Heritage Centre was to limit the use of Funds-in-Trusts for PACT and to promote the allocation of donations to the World Heritage Fund so that the World Heritage Committee can indicate the conservation priorities for which the funds should be used. In this way, PACT would serve more strongly the main aim of the *World Heritage Convention*, which is the Conservation of World Heritage sites.
  - b) The Working Group debated extensively the use of the **World Heritage emblem**. Two main issues were identified, namely limiting the commercial use of the emblem and ensuring a balanced partnership with equal benefits for all parties. The External Auditor indicated that the visibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and World Heritage itself can be increased by partnerships. Nevertheless, he took note that in several cases it is rather the partner that benefits from the use of the emblem of the *Convention* or the UNESCO logo. The Working Group also indicated that, since the World Heritage Programme is probably the most prestigious programme in UNESCO and a desired partner, the Programme should not try to seek more visibility as an aim in itself, but should valorize sufficiently the use of its emblem, which can be evaluated by the return received by a partnership for the Conservation of World Heritage. In the light of these findings, the Working Group formulated a recommendation in the action plan in which the World Heritage Centre is asked to consult the Committee in advance, when the timeline allows for it, on the use of the emblem for commercial use, since according to the guidelines, the commercial use of the emblem is supposed to be exceptional. In case this is not feasible, the exceptionality of the use of the emblem for commercial purposes needs to be justified afterwards. The Working Group also asked the Centre to always consult the Committee in advance in case this kind of partnership is renewed since this can be planned ahead. With regard to the use of the emblem, the Working Group recommended to the World Heritage Centre to safeguard the value of the World Heritage emblem in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* and to

include in partnership agreements a provision on the use of the emblem in partners' communication products, and to monitor such use.

- c) During the discussions, the Working Group emphasized the importance of having the right **expertise** for entering into a partnership with **the private sector**. The specificity of this activity requires that the Centre and UNESCO need to avail themselves of professional expert advice, whether it is external or internal, when establishing and negotiating private partnership agreements. The Working Group noted that this issue has been raised several times during the Executive Board, which indicates that Member States feel the need to strengthen this expertise within the Organization. This recommendation therefore addresses the whole of the Organization.
  - d) The Working Group highlighted several principles with regard to **strengthening the management of partnerships** as well as including important elements in the partnership framework in order to allow a strengthened monitoring and evaluation of partnerships. The External Auditor formulated several recommendations in this regard since he had observed a weak monitoring of PACT partnerships. The Working Group noted the work already accomplished by the World Heritage Centre in order to implement the Auditor's recommendations, and encouraged the establishment of long-term partnerships in order to diminish the administrative burden on the World Heritage Centre.
  - e) The Working Group commended the World Heritage Centre for the current template for **reporting** to the Committee. It was noted that the strengthened management of partnerships as well as the traceability of the funds should allow the World Heritage Centre to improve the analytical information given to the Committee, especially on prospective and renewed partnerships, including the benefits of these partnerships for World Heritage conservation. The Working Group indicated that the funds received from PACT partnerships that go to the World Heritage Fund, should be more clearly shown in the budget, so that these can be attributed to the Conservation priorities. In a more general way, the Working Group recommended to the Centre to more clearly indicate in the budget the funds received from all partnerships and their use.
  - f) With regard to the new PACT Strategy, the Working Group highlighted the importance of formulating a **long term vision** for entering into public-private partnerships and the use of the emblem as well as a time frame for the implementation of the Strategy. The reason why the World Heritage Programme enters into private partnerships need to be built upon a strong strategic vision.
9. In its closing remarks, the Working Group indicated the importance of having a strong framework for private partnerships within which the Centre has the flexibility to operate. It remains however important that States Parties decide on the priorities and that the partnerships concluded under PACT follow these priorities. The Working Group drew attention to paragraph 79 of the full report (WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A), in which the External Auditor highlights **a triple risk**, as the core issue of this evaluation: a risk of deterioration of the World Heritage

conservation partnership, a risk of banalization of the emblem of the Convention and the UNESCO logo, and a risk of losing sense when seeking visibility becomes more prominent than World Heritage Conservation.

10. The Implementation Plan is provided below in table format. All documents of the open-ended working group, including the letters sent to all States Parties and background information are posted on the World Heritage Centre website at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/open-ended-working-group>.

## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN BY THE WORKING GROUP FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR ON THE PACT INITIATIVE

Key:  
Ht.P = Highest Priority  
Hi.P = High Priority  
M.P = Medium Priority

BSP/CFS = Bureau of Strategic Planning/Cooperation with the Private Sector  
WHC/CEP/PACT = World Heritage Centre/Communication, Education and Partnerships Unit/  
Partnerships for Conservation  
WHC/AO = World Heritage Centre/Administrative Unit

BFM = Bureau of Financial Management  
ERI = Sector for External Relations and Public Information  
LA = Legal Affairs

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility
1. Ht.P	<p><i>Recommendation n° 4 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i> Indicate in agreements the obligations of the partner as regards activity reports and use of the emblem of the Convention; use tools to measure the impact of information diffused on the Convention and the sites and the contribution to World Heritage conservation.</p>	<p>1.a) The Working Group stresses that Conservation of World Heritage sites needs to be at the core of the objectives of private sector partnerships.</p> <p>1.b) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and the Committee to give priority to long-term strategic partnerships.</p> <p>1.c) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include in partnership agreements an obligatory evaluation and monitoring clause, especially for important partnerships, which takes into account the evaluation of the partnership before renewal.</p> <p>1.d) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to establish clear partnership frameworks with timelines, responsibilities, performance indicators, expected results and evaluation.</p> <p>1.e) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to involve the Advisory Bodies and other experts during the development of important partnerships and their evaluation.</p> <p>1.f) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to avail itself of professional expert advice when establishing and negotiating private</p>	<p>19 GA Ongoing</p>	<p>Estimations of additional costs for involvement of Advisory Bodies and external experts will have to be prepared.</p> <p>The other recommendations have no additional costs.</p>	<p>WHC/CEP/PACT WHCommittee BSP/CFS Advisory Bodies</p>

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility
		<p>partnership agreements in order to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) experts' advice on specifics linked to private partnerships</li> <li>ii) the added value of a partnership</li> <li>iii) a balanced partnership with equal benefits for all parties.</li> </ul> <p>1.g) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to safeguard the value of the World Heritage emblem in conformity with the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (Strategic Plan 2012-2022).</p>			
2 Ht.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°8 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Improve information of the «focal point for private sector cooperation» on partnerships in the Organization, by constituting a database to facilitate coordination.</p> <p><i>[As per the Auditor's report, this recommendation may also concern other UNESCO Sectors]</i></p>	<p>2.a) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to develop an updated list of prospective partnerships on Conservation in order to facilitate and encourage a proactive attitude towards the establishment of partnerships.</p> <p>2.b) In order to enhance the collaboration with National Commissions, the Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to provide information on PACT to National Commissions at their annual meeting at UNESCO to encourage them to proactively seek partnerships for World Heritage conservation.</p>	Ongoing	No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT  BSP/CFS
3 Ht.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°5 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Inspired by good practices observed in certain PACT partnerships, envisage the establishment of a consultative entity, associating qualified personalities.</p>	<p>3.a) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include in the new PACT Strategy, proposals on a more systemic use of a consultative entity for important partnerships, which includes external experts, in order to strengthen the expertise in the monitoring and evaluation of the partnerships.</p>	Ongoing	Include the costs for a consultative entity with external experts in the budget of important partnerships	WHC/CEP/ PACT

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility
4 Ht.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°3 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Implement the recommendations of the Administrative Manual for private sector partnerships: role of the focal point of the Division for Cooperation with Extrabudgetary Funding Resources, respect of the delegation of authority and signature; consultation with national commissions.</p>	<p>4.a) The Working Group takes note of the established procedure with regard to the attribution of different visas for non-standards agreements (which go up to a maximum of 5) before entering into a new partnership.</p> <p>4.b) The Working Group recommends to BSP/CFS, in order to ensure efficient consultations with States Parties and their timely reaction on the establishment of a new partnership, to systematically inform the relevant Permanent Delegations at the same time as the National Commissions concerned are consulted.</p> <p>4.c) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include the Advisory Bodies in the risk analysis of potential partners when requested.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Additional costs for Advisory Bodies' implication need to be calculated.</p> <p>The other recommendations have no additional costs.</p>	<p>BSP/CFS</p> <p>WHC/CEP/PACT</p>



