

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Twenty-second session
Kyoto, Japan
30 November - 5 December 1998**

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the
World Heritage Committee**

SUMMARY

Background

At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee requested that the Consultative Body examine the following four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical Issues
2. Communication and promotion
3. Management Review of the World Heritage Centre
4. Use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising guidelines.

The Consultative Body met to discuss these four issues on 29-30 April 1998. The Consultative Body used as the basis for discussion, preliminary papers prepared by designated members of the Consultative Body. At its twenty-second session (22-27 June 1998), the Bureau, examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and its recommendations and prepared specific recommendations for submission to the World Heritage Committee. Some of the Bureau's recommendations have required substantial follow-up on the part of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as well as by members of the Consultative Body.

Summary

This document presents the recommendations of the Bureau to the Committee on these four issues, reports on follow-up to these recommendations and suggests, at the end of each section of the document, particular decisions to be made by the Committee.

BACKGROUND

At its twentieth session in December 1996, the Committee requested a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund for the year ending 31 December 1996 and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, the Committee established a Consultative Body “to take action on the proposal adopted by the Committee, to undertake a review of the way in which the World Heritage Centre has assisted the Committee in implementing the World Heritage Convention”.

At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee had requested that the Consultative Body examine four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical issues
2. Communications and Promotion
3. Management Review and Financial Audit
4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.

The Consultative Body had asked Professor Francioni (Italy) to chair the Consultative Body in 1998. Members of the Consultative Body are Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, United States of America and Zimbabwe. A meeting of the Consultative Body was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 29 and 30 April 1998. At the invitation of the Chairperson, representatives of Germany and Greece also attended, as did observers from Ecuador and Hungary and the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

In accordance with the decision by the Consultative Body in December 1997, preliminary discussion papers on each of the four issues were prepared by designated members of the Consultative Body. These discussion papers then formed the basis of the Consultative Body’s deliberations on the four issues during their meeting in April. The Report of the Rapporteur of the meeting of the Consultative Body was adopted on 24 June 1998 and was subsequently discussed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

At its twenty-second session (22-27 June 1998), the Bureau, examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and made specific recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. Some of the Bureau’s recommendations have required substantial follow-up on the part of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as well as by members of the Consultative Body.

This document presents the recommendations of the Bureau to the Committee on these four issues, reports on follow-up to these recommendations and suggests particular decisions for the Committee at the end of each section of the document.

1. Technical Issues

The following technical issues were examined by the Consultative Body at the request of the twenty-first session of the Committee:

- (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi);
- (b) the test of authenticity;
- (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List; and

(d) the implementation of the Global Strategy.

A paper prepared by Australia, contributions from Malta, Zimbabwe, ICOMOS and Greece, and the report of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands in March 1998 (see Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7), formed the basis of discussion on the Technical Issues.

(a) The application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi)

The text of cultural criteria (i) and (vi) are currently included in Paragraph 24(a) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Bureau adopted the following recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi):

15. With reference to a more stringent interpretation of cultural criterion (i), the Amsterdam Expert Meeting has set up a working group, chaired by Madam Bercé (France) to finalise the wording for a new set of criteria, to operationalize them, and to bring forward recommendations regarding this to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. It is suggested that Mr Demicoli's proposals on wording be referred to this group.

In addition, the Bureau adopted the following recommendations:

In light of the endorsement of the recommendations of the Amsterdam meeting of experts ... by the Consultative Body, the Bureau recommends to the Committee that it endorse the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts.

The Bureau asks the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the advisory bodies, to co-ordinate the preparation of draft revisions to the sections of the Operational Guidelines relating to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity for submission to, and the final decision of, the twenty-second session of the Committee.

The proposed revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* have been examined by the Advisory Bodies and the participants of the Amsterdam meeting.

Decisions required: That the Committee discuss the proposed revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* under **Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention.**

That the Committee examine the report of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands in March 1998 (Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.12), under Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: **Progress Report and Action Plan for the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List.**

(b) The Test of Authenticity

The Test of Authenticity is currently included as Paragraph 24(b)(i) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Consultative Body and the Bureau concluded that there should be a more stringent application of the Test of Authenticity, to places where the fabric is the most important. They also recommended further examination of the meaning of “authenticity” in different regional contexts and particularly for living cultures.

The following recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the Test of Authenticity was adopted by the Bureau.

21. The Consultative Body concluded by asking that the text on criteria, including integrity and authenticity, prepared as a result of the Amsterdam expert meeting be referred to the Bureau. The Delegate of Australia noted that the final contribution should refer to the papers submitted by Malta, Zimbabwe and Greece.

The proposed revisions to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity included in the *Operational Guidelines* have been examined by the Advisory Bodies and the participants of the Amsterdam meeting.

Decision required: That the Committee discuss the proposed revisions to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity included in the *Operational Guidelines* under **Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention.**

(c) The imbalance of the World Heritage List; and, (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy

The Consultative Body discussed the balance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List in detail. The main issue of discussion centred on the question of how to move faster in the implementation of the Global Strategy whilst maintaining the rights of States Parties.

The following recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the balance of the List and the Global Strategy were adopted by the Bureau:

35. Noting that it had, in general, endorsed the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts, the Consultative Body referred them to the Bureau;

The Consultative Body recommended that:

- *in particular, in line with the discussions at the meeting of experts, that further work be undertaken on breaking down the cultural themes outlined at the 1994 Global Strategy Experts Meeting into sub-themes that would assist identification of those types places that are over- or under-represented on the World Heritage List. This work should recognise the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage;*
- *when considering ways of improving the balance and representativeness of the World Heritage List, the sovereign rights of the States Parties be fully respected and reference is made to Paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines.*

- *the World Heritage Centre prepare a prioritised action plan to ensure an acceleration in the implementation of the Global Strategy. The action plan should include reference to (i) methods for communicating the objectives and regional and thematic approach of the Global Strategy to all States Parties, (ii) objectives to be set in relation to regions and sub-themes currently underrepresented in the World Heritage List, and (iii) ways of channelling and increasing resources available to States Parties to ensure the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties in the long term. The preparation of an action plan, which should be submitted to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee, is in line with Paragraph 43 of the report of the 1997 Management Review.*

In summary,

The Bureau asks the World Heritage Centre to prepare, in close co-operation with the Advisory Bodies, a prioritised action plan for the future implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List, to be submitted for the approval of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

The prioritised Action Plan for the future implementation of the Global Strategy, prepared by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN, is presented as part of Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12.

