



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

World Heritage

18 GA

Distribution Limited

WHC-11/18.GA/8
Paris, 1 August 2011
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES
PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
7 – 9 November 2011

**Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of the *Global Strategy* and the
PACT Initiative**

SUMMARY

The General Assembly, at its 17th session, requested the World Heritage Centre to provide the General Assembly 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”. The Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) requested the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

Decision **35 COM 9A** (see Annex 1) requested the World Heritage Centre to transmit the documents WHC-11/35.COM/9A and WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A to the 18th session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2011) for examination. Subsequently, a Circular Letter was sent to all States Parties and to Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN) asking them to provide comments in writing to the World Heritage Centre. At the time of the preparation of this document, comments were received from 8 States Parties. All comments are posted on the World Heritage Centre website at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/655>

This document should be read in conjunction with WHC-11/18.GA/INF.8.

Draft Resolution 18 GA 8: see Point I.

I. **Draft Resolution 18 GA 8**

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC-11/18.GA/8 and WHC-11/18.GA/INF.8,*
2. *Noting the results of the independent evaluation by UNESCO's external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011 and the Partnership for Conservation Initiative (PACT) requested by its Resolution **17 GA 9** (UNESCO, 2009),*
3. *Welcomes the views of all States Parties that provided comments following the Circular Letter dated 13 July 2011;*
4. *Requests the World Heritage Committee, at its 36th session, to further review the implementation of the Global Strategy considering the recommendations of the External Auditor;*
5. *Also requests the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO to consider the recommendations concerning PACT notably in order to harmonize PACT with UNESCO's development of partnership strategies;*
6. *Further requests the World Heritage Centre to provide the General Assembly at its 19th session in 2013 with a report of the work undertaken.*

	External Auditor for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	
---	---	---

I. INDEPENDENT EVALUATION BY THE UNESCO EXTERNAL AUDITOR ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A CREDIBLE, REPRESENTATIVE AND BALANCED WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE PARTNERSHIPS FOR CONSERVATION INITIATIVE (PACT)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Framework and parameter of the evaluation.....	3
2. Evaluation of the Global Strategy for a Credible, Representative and Balanced World Heritage List (1994-2011).....	4
2.1 Lack of a clear definition of the objectives for the strategy and appropriate indicators to evaluate its results.....	4
2.2 Evaluation elements and contrasting results.....	5
2.3 An evolution that carries risks.....	6
3. Evaluation of the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT).....	13
3.1 An unsystematic approach to partnerships.....	13
3.2 Insufficient traceability provided for the modest resources.....	14
3.3 A very limited impact on World Heritage conservation.....	14

1. Framework and parameter of the evaluation

1. The General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention requested that «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 » be presented at its 18th session¹. The World Heritage Committee adopted the terms of reference for the evaluation at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010)².

2 The two parts of the evaluation are linked.³ Since the creation of the 1972 Convention, World Heritage protection is a major objective for UNESCO. Already nearly 1,000 properties of increasingly diversified categories have been listed. The success of the List is such that listing is a major stake, with the risk that protection becomes a secondary concern once listing is achieved.

2. Evaluation of the Global Strategy for a Credible, Representative and Balanced World Heritage List (1994-2011)

3. The evaluation of the Global Strategy was re-situated in the wider framework of the 1972 Convention.

2.1. Lack of a clear definition of the objectives for the strategy and appropriate indicators to evaluate its results

- Diversely interpreted notions in the absence of definitions in the Guidelines

4. The Global Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee (referred to in the report as the *Committee*) in 1994, and enlarged to embrace natural properties in 1996, had as objective a «credible, representative and balanced List ».

5. But these concepts were not defined by the Committee. Definitions proposed by experts were not included in the Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (referred to as *the Guidelines* in the report), which has been the source of diverging interpretations. Many States Parties interpret these notions according to purely geopolitical criteria, forgetting that the outstanding universal value (OUV) is the key condition for nomination of a property to the World Heritage List.