No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility
5 Hi.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°7 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Make more precise the provisions of the Administrative Manual so as to constitute an operational guide for the managers of private sector partnerships, in particular to define objectives and modalities of the partnership, the selection of the partner, the comparison of costs and benefits, risk analysis, piloting mechanism for the partnership and the final assessment of the results obtained.</p> <p><i>[Following the Auditor's report, this recommendation may also concern other UNESCO Sectors]</i></p>	<p>5.a) The Working Group notes that the UNESCO Administrative Manual contains guiding principles for selecting, monitoring and implementing partnerships and that the Manual is being updated in conformity with the UNESCO Strategy on Partnerships with the Private Sector.</p> <p>5.b) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and to UNESCO to make the Administrative Manual accessible to States Parties and National Commissions.</p>	Ongoing	No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT  BSP/CFS
6 Hi.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°6 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Make permanently available to the Committee exact information on partnerships.</p>	<p>6.a) The Working Group welcomes the current template for reporting to the Committee. However, the Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to improve the information given on prospective and renewed partnerships, including the result of their evaluation. For new partnerships and renewals, more analytical information should be provided on expected benefits for World Heritage conservation including the experts' opinions on the partnership where appropriate.</p> <p>6.b) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to bring proposals for the use of the</p>	Committee in 2014  Ongoing	No additional costs since the cost of the experts are already included in priority no. 1 of this table.  No additional	WHC/CEP/ PACT  BSP/CFS

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility
		<p>emblem for commercial use, which can only be done on an exceptional basis, to the Committee for approval when possible. For new partnerships, if the time frame does not allow consultation of the Committee in advance, the Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to report to the Committee afterwards on the exceptionality of the use of the emblem for commercial use. For renewals of partnerships, consultation of the Committee is always required in advance.</p> <p>6.c) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to include a summary on PACT implementation in the reporting of the Strategic Action plan to the Committee and to the Budget Working Group in order for the Group to have a clearer overview of the funds available.</p> <p>6.d) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to show more clearly in the Budget the funds received from partnerships which go to the World Heritage Fund.</p> <p>6.e) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre to organize, when convenient, events with private partners and States Parties and link them to important World Heritage meetings or events.</p> <p>6.f) The Working Group recommends to the World Heritage Centre and to BSP/CFS to ensure accessibility by States Parties to the full partnership agreements.</p>		<p>costs</p> <p>No additional costs</p> <p>Costs to be determined according to type and place of event.</p> <p>No additional costs</p>	

No. in priority order	Recommendation (Based on Working Document WHC-11/18.GA/8)	Recommendations Open-Ended Working Group	Time line (COM = Committee; GA= General Assembly)	Financial Implications	Allocation of Responsibility
7 Hi.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°9 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Include in the current reflections on partnerships at the Organization level, the establishment of a consultative body to ensure that partnership projects and developments or renewal of partnerships respect the regulations on which a consensus exists within the United Nations system.  <i>[Following the Auditor's report, this recommendation may also concern other UNESCO Sectors]</i></p>	<p>7.a) The Working Group notes that BSP, BFM, ERI, LA and the Programme Sectors form an internal consultative body and meet regularly, on a case by case basis, to discuss new important strategic partnerships. The Working Group recommends to this internal consultative body to also systematically discuss the evaluation of strategic partnerships before their renewal.</p>	19 GA	No additional costs	BSP/CFS
8. Hi.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°2 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Establish a reporting tool based on the FABS budgetary and financial system which would feed into a database providing the Secretariat (BSP/CFS) reliable information on partnerships.</p>	<p>8.a) The Working Group notes the establishment of the reporting tool which ensures traceability of the funds coming from partnerships and recommends to the World Heritage Centre to utilize this tool to enhance transparency and the quality of reporting to the Committee and States Parties.</p>	Committee in 2014	No additional costs	WHC/AO  WHC/CEP/ PACT
9 M.P	<p><i>Recommendation n°1 of Doc 11/18.GA/8</i></p> <p>Proceed with a clearly defined archiving method for documents relating to PACT and ensure the computerized safeguarding of information.</p>	<p>9.a) The Working Group notes the ongoing implementation of this recommendation and recommends to the World Heritage Centre to continue archiving all documents according to the established method.</p>	Ongoing	No additional costs	WHC/CEP/ PACT