Decision required: That the Committee discuss the Action Plan for the Global Strategy under **Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Progress Report and Action Plan for the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List.**

2. Communications and Promotion

A discussion paper on communications and promotion was prepared by Canada and reviewed by the Consultative Body on 29 and 30 April 1998.

The following recommendations relating to World Heritage communications and promotion were made by the Consultative Body and endorsed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 1998:

Recommendation I

The World Heritage Committee should adopt a set of principles and guidelines for the future governance of the communications and promotion activities. While any individual, organisation or enterprise is free to publish or produce products associated with World Heritage, any authorization to do so in formal association with UNESCO and use of the emblem is the prerogative of the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO and will therefore adhere to the following principles and guidelines. These would apply to States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, the UNESCO Publishing Office and the UNESCO Office of Public Information.

Principles:

- *States Parties retain full control over the content of texts and images related to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories*
- *Quality of content takes precedence over the quantity of products*
- *Communications and promotion products respect the values and objectives of the Convention*
- *Priority is given to products of educational, cultural, scientific or artistic value*
- *Authorized products do not exploit or endanger World Heritage sites*
- *Revenues flowing from communications and promotion activities benefit World Heritage Sites or the World Heritage Fund in agreement with the relevant States Parties*

Guidelines:

- *Standard texts and images are updated regularly by States Parties and then disseminated by the World Heritage Centre on demand without further approval from States Parties*
- *Texts and images for World Heritage communications and promotional products are reviewed and approved in writing by States Parties, with respect to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories, before authorization is granted to use the emblem*
- *The choice of external partners to sponsor communications and promotional products follows annex 5 of the UNESCO Internal Guidelines and requires the States Parties' approval; doubtful cases are referred to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee*

Recommendation II

The World Heritage Committee should review and approve a strategic plan for communications and promotion activity, including target markets, anticipated reach, cost implications (including potential for cost recovery) and performance measures. Performance against this plan should be reviewed annually and adjustments made as required. The Committee should evaluate periodically the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.

Recommendation III

A Business Case for the quarterly World Heritage Review should be tabled for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, since it has never received formal approval. The Business Case should include information on circulation, readership, quality, sustainability, cost (financial and staff time), policy on corporate sponsorship and options.

The Bureau, at its twenty-second ordinary session adopted the following recommendations regarding World Heritage communications and promotion:

1.The Bureau endorses the principles and guidelines as enumerated in paragraph 52 of the Consultative Body Report ... and recommends their adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.

2.The Bureau instructs the Centre to prepare a strategic plan as referred to in the Consultative Body Report ... for the future work on World Heritage communications and promotion activities for adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session. The plan should contain provisions for periodic review. The Bureau recommends that the Committee periodically evaluate the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.

3.The Bureau asks the Centre to prepare a business case as stated in the Consultative Body Report ... for the World Heritage Review for submission to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 includes a ***Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities***, which represents the UNESCO World Heritage Centre's proposed World Heritage communications and promotion strategy for approval by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session.

Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 also presents a ***Business Case for the World Heritage Review*** as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session.

Decision required: That the Committee discuss the proposed *Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities* and the *Business Case for the World Heritage Review* included in Working document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 under **Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: World Heritage documentation, information and education activities.**

3. Management Review and Financial Audit

The Consultative Body examined the recommendations of the Management Review and Financial Audit with reference to a discussion paper prepared by France and Italy.

The Bureau subsequently adopted the following recommendations:

1. The Bureau,

Having taken note of paragraphs 79 to 89 of the "Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee", adopted the following decision:

That a detailed document be prepared by the Director-General of UNESCO and made available to the Committee members before the end of October 1998. The report should specify:

- *the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention;*
- *the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialised sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage;*

- the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre.

The document will be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee, which will then formulate its recommendation to the General Assembly of the States Parties.

2. The Bureau,

Taking into account paragraph 90 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has recommended that:

UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre:

- ensure that all the permanent posts of the Centre are clearly identified with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public.
- fill all the permanent posts.

3. The Bureau,

Taking into account paragraphs 91 to 109 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has adopted the following:

Shares the view that ambiguities exist in the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the programmes and projects relevant to the 1972 Convention;

Reaffirms that this concern should form the subject of an urgent and scrupulous examination;

Recommends to the Director-General to clearly specify (in the report requested in Recommendation 1 above):

- the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;
- the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre with respect to the use of funds as Secretariat to the Convention.

The Director-General is currently preparing such a report.

The World Heritage Centre has prepared a *Progress Report on Follow-up to the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention”* which is included in **ANNEX I** of this document.

The “*Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention*” is made again available to the Committee for reference as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.16.

Decision required: The Committee may wish to examine the *Progress Report on Follow-up to the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention”* which is included in ANNEX I.

4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines

A discussion paper on the use of the World Heritage emblem and Fund-raising was prepared by Japan and the United States of America.

The following recommendations concerning the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising were adopted by the Bureau after having examined the work of the Consultative Body:

The Bureau asked the United States of America and Canada, who have already taken measures to protect the Emblem, to supply a legislative text as an information document for the Bureau at its twenty-second extra-ordinary session.

At the time of finalisation of this document these legislative texts had not been received.

Whilst the guidelines concerning the use of the emblem, quality control and Fund Raising were endorsed in-principle, the Delegates of Japan and the United States of America proposed to amend them, in co-operation with the Centre, to reflect the decisions reached in the discussions. The amended guidelines will be prepared for the twenty-second extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau prior to submission to the Committee.

A meeting with relevant Sectors and units of UNESCO was held on 3 September 1998 to discuss the proposed guidelines for the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising prepared by the United States of America and Japan. The aim of the meeting was to seek the advice and comments of these Sectors and units as input to the preparation of the revised guidelines. The results of the meeting were conveyed to the United States of America and Japan. A meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the United States of America and Japan has been organised for 20 and 21 October to further discuss these matters. It is expected that a report of the outcomes of these meetings will be presented to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Kyoto, Japan from 27 to 28 November 1998.