- Inadequate monitoring mechanism

6. Despite the importance accorded to the Global Strategy, no indicator has been established to objectively monitor its results.

7. The evaluation of the Global Strategy presented at each session is based on an inadequate mechanism that reduces the notions of credibility, representativity and balance to a series of simplified statistical tables on numbers and regions of World Heritage properties. This tool is not based on scientific criteria, contributing to a drift towards a more political rather than heritage approach to the Convention. Statistics are presented according to a division into five large zones; this is not applicable in regard to cultural or natural criteria,

¹ Resolution 17 GA 9, paragraph 16 (Document WHC-09/17.GA/10)

² Decision 34 COM 9A (Document WHC-10/34.COM/20)

³ The present report is accompanied by an information document in two parts that detail the observations made on the two parts of the evaluation.

notably for ensembles as vast as Europe and North America⁴ and Asia-Pacific. The number of properties is a rough indicator⁵. The development of serial nominations nullifies the notion of numbers of properties by zone.

8. To ensure the balance and representativity of the List, reference should be made to scientific criteria such as the large biogeographical provinces of « Udvardy⁶ » listing for natural properties (which does not apply to maritime zones) or the spatio-temporal analytical grids by type of heritage, by epoch and civilization for cultural properties.

2.2. Evaluation elements and contrasting results

9. The External Auditor cannot mitigate the absence of established indicators foreseen for the monitoring of the Convention in 2005 and the lack of updated data. It does not have the scientific competence to exhaustively update the analysis of gaps carried out in 2004 by the Advisory Bodies and continued in the framework of thematic studies. Therefore, it can only provide partial evaluation elements.

- A Convention which has become quasi universal

10. The Global Strategy encourages (paragraph 55 of the Guidelines) a greater number of countries to become States Parties to the Convention and to establish tentative lists and nominations for inscription. Almost all the 193 Member States of UNESCO have since ratified the World Heritage Convention (187 States Parties in 2010 in comparison to 139 in 1994) and the proportion of States Parties having at least one listed property has increased from 72 % to 80 %.

- The wide diversification of inscribed properties

11. In 1994, to improve the representivity of the List, specific criteria were introduced into the Guidelines to define historic cities, cultural itineraries and cultural landscapes. Criterion (i) has evolved since 2005 from aesthetic properties to more technical ones. Criterion (iii) has been extended to include living cultures. To fill the gaps of cultural heritage identified in 2004, industrial heritage and 20th century properties, prehistoric and rock art, routes and cultural landscapes, as well as some vernacular architecture were inscribed, but this latter category remains very under-represented.

- Insufficient progress concerning the representation of natural heritage

12. Some progress has been achieved in the framework of the Global Strategy, notably in the framework of thematic studies on forests (25th session, Helsinki, 2001) or marine heritage (29th session, Durban, 2005). The number of States Parties having inscribed a natural property on their tentative list has greatly increased: only eight in 1994, 51 in 1996, 124 in 2004 and 162 in 2010.

13. However, numerous States Parties remain without specialised administration on matters of environment. The majority of focal points for States Parties and World Heritage Centre

⁴ The Europe – North America region numbers 51 countries in contrast to 31 in Asia - Pacific, 30 in Africa, 25 in Latin America and the Caribbean and 15 in the Arab States. Europe in the sense of the region Europe / North America extends beyond the Urals to the whole of the Russian Federation: the Kamchatka Volcanoes are included. It also includes Turkey and Israel, Overseas Territories of France, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and Norway, as well as the subtropical islands of the Canaries, Madeira and the Azores attached to Spain and Portugal.

⁵ How to account for the natural properties with areas as dissimilar as the Vallee de Mai Nature Reserve of the Seychelles (less than 18 ha) and the Great Barrier Reef (34.87 million ha) or the protected area of the Phoenix Islands (40,825 million ha) ? Also, cultural properties comprising both isolated properties such as monuments, historic towns and serial properties are sometimes very spread out.

