

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.202/INF.7 (SPE)

Paris, 12 September 2000

Original : English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL  
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

## Special Session

Budapest, Hungary

2 - 4 October 2000

Advisory Body notes concerning treatment of International Assistance (section  
2.7 of Table of Collated Recommendations) for consideration during the Special  
Session of the Bureau, Budapest, Hungary, Oct. 2-4, 2000

**Advisory Body notes concerning treatment of International Assistance (section 2.7 of Table of Collated Recommendations) for consideration during the Special Session of the Bureau, Budapest, Hungary, Oct. 2-4, 2000.**

#### **A. Introduction:**

ICCROM has prepared the following review in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies in order to highlight some of the key issues related to International Assistance requiring examination during the Special Session of the Bureau in Budapest, Oct. 2-4, 2000. In addition, under separate cover, both ICCROM and IUCN have submitted comments concerning the findings of the C3E Report on International Assistance.

A number of conclusions concerning the provision of International Assistance are included within the reports being looked at in Budapest, particularly Section 2.7 of the Task Force report submitted to the Bureau in June 2000, (herein referred to as the **Task Force report**), and the report of the Canerturbury meeting on the Operational Guidelines (herein referred to as the **Canterbury report**).

However, the Advisory Bodies believe that annexes to two of the above reports deserve special consideration during the Special Session of the Bureau:

- the important statements of policy and principle found within the **Proposed new text on International Assistance for the revised *Operational Guidelines***, Annex VII of the report on the Canterbury meeting, (referred to herein as **Annex VII Canterbury**),
- the ICCROM submissions to the Task Force discussions (prepared in consultation with ICOMOS) concerning international assistance found within **Annex One: ICCROM of the Report of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World heritage Convention**, (referred to herein as **Task Force ICCROM Annex**).

#### **B. Recommendations:**

This report includes recommendations for Committee action in five areas of concern relating to International Assistance:

- **Concerning establishing priorities for international assistance.**
  - **Sources:** The **Task Force report** (2.7.5) notes that the “Committee should allocate International Assistance in line with strategic priorities (e.g., World Heritage in Danger, Global Strategy)”. The **Annex VII Canterbury** document links decisions concerning allocation of international assistance to a “policy and priorities” defined by the Committee, to a “strategic plan to be drawn up the Committee at least every six years”. Priorities are “to be defined and updated regularly by the Committee.....taking into consideration the results of the latest regional Periodic Reports by the Committee”.

- **Conclusions:** There is a need for a unified strategic planning process, tying together and integrating all sources of informational input, and ensuring integrated and well co-ordinated outputs.
- **Recommended:** The Committee should commit itself to a strategic planning process which:
  - integrates the findings of the Periodic Reporting process,
  - integrates the results of periodic independent evaluations of the relevance, impact and effectiveness of international assistance,
  - integrates concern for situations of urgent need (e.g., emergency assistance, WH List in danger),
    - is updated regularly,
  - establishes clear priorities for development of the global strategy,
  - establishes clear priorities for the allocation of international assistance,
  - establishes clear lines of action for collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre, in implementation of the planning process.
- **Concerning establishing principles and procedures for reviewing requests for International Assistance**
  - **Sources:** The **Task Force report (2.7.5)** notes that the Committee should “consider establishing principles and procedures for assessing requests for international assistance”.  
The **Task Force ICCROM Annex** document recognizes that the Advisory Bodies have established criteria and procedures for the review of requests for international assistance. (*Criteria and checklists developed by ICCROM for training reviews, and International Assistance procedures developed by ICCROM and ICOMOS are included in the Global Training Strategy document submitted to the Bureau, July, 2000*).
  - **Conclusions:** The Advisory Bodies believe, as previously proposed, that the Committee should ensure that existing evaluation procedures and criteria documents are used as a starting point for improvement.
  - **Recommended:** The Committee should ensure review of evaluation procedures and criteria already established and in use by the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre, as a basis for developing appropriate procedures for inclusion within the Operational Guidelines. The Committee should ensure periodic review and updating of such measures.
- **Involvement of the Advisory Bodies.**
  - **Sources:** Article 14.2 of the **WH Convention** notes that the DG of UNESCO is expected to utilize “to the fullest extent possible” the services

of the Advisory Bodies in “their respective areas of competence and capability. The **Task Force ICCROM Annex** notes however, that there is no consistent standard for the involvement of Advisory Bodies with requests for international assistance (with the exception of Cultural Heritage training requests which following a Committee decision of 1996 must be forwarded to ICCROM). The **Annex VII Canterbury** document states that “All requests for international assistance shall be referred to the appropriate advisory bodie(s) for professional review and evaluation”.

- **Conclusions:** The Advisory Bodies believe that the Committee is ill-served by random requests for their evaluation services. The Advisory Bodies believe that the effectiveness of Committee spending is enhanced immeasurably by making consistent and continuing use of Advisory Body services and standards, particularly in evaluation of international assistance requests.
- **Recommended:** The Committee shall ensure that all requests for international assistance shall be referred to the appropriate advisory bodie(s) for professional review and evaluation.
- **Categories of International Assistance.**
  - **Sources:** The **Task Force ICCROM Annex** notes that “the categories of international assistance are interpreted differently by States parties, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Proper use of the budget provisions established by the Committee require that the demarcations of activity be clearly defined and respected. The **Annex VII Canterbury** document, referring back to the **WH Convention (Article 22)**, notes only that “the Committee may support requests concerned with provision of professional expertise (studies, experts, training), equipment and financing (loans and grants)”.
  - **Conclusions:** The Advisory Bodies feel that categories of International Assistance must be defined without possibility of confusion or varying interpretation, and in ways which assist the Committee to ensure that its available funds are being spent broadly in relation to agreed upon strategic priorities.
  - **Recommended:** The Committee should ensure review of the categories of international assistance presently in use in order to ensure that the distinctions defined are clear and mutually exclusive, and of direct help to the Committee in allocating its resources according to its strategic priorities.
- **Respecting Operational Guidelines Provisions.**
  - **Sources:** The **Annex VII Canterbury** document notes that “deadlines for application for international assistance will be determined by the Committee in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat”. However, the **Task Force ICCROM Annex** notes that Operational Guidelines procedures for requests (deadlines) and requirements for

follow-up evaluation are routinely ignored by States Parties. The **Task Force report (2.7.3)** notes that all parties to are encouraged to “respect the Operational Guidelines provisions for international assistance especially on deadlines and follow up”.

- **Conclusions:** The Advisory Bodies believe that if the Committee adopts procedures (deadlines - that is, May 1 for Bureau review, and Sept. 1 for Committee review, and follow-up requirements), these should be respected fully. If these are not being being respected – and at present, a lack of respect is very much the norm - these procedures should be abandoned or modified to make them workable. The need to respect deadlines has been drawn to the attention of States Parties in a circular letter (March 1999), and in a statement made by the Committee during its Dec. 1999 meeting; thus far, however, little evidence of greater attention to deadlines and other requirements is evident.
- As a consequence, the Advisory Bodies believe that the Committee must do more than “encourage” States Parties to respect the procedural requirements. If the Committee feels the deadlines and other provisions are important for the effective use of International Assistance, the Advisory Bodies feel that it must “insist”, by ensuring that the provisions it has adopted are respected by all partners in the WH system involved with requests for international assistance.
- **Recommended:** The Committee should ensure that the procedures it has adopted for international assistance review, particularly in relation to deadlines and follow-up evaluations are respected by all partners in the World Heritage system, including the Committee, the Bureau, the Chair, States Parties, the WH Centre, and the Advisory Bodies.