Decision required: The Committee may wish to acknowledge the progress made in revising the *Guidelines concerning the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising*. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to decide upon the modalities and timetable for the finalisation of the *Guidelines*.

ANNEX I

PROGRESS REPORT ON FOLLOW-UP TO THE "REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR TO THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNESCO ON THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION"

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
	Preamble I have carefully read the above Report and taken note of the 35 recommendations put forward by the External Auditor. I wish to thank the Auditor General of Canada for their considered work and advice. Most of the recommendations proposed are rather general. Hence, in their current form it is very difficult to see how they can be considered for immediate application with a view to further improving the efficient functioning of the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre. This is perhaps due to the extremely limited time which was set aside for the Review (approximately 3 months). In my view, in addition to those issues raised in the Report, the most important need is to enhance the conservation of World Heritage sites through a closer and decentralised monitoring of the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites. I have tried to respond to each of the recommendations in as positive and constructive a manner as possible. I am also interested in knowing the Committee's views, both on the Report and its recommendations. In particular I now wish to see a detailed set of priorities established and a timetable of implementation agreed upon. Finally, I wish to assure the members of the World Heritage Committee that I am at their service to implement those concrete recommendations which they may identify as pertinent, and whose implementation is feasible.	Background At its meeting on 29-30 April 1998, the Consultative Body examined the recommendations of the Management Review and Financial Audit with reference to a discussion paper prepared by France and Italy (Section D of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11). The Delegate of France presented the first part of the discussion paper which had been prepared by France and Italy. He stated that no new recommendations had been added, but an analysis of the Report of the External Auditor had been made: ▪ The functioning of the WHC, which has been itemised in three categories; ▪ The technical capacities of the WHC; ▪ Human Resource management. The French Delegate commented that the Report was extremely thorough and dealt with many day-to-day difficulties at the Centre. Yet he recalled that the World Heritage Committee, convened in Naples in December 1997, held the view that the auditors had gone beyond their terms of reference in expecting the role of the World Heritage Committee and Centre to be redefined. On this point several Delegates insisted that it was equally important for the Management Review to have considered and commented on the role of the Committee and of the Centre.	Background At the 22nd session of the Bureau (22-27 June 1998) the Delegates of France and Italy presented the conclusions of the Consultative Body on this subject and drew the Bureau's particular attention to the recommendations concerning the Management Review in Paragraphs 78 to 90, and the Financial Audit in Paragraph 110 of the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.). During the Bureau's discussion on this subject, the Chairperson emphasised the need to clarify and reduce the ambiguity concerning the different roles and the institutional context of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and of the different Sectors of UNESCO. The Director of the Centre responded by informing the Bureau that the Director-General of UNESCO was committed to ensuring that the Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee be both efficient and effective.	Background The <i>Management Review of the World Heritage Convention</i> was performed by the UNESCO External Auditor (Auditor General of Canada) between September and November 1997. The Management Review report was forwarded to the Director-General of UNESCO on 20 November 1997 (see Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.16). This synoptic table summarises the actions undertaken by UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre to address the recommendations in the Report of the Management Review. Decisions required by the Committee are clearly indicated throughout the table.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
Strategic Direction 27. The Committee should : • direct a Strategic Review exercise, fully supported by the Centre, using as a starting point a follow-up on the goals, objectives and recommendations adopted by its at the sixteenth session and contained in the 1992 document entitled "Strategic Orientations for the Future"; • ensure that an updated strategic framework, containing as a minimum a vision, goals, objectives and short-, medium- and long- term action plans, be produced by December 1998 and systematically followed up through an action plan specifying accountable parties, time horizons and reporting mechanisms ; and • adopt the review of the status of the strategic framework as a permanent item on its agenda.	The conduct of the systematic strategic review is an important first step because the implementation of nearly all the other recommendations of the Management Review Report will depend on the outcome of such a review.			An updated, coherent strategy for the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> is needed. It would be helpful if the Strategic Orientations of 1992 were updated as was proposed to the Committee at its twentieth session in Merida, Mexico in December 1996. Decisions required: The Committee may wish to establish a World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force which would work with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to bring forward a coherent strategy for the future implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> to the Bureau and Committee at its twenty-third sessions in 1999. This strategy could include, as was suggested in the Report of the Management Review, a long-term vision, measurable goals and objectives, priorities, delegation of responsibility for implementation, action plans, a timetable for implementation and an appropriate mechanism for follow-up. Key questions relating to whether the <i>Convention</i> is being implemented effectively would need to be addressed.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
Implementing the Convention 32. The Committee should examine whether its existing structure and operating procedures are still appropriate for today's environment and make any recommendations for improvement.	I fully agree; it is important that the Committee minimises redundancy in the work agenda of the Bureau and the Committee and ensures that the work of the Committee involves, to a much greater extent than at present, renowned experts in both fields: conservation of cultural and the conservation of natural heritage.			In addition to reinstating a biennial budget and planning cycle for the use of the World Heritage Fund (see recommendation 150 below) it is proposed that that the Committee could delegate more responsibility to the Bureau and strengthen the role of the Chairperson. The use of sub-committees such as the World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force (see recommendation 27 above) by the Committee is also suggested. To avoid duplication and to better define the differential roles of the General Assembly of States Parties, the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau it is proposed that in future, - the General Assembly of States Parties will approve the World Heritage Fund accounts, elect members of the World Heritage Committee and examine regional synthesis reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and their general implementation of the <i>Convention</i> submitted by States Parties and already examined by the Committee. - the World Heritage Committee will examine and approve a biennial budget and plan for the use of the World Heritage Fund (see recommendation 150 below). The Committee will make decisions relating to the inclusion of properties on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger and only examine those state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties suggested for inclusion in the World Heritage in Danger List. - the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee will prepare the work of the Committee in relation to the inclusion of