⁶ [*A Classification of the Biogeographical Provinces of the World*](#), Prepared as a contribution to UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme, Project No. 8. IUCN Occasional Paper No. 18. IUCN, Morges, Suisse, 1975.

regional representations are directed by cultural or educational specialists. The World Heritage Centre itself counts only a few scientific experts, specialists in natural properties, with acknowledged competence but too few in respect to the extent of the task in hand. States Parties are often reticent in requesting the nomination of natural properties because economic development of the territories (mining, petroleum, forestry exploitation, dam constructions or other infrastructures) is given priority. The services provided by the ecosystems are nevertheless essential, particularly for the poorest populations⁷. But these services remain insufficiently considered in the process of economic decisions and challenges for their preservation have difficulty in being translated into operational mechanisms (such as payments for ecosystem services) both at the State level and the international level⁸. The World Heritage Convention does not apply to areas that are not part of the sovereignty of States Parties (high seas, including a part of the Arctic, the Antarctica).

14. The Cairns-Suzhou Decision, authorising two nominations by States on the condition that one of them be for a natural site, enabled a notable increase in nominations for natural properties. But the Christchurch Decision (31st session, 2007), that gave States Parties free choice to decide, on an experimental basis, the nature of the properties they wished to nominate at the same session, led to a decrease in these nominations. It was clearly noticeable in Brasilia (only 12.1% of nominations submitted to the Advisory Bodies).

- Evolution of the geographical distribution is difficult to evaluate due to arbitrary zoning

15. Over the period 2004-2010, the increase in nominations was more marked in the Asia-Pacific region, followed by Africa and the Latin America and the Caribbean region. However, due to the pursuance of nominations in Europe and North America, this region maintained its level with a slight increase (from 47 % to 49 %). These statistics are however biased by arbitrary zoning of World Heritage⁹. The Asia-Pacific region slightly strengthened its position (from 20 to 22 %), as did the Latin America and the Caribbean region (from 13 to 14 %). However, nominations for Africa, representing 10% of the total listed properties in 1994, only make up 8.5% in 2010. Also, the Arab States part went from 10% to 7%.

16. The efficacy of Preparatory Assistance with regard to the objectives of the Global Strategy appears mediocre. Only 28% (45) of the 185 properties concerned with Preparatory Assistance were inscribed. 25% of these properties did not even result in nominations by the States concerned. A better selection of properties proposed for Preparatory Assistance would avoid the waste of funds in preparing files that do not fulfil the criteria required by the Guidelines.

2.3. An evolution that carries risks

17. Interest in the Convention and the reputation of the World Heritage properties with the public at large are a success for the Global Strategy. But this success carries with it risks and diversions.

- Difficulties linked to the growth of the List

18. With the current rhythm of 20 to 25 nominations a year, the List will soon number 1,000 properties and could number 1,500 in 2030 and 2,000 in 2045, the one-hundred year

⁷ As emphasized in the « Evaluation of Ecosystems for the Millennium », conducted between 2001 and 2005 under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of 1360 experts originating from 95 countries, and more recently the study on ecosystem economies and biodiversity established in 2010 in response to the request of environment ministers of the G8 countries and five other countries.

⁸ Cf. negotiations on forests, World Trade Organization.

⁹ Thus, the nomination of the Historic Area of Willemstad in the Netherlands Antilles (1997), Gough and Inaccessible Islands (1995) in the middle of the South Atlantic (United Kingdom) the Lagoons of New Caledonia (2008) and the Reunion (2010) accounted with France, Hawaiï with the United States of America (2010), have strengthened the Europe-North America region which also comprises Henderson Island (1988) in the South Pacific (United Kingdom). Also, The nomination of several extensive natural properties located east of the Caucasus (including the Volcanoes of Kamchatka) are counted as Europe (Russian Federation).

anniversary of UNESCO. While, during the first years of the implementation of the Convention properties described as iconic were inscribed, the refining of the categories has led to the inscription on the tentative lists of sites where the outstanding universal value is only perceptible to hyper-specialists. Moreover, due to the prestige of the List and the economic interests at stake, States Parties insist upon the nomination of properties that, in the opinion of the Advisory Bodies, do not appear to respond to global recognition but more to a national or regional recognition. For several inscribed properties, the question may well be asked whether the criteria for outstanding universal value in the sense of the Kazan Declaration of 2005 (reproduced in paragraph 49 of the Guidelines) is truly fulfilled: « outstanding universal value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole ».