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
32. (continued)				properties on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, process all state of conservation reports and will have the financial responsibility and authority to approve International Assistance over US\$30,000. • The Chairperson will have the financial responsibility and authority to approve international assistance requests up to US\$30,000. Decision required: In order to implement the above streamlining in functions, the Committee may wish to examine the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12) under item 10 of the Provisional Agenda.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
Site Listing and inscription 43. The Committee should request that the Centre prepare an analysis of the sources of the imbalances in the World Heritage List and the list of sites being nominated, with a view to redress the imbalances in the nomination and inscription process. The analysis should include the effect of UNESCO and Centre interactions with regions and States Parties including missions to particular regions or countries, allocation of preparatory assistance, and allocation of funding for preparation of tentative lists. The Centre should also prepare a set of options that reflect their findings for discussion and decisions by the Committee.	There have been some past efforts to undertake a partial analysis; for example, as part of the meeting of natural and cultural heritage experts which was held in Parc de la Vanoise in March 1996.			The World Heritage Centre, in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies has prepared such an analysis as part of the Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12). Decision required: The Committee may wish to examine the Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12) under item 10 of the Provisional Agenda.
51. The Committee should examine options for changing the timing of the nomination process or limiting the number of nominations considered each year.	I do not agree with this recommendation. In my view, what is important is that the Committee uses its authority and capacity to judge the merit of each site nominated according to its quality.			The timing of the nomination process has recently been changed and no further change is necessary. Decision required: The Committee may wish to maintain the present timing of the nomination process.
52. The Committee should consider revising the Operational Guidelines for nominations and evaluations to enforce application of Article 11 paragraph 1 of the Convention requiring that all States Parties submit tentative lists for both cultural and natural heritage; and extend the time-frames for nomination evaluations, preparation of evaluation summaries and consultation with States Parties, thereby providing for a “fast track” option in compelling cases. Any revisions should be done in consultation with the advisory bodies.	Submission of tentative lists must be made an obligatory requirement for natural sites as well. The recommendations of the Global Strategy, approved by the Committee at its eighteenth session (1994) identifies regions and categories of properties which are under-represented and could provide a basis for determining the compelling cases. Advisory Bodies, in particular ICOMOS, should be requested to take into full consideration the recommendations of the Global Strategy, and bring more rigour in the evaluation of nominations of categories of properties which are already well represented on the List.			The proposed obligation for all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both natural and cultural properties is foreseen in the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16). Decision required: The Committee may wish to examine the proposed revision to the Operational Guidelines (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12) under item 10 of the Provisional Agenda.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
53. The Centre should consider preparing separate guides for different players and for different activities instead of revising all-inclusive Operational Guidelines. For example, the States Parties could receive a guide outlining the steps of the nomination process, the expectations for nomination submissions, and relevant deadlines. For the advisory bodies, these requirements could be incorporated into the contracts, possibly with a penalty for late submission.	The Committee should assess the advantages and disadvantages of preparing separate guidelines as proposed, and instruct the Centre of its decision for implementation of this recommendation.			The Centre is prepared to publish and distribute separate guidelines for different audiences subject to the granting of the necessary funds by the Committee. Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education outlines a proposal to prepare the following guides: • International Assistance • The preparation of tentative lists and nominations • Monitoring and reporting • The organisation of World Heritage ceremonies and plaquing events (to include reference to the use of the World Heritage emblem) Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the means for the Centre to prepare the above mentioned guides as recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education under item 13 of the Provisional Agenda.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
59. The Committee should : • amend the Operational Guidelines or the contracts with the advisory bodies to require the nomination evaluations to describe clearly the important values at each site and how they related to the criteria applied to the site ; and • periodically and selectively obtain an independent second opinion on nomination evaluations. This second opinion should be rendered by experts who are clearly independent of the original evaluations and should involve a site visit.	This requirement is already clearly well-established in the present Operational Guidelines (see Paragraph 63). I am of the opinion that the full responsibility for independent evaluations has to lie with the advisory bodies. In making its decisions, the Committee has to express its views on the quality of these evaluations.			The proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16) include reference to the Advisory Bodies preparing a statement of significance (1 to 2 paragraphs) for each site evaluated for inclusion in the World Heritage List. This statement, once approved by the Committee, could then be used for information purposes as the official statement relating to the outstanding universal value of World Heritage properties. Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> to include reference to the preparation of a statement of significance by the Advisory Bodies as is recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16 to be examined under item 14 of the Provisional Agenda. UNESCO does not consider that a second opinion for nomination evaluations is required. Furthermore, it must be stressed that it is the Committee which decides on whether to include a property on the World Heritage List, not the Advisory Bodies. Decision required: The Committee may wish to decide to maintain the present mode of co-operation with the Advisory Bodies responsible for the evaluation of properties nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

<i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
60. The Centre should : - ensure that each nomination is checked carefully by a staff member experienced with the contents of nominations and familiar with the current Operational Guidelines. Only if the nomination is complete, should it be forwarded to the advisory bodies. If technical questions arise, the relevant technical staff should be consulted and sign the nomination checklist before sending it on. The advisory bodies could, at their discretion, take incomplete files with information to be filled in later ; and - work with the advisory bodies to prepare a proposal to the Committee for other steps to promote high-quality and credible evaluations.	The Centre will further improve its method for checking the completeness of the nomination files. The Advisory bodies will be asked to provide a detailed list of the information necessary for considering a nomination ready for evaluation by them. The Director of the Centre will raise this matter at the Centre's next meeting with the Advisory Bodies.	Recommendation 1: Verification of the content of each nomination file As the Operational Guidelines clearly state, it is the responsibility of the WHC staff to check the content of the files in order to assist the States Parties, while preserving the neutrality of the Secretariat. The technical capacity of the WHC to ensure this function will strengthen its image as a structure in the service of the Parties, while allowing the ICOMOS and IUCN experts to concentrate on evaluating the properties as soon as the inscription files are received. Recommendation 2: Evaluation of the properties Together with the advisory bodies responsible for evaluating the nominations (ICOMOS and IUCN), the WHC will define clear rules governing their collaboration in order to further involve the Centre's staff in the procedure, with a view to providing better information to the Committee and assistance to the Parties.		Each regional desk officer in the World Heritage Centre checks the contents of nominations, acknowledges receipt of all nominations and if necessary requests additional information and transmits the nomination to IUCN and/or ICOMOS. The World Heritage Centre works closely with the Advisory Bodies to ensure the preparation of high quality, credible evaluations. This matter is the subject of continual discussion between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

<i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
64. The Committee should : • consider the implications of a growing World Heritage in Danger List, especially now that monitoring activity under the Convention steps up ; and • set strategic priorities for action on sites on the List.	The World Heritage in Danger List is indeed a tool for improving the conservation of threatened properties. Its potential for protection and conservation of World Heritage properties however, has not been fully exploited. The Committee should ensure that the implementation of this recommendation too is linked to the overall strategic review as recommended in paragraph 27.			The World Heritage in Danger List would grow considerably if it was to contain all World Heritage properties under potential or actual threat. The main purpose of this listing is to reverse a situation which would impact the World Heritage values for which the property was listed. In many cases the prospect of in Danger listing has led to States Parties taking immediate steps for improving the conservation of properties. World Heritage in Danger listing is a particularly powerful instrument as it provides the mechanism and process for negotiating for the better conservation of properties. However, a number of properties are forever on the in Danger List and may be justified for de-listing. It is important for the option of de-listing to be applied when justified. Decision required: The Committee may wish to ask the World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force proposed above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to discuss and clarify a future policy concerning World Heritage in Danger listing and the potential delisting of World Heritage properties.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
65. The Centre should strengthen co-operation with the Culture and Science-sectors of UNESCO : • to monitor sites, especially those on the World Heritage in Danger List, and • to develop joint approaches to provide assistance to those sites.	I shall set up a Task Force involving professionals from the Centre and the Science Sector to develop joint approaches for monitoring and international assistance to those natural heritage sites which are also Biosphere Reserves as well. In the case of cultural properties the Centre and the Cultural Sector will develop an information exchange system to notify one another before undertaking activities so that the activities could be better co-ordinated .			For natural World Heritage properties, a task force made up of representatives of the World Heritage Centre, the MAB Secretariat and IUCN-WCPA was established following the 5th Meeting of the Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves in July 1998. The task force will define a workplan and associated funding requirements to support World Heritage conservation. Similar arrangements will be made to reinforce the co-operation with other sectors notably the Culture Sector. In further developing co-operation with the different sectors of UNESCO, and with the Advisory Bodies, States Parties and other partners involved in World Heritage conservation, priority is being given to the monitoring of properties, especially those on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the development of bi-lateral and multi-lateral approaches to providing assistance to these properties.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
Monitoring of sites 72. The Centre should institute consolidated record keeping and reporting for monitoring reports starting as soon as possible, ensuring that they can be matched with nomination files. This information should be supplemented with the reports from previous years as soon as possible, drawing on the files of ICOMOS and IUCN if necessary.	The Centre will institute appropriate systems for record keeping and reporting on monitoring in full consultation with its partners, both inside and outside of UNESCO.			A new system for handling state of conservation and periodic reports will be implemented as part of the follow-up to the report of the Expert Group Review of the World Heritage Centre Data and Information Structure. A data base is presently being developed for the state of conservation reports presented to the Bureau and the Committee and of their respective decisions. A next step will be to link this data base to a technical report depository. Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the proposal for the establishment of a state of conservation data base as recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 to be examined under item 13 of the Provisional Agenda. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to support the proposed development of a modern integrated World Heritage Information System as presented under Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.
82. The Committee should request the Centre : to prepare an outline of different types of monitoring activity and identify which organization (or combination of organizations) could most effectively carry out the activity. This outline should be prepared in consultation with the advisory bodies and the UNESCO Sectors and agreed to by them.	The Committee should instruct the Centre to undertake work necessary to implement these proposals which in my view are important to accomplish.			Procedures for reactive monitoring of properties that are under threat have been discussed with the Advisory Bodies and sectors of UNESCO. Whilst the World Heritage Centre has a co-ordinating role, it is recognised that other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies, as well as other organisations and experts, play an important role in information gathering and examination of technical documentation relating to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
82. (continued) to develop a mechanism for co-ordinating actions on an on-going basis with all parties who carry out monitoring at World Heritage sites.				As for monitoring properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, clear indications are given in paragraphs 82 to 89 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>. Co-ordination of monitoring activities and missions takes place on a continuous basis with the Advisory Bodies and other sectors and units of UNESCO, as well as during the biannual consultative meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (February and September of each year).
84. The Committee should request the Centre : - to prepare in consultation with the Advisory Bodies a format for the periodic reporting by the States Parties for approval by the World Heritage Committee ; and - to develop mechanisms for the handling and record keeping of the periodic reports.	I attribute great importance to this recommendation. The Centre is ready to implement the Committee's decisions on this matter.	Recommendation 4: Monitoring of sites As the Audit proposes, the Centre could strengthen its competency in this domain - systematic and reactive monitoring - (Recom. 72 and following), while respecting the sovereignty of States Parties, particularly in view of the decision of the General Assembly of States Parties for the monitoring of sites. The draft for the periodic reporting requested in Naples, on harmonising the reporting (and the frequency of the reports) will allow the Centre to co-ordinate the preparation of concise, thematic monitoring reports on the state of the properties by the relevant States Parties.	The Bureau examined a draft format for periodic reporting by States Parties and considered the handling, examination and response by the Committee to these reports. The Bureau requested the Centre to study in further detail different scenarios for the handling, review process and examination of the periodic reports. It requested the Centre to continue to refine the document in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and on the basis of the comments and observations made by the Bureau for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.	The Secretariat will implement the decisions of the World Heritage Committee with regards to periodic reporting. Decision required: The Committee may decide to adopt the methodology and procedures for periodic reporting proposed in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6 under item 6 of the Provisional Agenda.