19. The growth of the List, potentially unlimited due to the diversification of nomination criteria, and the increasing complexity of the files (transnational sites, serial properties, need for comparative analyses) entails an increasingly heavy workload for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, both in the nomination process and for the monitoring of the properties. The mechanism depends more and more on extrabudgetary funding which has increased from 18% (1996-1997) to 54 % (2008-2009) of the resources of the World Heritage Centre.

20. There is a need to refocus nominations on the most outstanding properties, in conformity with the spirit of the 1972 Convention and to create other more efficient tools for recognition and protection.

- Risk of weakening the credibility of the List due to decisions based more on geopolitical decisions rather than scientific ones

21. Due to the prestige of the World Heritage List, nomination becomes increasingly a geopolitical stake and not a heritage one for the benefit of all humanity and future generations.

22. The 1972 Convention refers to scientific methods. It depends on the Advisory Bodies whose professionalism is the scientific guarantee of the value of the World Heritage List.

23. But one observes a strong correlation between the countries represented on the World Heritage Committee and the location of properties nominated. From 1977 to 2005, 314 nominations, 42% of which had benefitted countries with Committee members during their mandate. Since then, evolution has been erratic: the proportion decreased to 16.7% in 2006 (Vilnius) and increased to 25% in 2008 (Quebec), and increased again to 42.9% in 2010 (Brasilia).

24. Contrary to the provisions of Article 9-3 of the Convention, sufficient representation is not observed for experts in the delegations. Frequently, the decisions of the Committee increasingly diverge from the scientific opinions of the Advisory Bodies, as indicated in the tables established in the framework of the audit. Differences had already been observed in the past, notably at the Durban (2005), Christchurch (2007) and Quebec (2008) sessions, but they were flagrant at the 34th session (Brasilia). Amendments were made to the draft decisions even before the presentation of the property; several delegations made official complaints.

25. An increasing number of nominations are accompanied by conditions or recommendations, because the conditions relating to the conservation and the management of the property were not in place at the time of nomination. Thus, the provisions of the Guidelines allow, without strict enforcement, the possibility of derogations from the obligations set out. Therefore, paragraph 115 foresees without more precision that : « in some circumstances », a derogation is possible – required in paragraph 108 – a management plan or other management system may not be in place at the time when a property is nominated. Reports on the state of conservation of properties show that the

problems which remain unsolved at the time of premature nomination persist several years later.

26. Other properties, without outstanding universal value according to the Advisory Bodies, have been inscribed. Three cases were recorded during the period 2005-2009. In 2010, at the 24th session, the Committee was unable in four cases to reach an agreement regarding a statement of outstanding universal value of a property: the decisions for the statement of outstanding universal value established by the State Party « are recorded provisionally ».

- Priority given to new nominations to the detriment of monitoring and conservation, keystone of the 1972 Convention

27. As noted in the Document « *World Heritage: Challenges for the Millennium* », the real issue is not the number of sites, but rather the capacity to ensure the effective conservation of those inscribed¹⁰ ». Whereas all too often the interest of States Parties is focused on the nomination to the List that tends to be an end in itself, the conservation of the property – the objective of the List – becomes a secondary concern.