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
International assistance 88. The Centre should establish a management information system that will enable easy access and analysis of trends and patterns of international assistance projects.	The Centre will improve its information management capabilities, particularly with regard to enabling the Committee to regularly publish an updated list of properties to which the Committee has granted international assistance.	Recommendation 3: International Assistance The Consultative Body decided not to approve the Management Review recommendation concerning the use of external expertise or the allocation of funds for International Assistance and an external evaluation of the appropriateness and impact of the assistance provided.		All International Assistance projects approved by the Chairperson, the Committee or the Bureau, have been regularly reported to the World Heritage statutory bodies. In the future the Centre's information management systems will be improved to ensure easy access and analysis of trends and patterns of these projects. These trends are likely to reflect the fact that International Assistance requests are often received on an ad hoc basis from States Parties. Decision required: As the trends and patterns of International Assistance projects have so far not been analysed, the Committee may wish to set aside funds for a consultant to perform such a study. Following the results of the study, the Committee may wish to pursue a policy debate on the future granting of International Assistance projects. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to support the proposed development of a modern integrated World Heritage Information System as presented under Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
89. The Committee should take necessary steps in order to fulfil its obligation, as per paragraph 5 of Article 13, to establish, regularly update and publicize a List of properties to which it has granted international assistance.	The Centre will improve its information management capabilities, particularly with regard to enabling the Committee to regularly publish an updated list of properties to which the committee has granted international assistance.			Extensive lists of international assistance projects have been distributed to the World Heritage Committee and Bureau showing details of these projects. Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education outlines a proposal to prepare and publicise this list on a biannual basis. Decision required: The Committee may wish to provide the means to prepare and publicise the list of international assistance projects as proposed in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 to be discussed under item 13 of the Provisional Agenda.
94. The Committee should : - consider revising the Operational Guidelines to give greater flexibility to the Centre to allocate international assistance, while requiring the Centre to provide proper accountability and performance reports ; and - develop strategic priorities among and within categories of international assistance, considering the niche of the World Heritage Fund, the role of Regular Program funds, and the actions of other Sectors within UNESCO and other donors.	A very welcome recommendation. It will have significant beneficial impacts on nearly all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, particularly with regard to bettering the current implementation rates for funds set aside for international assistance projects. This must constitute an important component of the overall strategic review recommended in paragraph 27.			All International Assistance requests are to be examined by the World Heritage Centre and submitted to the relevant Advisory Bodies for review prior to submission to the either the Chairperson or Bureau. The following suggestions for changes to the system for International Assistance are included in the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16). - The ceiling for Preparatory Assistance to be increased from US\$15,000 to US\$20,000. - Emergency assistance up to US\$30,000 to be approved at any time subject to the agreement by the Chairperson and the overall availability of funds. - Requests for over US\$30,000 to be screened by the Bureau and submitted to the Committee. - Creation of a new category of educational assistance.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
94. (continued)				The complementary funding available from different budgetary sources should be laid out in a transparent way. Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the proposed revisions to the International Assistance section of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> as recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16 to be examined under item 14 of the Provisional Agenda.
95. The Committee and the Centre should jointly develop performance expectations for international assistance provided under the banner of the World Heritage Convention.	I shall instruct the Centre to take necessary action to follow up on this matter			International Assistance is provided under contractual arrangements which clearly state the proper procedures for evaluation and financial reporting. Decision required: The Committee may wish to ask the proposed World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force to address this issue in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.
96. The Committee should request the Centre to prepare draft revisions of the Operational Guidelines. These revisions should include preparing a separate description for States Parties of the types of international assistance available, procedures for obtaining that assistance, and obligations of that assistance.	In the preparation of the draft revisions of the Operational Guidelines, the decisions of the Committee with regard to the recommendations in paragraphs 93 and 94 will have to be taken into account. A small brochure on the World Heritage Fund was produced during the early 1990s and the Committee may consider updating that brochure to reflect all the proposed changes to the Operational Guidelines.			The follow up to this recommendation has been addressed in relation to recommendation 53 above.
97. Centre desk officers should obtain a formal peer review and sign-off by one other desk officer on the technical merits of any particular project they are reviewing before funds are approved internally by the Centre.	The establishment of a Task Force between the Centre and the Science Sector and an information exchange system between the Centre and the Cultural Sector will provide an in-house peer review mechanisms.			In-house peer review may be promoted through the task force made up of representatives of the World Heritage Centre, the MAB Secretariat and IUCN-WCPA established following the 5th Meeting of the Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves in July 1998 and through information exchange with the Culture Sector.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
106. The Committee should request the Centre to conduct an outside evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of international assistance provided. This information should provide a baseline for a follow-up evaluation in three years.	An evaluation will be undertaken by the Central Evaluation Unit of UNESCO and/or outside organisations.			The Central Evaluation Unit of UNESCO has been requested to perform this evaluation. Decision required: The Committee should decide whether to allocate the necessary funds for this purpose, in accordance with the proposal made in Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.
<u>Management of the World Heritage Centre</u> Management of activities 117. The Centre should examine its current span of functions and activities in line with : - the Committee's strategic priorities; and - a clarified statement of its roles, responsibilities and accountability relationships for World Heritage activities that are not directly linked to statutory meetings.	Upon the completion of the strategic review as recommended in paragraph 27, and once the Committee has set strategic priorities for the Convention's future work, I intend to update the terms of reference of the Centre's work in consultation with concerned Sectors and units.			The World Heritage Centre as a unit of UNESCO is in charge of World Heritage matters. The Centre not only services the World Heritage statutory bodies (the General Assembly of States Parties, the World Heritage Committee and Bureau) and States Parties to the <i>Convention</i> but also the UNESCO statutory bodies (the General Conference and Executive Board) and UNESCO Member States. The World Heritage Centre's work is therefore organised to service all these particular clients.
125. The Centre should : - develop, under guidance by the Office of Public Information and UNESCO Publishing Office, adequate policies and mechanisms for controlling the quality of information and publication products and protecting the rights and interests of UNESCO, the Fund and the States Parties/sites as necessary ; - ensure that its presentation and information activities are harmonised with the activities undertaken by States Parties in line with their obligations as signatories to the Convention ; and	An ad-hoc working group has been constituted by the Centre with other Sectors and units in UNESCO, notably OPI and UNESCO Publishing Office to address these concerns. It will develop policies and mechanisms to control the quality of information and publication products. The Centre will notify information and publication activities in advance to the States Parties as well as to the relevant UNESCO Sectors.	Recommendation 5: Promotion and information to the public The Consultative Body recommends that the World Heritage Centre: - control the quality of information with UNESCO's competent services, - harmonise this information with the States Parties, - evaluate periodically its information and education activities. The Consultative Body noted that this recommendation should be viewed with reference to Recommendation II in section II of WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11 (Communications and Promotion).		As requested by the Consultative Body and Bureau, the World Heritage Centre will present to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee, strategic elements in the fields of promotion, multi-media co-operation, information and documentation. The World Heritage Centre will strictly follow guidelines the Committee may wish for future use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising. The World Heritage Centre is also currently working with other sectors and units of UNESCO and States Parties to improve the quality control of World Heritage multi-media products.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
125. (continued) • evaluate periodically the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.				Decision required: The Committee may wish to discuss these issues with reference to the <i>Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities</i> proposed in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 under Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda.
128. The Centre should strive for an ideal mix of expertise based on a clear definition of the extent and nature of each activity, and the cost-effectiveness of alternate delivery modalities available.	The precise listing of activities for which the Centre is responsible for will have to be derived from the strategic review recommended in paragraph 27 and will enable the identification of the ideal mix of expertise.			Although the staff of the World Heritage Centre is as qualified as possible to respond to the transdisciplinary work, it is recognized that highly specialized input is sometimes also required from advisers and consultants when it is not available within UNESCO.
130. The Centre should achieve a better integration between the cultural and natural heritage functions.	There are certain functions common to natural and cultural heritage which can be integrated. But certain areas of expertise related to cultural and natural heritage conservation are distinct and must remain separate.			The World Heritage Centre has made considerable progress in this regard and the imbalance between the natural and cultural heritage expertise has been redressed. For each region, the Centre has the capacity to provide specialised inputs in both cultural and natural heritage conservation.
136. The Centre should develop mechanisms to enhance collegial decision-making, co-ordination and sharing of lessons learned in the following areas : • strategies and priorities ; • budgeting and work planning ; • management of activities ; and • reporting on activities and results.	The Director of the Centre will improve sharing of lessons with regard to all four areas. In-house decision making system will also be improved with establishment of a Task Force with the Science Sector and an information exchange system with the Cultural Sector.			In order to enhance collegial decision-making, to improve co-ordination and sharing of experience staff meetings are supplemented by frequently convened ad-hoc meetings that bring all those directly concerned with particular issues together. This has led to greater coherence in the actions of UNESCO in regard to World Heritage matters. A Task Force has been established with the MAB Secretariat and IUCN/WCPA and the exchange of information concerning World Heritage with the Culture Sector will be improved. Daily co-operation continues between the World Heritage Centre and the Associated Schools Unit of the Education Sector for the implementation of the UNESCO Special Project: "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion".