28. However, the periodic reports and reports on the state of conservation established in the framework of the reactive monitoring procedure reflect a very worrying situation for many sites where the values justifying their inscription are degrading due to anthropogenic pressures and lack of adapted protection and management measures. Studies requested by the Committee have emphasized the seriousness of the impact of current and future climatic change on both the natural and cultural and mixed properties. Thus, the very many sites in danger is in no way comparable to the low number of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, mechanism that is, in practise, only implemented by the Committee with the agreement of the State Party concerned.

29. The organisation of so-called « proactive » monitoring accompanying the State Party upon nomination of the site without waiting for the site to be threatened appears necessary, inasmuch as the degradation of the property can be very rapid. To encourage States Parties to fulfil their conservation obligations, it would be appropriate to remove from the List properties where the outstanding universal value has irremediably disappeared and to envisage the inscription of sites for a limited period, renewable following verification by the Advisory Bodies regarding the continued presence of the outstanding universal value (including integrity and protection).

30. Funding to ensure the effective monitoring of properties is insufficient; conservation, the principal objective of the Convention, is mainly covered by extrabudgetary sources (69%). Funding needs for conservation are not estimated, including for properties inscribed on the In-Danger List, in contradiction to the provisions contained in Article 11-4 of the Convention. In general, there is a need to define a conservation strategy and establish an ad hoc programme, financed from permanent sources to implement the funding solutions examined at the 34th session, and effectively implement the provisions contained in Article 7 of the Convention. This programme would have as objective the funding of conservation actions for properties that require the assistance of the international community. Funds should be allocated in relation to priorities determined according to the degree of urgency of the interventions evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. The possibility of collecting ad hoc resources from the public for conservation through international campaigns could be envisaged.

31. The involvement of local communities in the conservation of the property is to be encouraged to limit the potential negative effects of the nomination both to the property and for the communities. It would be useful to synergize the mechanism of the World Heritage Convention and the United Nations programmes on sustainable development.

- Wider conservation objectives for heritage set by the 1972 Convention have been lost to view

¹⁰ « *World Heritage: Challenges for the Millennium* », 2007, p. 192

32. The Global Strategy and the reorganization of UNESCO have caused the mechanism of the Convention to focus solely on the World Heritage List. The obligations emanating from Articles 4 and 6 of the Convention are often misunderstood and properties of very great value disappear in the face of indifference of the international community.

RECOMMENDATIONS¹¹ :

a) Envisage objectives and establish appropriate piloting tools

1) Indicate in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention objectives for the Global Strategy and determine their compatibility with the objectives of the 1972 World Heritage Convention (cf. paragraphs 10 to 27).

2) Establish criteria and monitoring indicators for the Global Strategy, and more generally the implementation of the Convention, indicators that must concern not only the representativity of the List, but also and specifically the effectiveness of the nomination to the List, as a conservation tool (cf. paragraphs 28 to 33 and 208).

3) Establish more pertinent statistics by sub-region rather than the arbitrary zoning currently in use; avoid the approach by country and political region in favour of scientific analysis grids that the Advisory Bodies should be responsible for preparing; complete the statistics according to these classifications (cf. paragraphs 34 to 42).

b) Improve representation of natural properties to respond to the objective of the Global Strategy

4) Strengthen the representation of natural scientific experts within the World Heritage Centre and its regional units, as well as synergies between the mechanism of the 1972 Convention and other international mechanisms for environmental protection (cf. paragraphs 63 to 87).

5) Reflect upon appropriate means to preserve the sites that are outside of the sovereignty of States Parties responding to the conditions of outstanding universal value (cf. paragraphs 88 to 90).

6) Take into account the evolution noted since 2007 and re-examine the appropriateness of amendments to the Suzhou Decision (cf. paragraphs 164 to 166).

c) Strengthen strictness of procedures

7) Refocus World Heritage nominations on the most outstanding properties and for the others, envisage new tools for recognition and preservation at the regional level or by themes under the auspices of UNESCO or in concert with regional organizations (cf. paragraphs 118 to 134).

8) Encourage States Parties to update and harmonise the tentative lists at the regional level; study the possibility of establishing regional or thematic tentative lists during the next periodic reporting cycle (cf. paragraphs 157 to 162);

- condition the granting of Preparatory Assistance destined for the establishment of tentative lists on the commitment to nominate in priority on these lists sites recognized by the Advisory Bodies as corresponding to gaps on the List and to participate in the experimental

¹¹ For each recommendation, reference is made to the paragraphs in the information document (Volume 1).

« Upstream » process aiming at evaluating potential outstanding universal value prior to the preparation of a nomination file (cf. paragraphs 144 to 156) ;

- assist, if need be, States Parties lacking the capacity to maintain the values, integrity and authenticity of properties inscribed on their tentative lists and where the potential for nomination on the World Heritage List has been recognized by the Advisory Bodies (cf. paragraph 163).

9) Continue the diversification of the geographical origin of experts working with the Advisory Bodies; give consideration to travel costs of « panel » members in the contract between the Advisory Bodies for the implementation of the Convention (cf. paragraphs 175 and 176).

10) Ensure, as requested by the Committee at its 34th session (Decision 34.COM/5C), indication of the share of tasks between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to improve the effectiveness and economy of the mechanism (cf. paragraphs 177 and 178).

11) Ensure respect of the provisions contained in Article 9, paragraph 3 of the Convention whereby experts have a central role in delegations to the Committee, or otherwise take note of the current evolution and revise the Convention to clearly recognize it is more geopolitical rather than the scientific nature (cf. paragraph 180).

12) Revise, for a better application of the Convention, the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to:

- forbid a State Party to present a nomination during its mandate (or at least to suspend the examination of a file by the Committee as long as the State Party is present) and take part in the decision on the follow-up of state of conservation reports concerning a property located on its territory (cf. paragraphs 182 to 184 and 214);
- proscribe the practice of the presentation of signed amendments before the opening of the debate on the nomination of the site (cf. paragraph 185);
- effectively ensure the transparency of the process through the publicity of debates (cf. paragraph 186);
- prohibit nominations that do not fulfil the conditions set out in the Guidelines (cf. paragraph 188).

13) Delete from the List properties that have irremediably lost their outstanding universal value, in conformity with the provisions of paragraphs 192 to 198 of the Guidelines (cf. paragraphs 190 to 192).

14) Limit the period for new nominations by subordinating their reconsideration for a new examination after consultation with the Advisory Bodies (cf. paragraph 193).

d) Restore conservation as a priority

15) Define, together with the Advisory Bodies, a global conservation strategy that could in particular examine the points mentioned in the following recommendations (cf. paragraphs 194 and 198).

16) Reconsider the priority accorded to Preparatory Assistance in comparison to assistance for conservation and management and reinforce training in the field of management and conservation. (cf. paragraphs 203 and 204).

17) Review the provisions in paragraph 115 of the Guidelines that depart from the obligation to include an appropriate management plan or another documented management system in the nomination file: at least, strictly indicate under what circumstances derogation of the obligation may be accorded; ensure the effective establishment of an appropriate management plan; review the drafting of paragraph 116 of the Guidelines to make obligatory

the definition of a plan of action, approved by the Committee following consultation with the Advisory Bodies, on corrective measures concerning anthropogenic threats; inscribe in the Guidelines the requirement of a management plan for public use; require — and not only to recommend — the integration of a risk and catastrophe management plan into the management plan (cf. paragraphs 198 to 202).

18) Strengthen the monitoring of properties; define monitoring indicators for the state of conservation, establish proactive monitoring by the Advisory Bodies without waiting for the occurrence of serious problems; ensure the participation of experts from the Advisory Bodies in the preparation of periodic reports; actively promote best practice exchanges for conservation (cf. paragraphs 203 to 216).

19) Study the establishment of a « rapid reaction » fund for threatened cultural properties (cf. paragraph 235).