<i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
142. The Committee and the Centre need to review the way in which the needs of the Committee are currently fulfilled and how they could better served.	If the Committee lists its needs in accordance with its priorities, then the Centre will organise its work in order to better meet those priorities.			The World Heritage Centre's work is organized around the servicing needs as expressed by States Parties, Member States, the World Heritage and UNESCO statutory bodies. As mentioned under recommendation 27 above, an updated, coherent strategy for the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> is needed. Decision required: If the Committee establishes a World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force (as mentioned under recommendation 27 above), it may wish to ask the Task Force to examine this issue.
143. The Centre should consider having dedicated support to streamline preparatory work and follow-up documentation for the statutory meetings.	I believe it is better that all members of the Staff are associated with the statutory meetings so that they are fully aware of the working procedures and agenda of the Bureau and the Committee.			The work of the staff of the World Heritage Centre is focussed primarily on the preparation, servicing and follow up of the work of the statutory meetings.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 nd session of the World Heritage Committee
Operational planning and performance measurement 150. The Committee should consider harmonising its planning cycle with the UNESCO biennial planning system.	If requested by the Committee, the Centre will provide a paper outlining a possible biennial planning cycle to the next session of the Committee.			Within the context of UNESCO's biennial strategic planning cycle, the World Heritage Centre will contribute to the preparation of the 31C/4 (UNESCO's Medium-Term Plan 2002-2007) and the 30C/5 (Programme and Budget 2000-2001). These strategic documents refer to the allocation of Regular Programme funds and will need to be adopted by the 30th session of the General Conference in 1999. At present, decisions concerning the use of the World Heritage Fund are made on an annual basis despite the fact that Article 2 of the <i>Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund</i> states that "The financial period shall be two consecutive calendar years coinciding with the financial period of the Regular Budget of UNESCO". Decision required: In order to harmonise the strategic planning, budget cycles and work planning for the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund, the Committee may decide to reinstate biennial budgeting and planning for the use of the World Heritage Fund in line with Article 2 of the <i>Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund</i> as of the financial period 2000-2001.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 nd session of the World Heritage Committee
151. In order to improve the monitoring of the implementation of Committee decisions and other activities, the Centre should : • formalise the process for preparing and updating work plans; • prepare work plans presenting options with estimates of full cost implications and based on clearly established strategic priorities ; • monitor operations through quality management and financial information against approved work plans ; and • account to the Committee on a regular basis through a report on its performance against clearly targets, priorities and fully costed plans.	The Centre will further improve its performance in all four aspects.			The World Heritage Centre expends considerable time in the complex and detailed task of preparing, updating and reviewing the performance of work plans for both the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund. For the Regular Programme, the Centre prepares inputs into a Medium Term Plan (2002-2007) and to the biennial Programme and Budget (2000-2001) for submission to the General Conference. The Medium Term Plan (C/4) and the biennial Programme and Budget (C/5) are UNESCO's primary strategic frameworks which outline approved budgets, work plans, priorities, targets and evaluation. So far, for the World Heritage Fund, annual work plans are prepared for submission to the World Heritage Committee. Decision required: The Committee may wish to adopt the proposal made in recommendation 150 above, for the harmonisation of work plans, budgets for the use of the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund.
157. The Centre should report systematically on the performance (results) of its activities and projects, and of other factors which are deemed critical for the success of the Convention.	Special attention will be given to providing performance-focused reports to the Committee on all activities undertaken, and in particular those dealing with monitoring, international assistance and promotion.			It is important that evaluation of the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> (including monitoring, international assistance and promotion) be conducted with the full co-operation of the States Parties. States Parties should be encouraged, to the extent possible, to use their own means for the evaluation for these activities. Decision required: The Committee may wish to adopt the proposals made under recommendations 27 above for strategic planning and under recommendation 106 for the evaluation of international assistance.

Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
Human Resource Management Staffing of the World Heritage Centre 174. The Centre should ensure that all posts are described and approved following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard and taking into account the actual responsibilities, duties and qualifications required for the posts necessary to meet the operational needs.	This recommendation will be rigorously followed.	Recommendation 6: Human Resource Management and organization of the World Heritage Centre (Recom. 164-172) The Consultative Body recommended that the World Heritage Centre must: - ensure that all the <u>permanent posts</u> are clearly <u>identified</u> with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public. - fill all the permanent posts: With regard to temporary assistance, the Audit noted a strong recourse to supernumeraries and contractual consultants, who in some cases have assumed the functions of permanent staff. However, if the tasks are clearly defined and distributed amongst the permanent staff and if the posts are filled rapidly, there will be a correspondence between the objectives of the centre and the tasks that are assigned to it. If, in addition to associate experts made available through agreements, the Centre feels the need to recruit temporary staff for permanent tasks, it will be necessary to either review the job descriptions and distribution of tasks, or obtain additional permanent staff, which, under the present circumstances is not authorised by UNESCO.	The Bureau adopted the following recommendation: 2. Taking into account paragraph 90 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has recommended that: UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre: - ensure that all the permanent posts of the Centre are clearly identified with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public. - fill all the permanent posts.	All posts in the World Heritage Centre are described in accordance with UNESCO Rules and Procedures. At the request of the World Heritage Centre several desk audits have been undertaken to ensure rigorous application of the classification standards. Considerable progress has been made in regularising staff who were previously on temporary contracts. Staff training in quality management should be foreseen in the future. The World Heritage Centre will approach the Bureau of Personnel on this crucial subject.

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
Financial management 179. The Centre should continue to give priority to improving its financial management situation, together with the assistance of UNESCO's Comptroller and Inspector General.	Internal control through the Comptroller's Office will be strengthened.			A detailed report of actions undertaken by the Centre as follow-up to the recommendation of the External Audit was presented to the 22nd session of the Bureau as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.5
Management of Information 193. The Centre should : - carefully review the recommendations from the Documentation Unit to strengthen the corporate memory and improve document management procedures, and implement all the steps that are feasible as soon as possible ; - adapt the central filing system to take into account the UNESCO wide requirements and the operational needs of the Centre. This should involve co-ordination among professional and support staff members to select the best of their individual systems ; - maintain a database on the number, type and source of requests received as well as staff time spent on responding to them in order to streamline this activity through effective support mechanisms ; and - ensure maximum use of up-to-date technology such as voice-mail and electronic mail.	The Centre will control access to nomination files and will systematically file monitoring and mission reports as well as check lists and correspondence related to nominations of properties.			Prior to the Management Review, the World Heritage Centre identified several key deficiencies in the management of World Heritage documentation. These included a critical lack of space, absence of effective electronic document control, and a paper filing system that made retrieval of documents and information highly resource intensive. In response to this assessment, and that of the subsequent Management Review, the Centre organized a review of the Centre's information infrastructure by internationally recognized experts in information management (March 1998). This group concluded that the Centre should put in place an integrated World Heritage information management system using outside professional guidance and full staff participation. This new system would integrate existing and new databases, nomination files, statutory meeting documents, reports and correspondence into a unified electronic system accessible to all staff, and where appropriate, using passwords, Advisory Bodies, Committee members and the general public. During 1998, 95% of the nomination files were scanned and a new International Assistance database constructed. An expert has been identified to build the World Heritage Information System and partial funding identified from extrabudgetary sources. However, at the time of this report the modalities of this operation have not been concluded. The World Heritage Centre

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
193. (continued)				continues to experience a critical lack of space. Decision required: As mentioned above in relation to recommendation 72, the Committee may wish to support the proposed development of a modern integrated World Heritage Information System as presented under Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda. All staff now have, and use, electronic mail. A staff mailing address, whc-staff@unesco.org, permits the distribution of announcements and other information to all staff simultaneously. UNESCO voicemail is available to all staff members.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee
<u>Co-operation within UNESCO and with International Organizations</u> Role and responsibilities within UNESCO 201. The Director-General should : - strengthen the existing processes for co-ordinating world heritage activities within UNESCO to ensure that these activities are administered in the most efficient way. - clarify the responsibilities of the Centre for world heritage activities within UNESCO.	The Steering Committee will be re-invigorated as a policy organ to assist the Centre's in its work to co-ordinate the implementation of the World Heritage Convention within and outside of UNESCO and in accordance with the decisions of the Committee. The establishment of a Task Force with the Science Sector and an information exchange system with the Cultural Sector will complement the work of the Steering Committee at the operational level.	The Consultative Body recommended that a detailed internal UNESCO document be prepared and submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee that:- - defines the tasks of the World Heritage Centre; - defines the modalities of co-ordination of the other sectors of UNESCO.	The Bureau adopted the following recommendation: 1. Having taken note of paragraphs 79 to 89 of the "Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee", adopted the following decision: That a detailed document be prepared by the Director-General of UNESCO and made available to the Committee members before the end of October 1998. The report should specify: - the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention; - the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialised sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage; - the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre. The document will be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee, which will then formulate its recommendation to the General Assembly of the States Parties.	The Director-General is preparing such a note.
Co-operation with other international organizations involved with cultural or natural world heritage activities or related instruments 208. The Committee should, as part of the strategic planning exercise, request the Centre to prepare a plan that systematically identifies international organisations that are involved in world heritage activities, and the opportunities and approaches to co-operation.	If requested by the Committee, the Centre will prepare such a plan.			Decision required: The Committee may decide that such a plan should be prepared as part of the strategic planning work suggested in recommendation 27.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 nd session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 nd session of the World Heritage Committee
	Final remarks With regard to the implementation of the recommendations, I request the Committee to: • set priorities and time schedules for implementation; • decide whether review, analyses and studies recommended are to be carried out by the Centre in co-operation with UNESCO based units or by external organisations; and • estimate and provide the necessary financial resources for implementing the recommendations where necessary .		The Bureau adopted the following recommendation: 3. Taking into account paragraphs 91 to 109 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has adopted the following: <u>Shares</u> the view that ambiguities exist in the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the programmes and projects relevant to the 1972 Convention; <u>Reaffirms</u> that this concern should form the subject of an urgent and scrupulous examination; <u>Recommends</u> to the Director-General to clearly specify (in the report requested in Recommendation 1 above): • the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention; • the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre with respect to the use of funds as Secretariat to the Convention.	The improvement of the functioning of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee is necessary to address the new challenges posed by the implementation of the <i>Convention</i>. The implementation of the <i>Convention</i> is a dynamic process whereby the spectrum of conservation issues is both broad and complex, especially in cases where properties are highly symbolic, of importance to particular groups of people or where short term resource exploitation threatens the long term conservation of properties. At the same time the number of properties included on the World Heritage List is steadily increasing. The human and financial resources available within the Centre to address these many challenges will be strongly bounded by the resources of UNESCO itself.