20) Fully use the mechanism of In-Danger listing, in conformity with the provisions of the Guidelines (both for inscription and removal); revise the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to forbid a State Party serving on the Committee to take part in the decision following debates on state of conservation reports concerning a property located in its territory (cf. paragraphs 210 to 215).

21) Allocate a part of accumulated funds to conservation; estimate the funding needs for the safeguarding of properties in danger in conformity with the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Convention; elaborate a conservation programme for properties requiring assistance from the international community, financed from permanent resources and not allocated, by implementing the funding solutions examined at the 34th session and in allocating funds in accordance with the degree of urgency of the intervention, evaluated by the Advisory Bodies; study the possibility of collecting ad hoc resources for conservation through public campaigns. (cf. paragraphs 219 to 226 and 230).

22) In the spirit of the initiative « United in action », establish an annual report presenting in an exhaustive manner, extrabudgetary funding of United Nations institutions that benefit World Heritage properties and create a database on funding of all kinds (public or private) benefitting World Heritage properties (cf. paragraph 233).

23) Establish a convention between UNESCO and the other United Nations institutions to organise cooperation on World Heritage properties (cf. paragraph 236).

24) Strengthen cooperation between the mechanism of the World Heritage Convention and the United Nations mechanisms on sustainable development and the other United Nations conventions in the field of culture and the environment (cf. paragraphs 237 to 240).

25) Render World Heritage properties examples of best practice in the service of heritage protection; develop new tools to provide full meaning to Articles 4 to 6 of the Convention and the recommendation of 1972 on the protection of the national plan for cultural and natural heritage; envisage, if need be, an additional protocol or new thematic conventions (cf. paragraphs 241 to 244).

3. Evaluation of the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT)

33. The evaluation of the PACT Initiative comprised the examination of statutory documents, progress reports, information systems and financial statements relating to the Initiative, as well as the analytical review of 33 of the 59 PACT partnerships.

3.1 An unsystematic approach to partnerships

34. In 2002, the World Heritage Committee favourably welcomed the World Heritage Partnerships Initiative (WHPI), which became PACT in October 2003, « as a new systematic approach to partnerships »¹².

35. In general, the filing system of the World Heritage Centre seriously lacks method. This situation is an obstacle to traceability in the use of resources and contrary to the monitoring of partnerships.

36. With respect to fundamental principles of the regulation framework for PACT, adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2005, several of the agreements examined are drafted in a confused or vague manner; the accounting obligation of contracts is frequently omitted, or neglected when due; information from States Parties and national commissions should be improved.

37. The World Heritage Centre emphasized the « lack of standard approaches and strategy at the Organization level ». But the Administrative Manual now contains the article »Private sector « (point 5.8), with provisions and recommendations that should be implemented for the PACT mechanism. It would be advantageous to constitute operational guidelines for managers of partnerships, in particular the definition of objectives and modalities of the partnership, the selection of the partner, the comparison of costs and benefits, risk analysis, the piloting mechanism of the partnership and the final evaluation of the results obtained. The managers should also be able to call upon expertise, technical assistance and management tools from the « focal point for private sector cooperation».

38. Reflection on dimension, competence profiles and positioning of the PACT team has not taken place. Coordination with programme specialists of the World Heritage Centre or other services or sectors, as well as with the support sectors and services, is mostly carried out a *posteriori* rather than prior to any activity, if at all.

39. Initiative mainly comes from the private sector. The World Heritage Centre has a reactive attitude rather than a proactive one. There is a risk of accumulation of small projects involving servicing for UNESCO, as costly as that for big projects, but which have a weak impact. Generally, the files examined provide no trace of an analysis of the situation, potential and strategy of the partner companies, nor of a cost/benefit analysis. However, at the end of 2010, the World Heritage Centre has engaged upon a more active and reasoned analysis in the prospection for partnerships.

40. Expertise of the Advisory Bodies has not been requested, although it could be profitable to the activity¹³.

3.2 Insufficient traceability provided for the modest resources

41. There is insufficient traceability in the use of resources. Often it is problematic to identify the origin of the funds received and their budgetary allocation.

42. In total, PACT has secured for UNESCO USD 4.15 Million from 2005 to 2010, approximately USD 690 000 per year (USD 532 537 in 2010). In comparison, the World

¹² Decision 26.COM/17.3, 26th session (Budapest, juin 2002)

¹³ Paragraph 31 c) of the Guidelines

Heritage Fund, to which the terms of reference of the evaluation refer, has encashed USD 25.65 Million income from 2004 to 2009. A dollar spent in prospection and management for PACT only enables the return of a little more than an additional dollar (USD 1.09 Million). However, this mediocre ratio does not take into account the non-monetary income, which is not valorised but can be important.

3.3 A still limited impact on World Heritage conservation

43. As emphasized by the Committee in 2005, « more time will be required before such an initiative can have a demonstrable impact on the World Heritage Fund »¹⁴.

44. Several partnerships, notably with the press and media bodies, raise awareness of the Convention and thus contribute to one of the strategic objectives of the Convention (4th « C »)¹⁵. Nevertheless, the objective to raise World Heritage awareness with a view to its conservation often assumes a stylised character and the results are sometimes extremely modest. The files rarely contain a report on the use of the emblem of the Convention.

45. Capacity building (3rd « C ») appears less frequently as an objective of visibility of World Heritage, but it figures in major partnerships. However, little activity in the development of partnerships at the regional and local levels (5th « C ») has been identified in the partnerships examined.

46. Some contributions benefit World Heritage conservation (2nd « C »), but mostly serve to cover running costs of the World Heritage Centre. Their contribution to World Heritage conservation is only indirect.

47. In all, the conduct of the evaluation resulted in the positive appreciation of several of the 33 partnerships examined. But it was not possible to extend it to cover the entire sample studied.

48. PACT is still far below the perspectives outlined in 2002 « towards innovative partnerships for World Heritage »¹⁶.

RECOMMENDATIONS¹⁷ :

a) Specifically concerning the PACT Initiative

- 1) Proceed with a clearly defined archiving method for documents relating to PACT and ensure the computerised safeguarding of information (§ 30) ;
- 2) 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 (§ 33 to 37) ;
- 3) 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 (§ 52 to 56) ;
- 4) 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

¹⁴ Decision 29 COM 13 (29th session, Durban, July 2005)

¹⁵ Budapest Declaration (2002); Guidelines, paragraph 26

¹⁶ Venice Conference, November 2002 (*World Heritage 2002 – Shared Heritage, Common Responsibility*, p. 142)

¹⁷ For each recommendation, reference is made to the paragraphs in the information document (Volume 2).

the Convention and the sites and the contribution to World Heritage conservation (§ 63 to 72) ;

5) Inspired by good practices observed in certain PACT partnerships, envisage the establishment of a consultative entity, associating qualified personalities (§ 21 and 83) ;

6) Make permanently available to the Committee exact information on partnerships (§ 46 to 50 and 84).

b) May also concern other UNESCO partnerships

7) 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 (§ 52 to 56) ;

8) Improve information of the «focal point for private sector cooperation » on partnerships in the Organization, by constituting a database to facilitate coordination (§ 33 to 37, 72 and 82) ;

9) 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 (§ 70 to 72 and 85).

Response of the Director-General of UNESCO:

The Director-General takes note of the report of the External Auditor which was presented at the request of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. It seeks to address complex issues, many of which are in the hands of States Parties to the Convention. The Director-General takes note of the recommendations of the External Auditor and will endeavour to implement them to the extent that they are practicable.

Decision **35 COM 9A** adopted by the World Heritage Committee
at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011)

Decision: 35 COM 9A

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC-11/35.COM/9A and WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 9A**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Also recalling Resolution **17 GA 9**, adopted by the 17th session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2009),
4. Requests the World Heritage Centre to transmit the documents to the 18th session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2011) for examination.