

Q6: Beyond the answers you have already provided, do you have any comments or suggestions how to ensure the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund?

COMPLETE LIST

Country	Region	Response
Afghanistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Albania	Europe and North America	No
Algeria	Arab States	No response received
Andorra	Europe and North America	0
Angola	Africa	No response received
Antigua and Barbuda	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Argentina	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Armenia	Europe and North America	0
Australia	Asia and the Pacific	<p>The World Heritage brand is universally respected, but could be considered to be undervalued and underutilised. Successful organisations realise the importance of harnessing the power of branding – particularly in the not for profit sector. A strong brand connects with people at an emotional level and creates mental shortcuts to positive and unique images of an organisation or product.</p> <p>A brand review of World Heritage conducted in 2009 noted there was only reasonable awareness of the World Heritage brand, low knowledge of properties on the List, and a possible credibility mismatch between the identity and image of World Heritage. The review found that these factors reduce the visibility of the World Heritage brand. World Heritage could benefit from a more strategic approach to brand management. This involves better understanding the brand in the current global environment to define the benefits that it can bring to potential partners – individuals, private sector organisations and philanthropic foundations – who can in return, support World Heritage.</p> <p>A stronger World Heritage brand would also increase visitation to sites (improving tourism revenues for host communities), act as a unifying element (bringing together the disparate properties on the World Heritage List) and invoke a call to action – a reason to support, protect and align – for States Parties and private sector partners.</p> <p>A detailed Fund Raising Strategy is needed and we believe that dedicated expertise needs to be secured to work with or within UNESCO with the objective of working toward the long term sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. There is a range of ways to do this, including through the employment or contract of an expert to work within the World Heritage Centre or through partnership arrangements that would have minimal impact on the existing budget. We recognise that any employment of a consultant or staff member is at the discretion of the Director General of UNESCO.</p> <p>A dedicated resource with expertise in the finance and marketing sectors is essential – it is important to recognise that this is not a job for heritage experts or for diplomats.</p> <p>The skills needed may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I.brand development and marketing II.familiarity with innovative financing mechanisms III.relationship building with corporate and philanthropic sectors IV.coordinating social media campaigns
Austria	Europe and North America	Ensuring the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund is primarily the task of the State Parties affiliated to the World Heritage Convention. These annual contributions should at least be increased from time to time (for example in relation to the development of inflation rates and the decrease of currency values going along with it). Austria increased its voluntary annual contribution to ICOMOS International in 2017 and considers to survey the possibility of either increasing its contribution to the World Heritage Fund as from 2018 or to provide a voluntary annual contribution to the World Heritage Fund by analogy with the one to ICOMOS International.
Azerbaijan	Europe and North America	No response received
Bahamas	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Bahrain	Arab States	No response received
Bangladesh	Asia and the Pacific	It's a great ideas about the world heritage sites all over the world. If each member of World Heritage Center contribute to enrich this funds which will help to the developing countries to protect their world heritage sites properly.
Barbados	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Belarus	Europe and North America	0
Belgium	Europe and North America	No response received
Belize	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Benin	Africa	No response received
Bhutan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Europe and North America	No response received
Botswana	Africa	No response received
Brazil	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Brunei Darussalam	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Bulgaria	Europe and North America	0
Burkina Faso	Africa	No response received
Burundi	Africa	No response received
Cabo Verde	Africa	0
Cambodia	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Cameroon	Africa	No response received
Canada	Europe and North America	<p>•Priorities in time of fiscal pressure need to be placed solely on core activities that carry out obligations under the Convention: preparation of Committee documents and support for the annual Committee meetings; support for the General Assembly; the World Heritage Fund; dissemination of Committee decisions and monitoring of follow up with States Parties; implementing decisions that directly require action by the Secretariat; website support; core staffing.</p> <p>•When funding is constrained, all activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre should be triaged into: required (statutory) activities; desired (but not required) activities providing clear benefit to World Heritage; other desired activities. Required (statutory) activities must be funded before those that fall in the other two categories.</p> <p>•Strong linkages should be explored tying external partnerships, including sponsorships, as potential sources of increased revenue to the World Heritage Fund. Any formal sponsorship mechanism would benefit from legal advisor and auditor input to ensure the strongest possible guidance material, roles and responsibilities. Further discussion is merited on whether or not it is the place of WHC and the Advisory Bodies to directly manage or influence a 'marketplace' or donors' forum.</p> <p>Regarding Question 1 above, we have provided "0" as a response because we do not have information on post-inscription income and funding readily available. We are aware that, anecdotally, increases in visitor revenue at recently inscribed sites has been noted.</p>
Central African Republic	Africa	No response received
Chad	Africa	<p>- La pérennisation de l'assistance internationale aux États parties dans le cadre des préparations des dossiers de candidature d'inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial, l'appui à la conservation de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle ayant conduit à l'inscription du site sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial;</p> <p>- La pérennisation de la contribution statutaire des États parties à convention de 1972;</p> <p>- L'organisation des formations sur les processus d'octroi de l'assistance internationale afin que les États parties puissent se l'approprier; etc.</p>
Chile	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
China	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Colombia	Latin America and the Caribbean	<p>- Calling for greater contribution to countries with more sites inscribed on the World Heritage List</p> <p>- Through campaigns in the social networks to summon the participation of the people to contribute to the Fund that deals with the world heritage</p> <p>- Inviting sectors with greater economic resources to contribute to the World Heritage Fund as a way to pay for the benefits of the world heritage for sectors such as tourism, education, economy</p> <p>- To convene the world banking sector not only to provide financial resources, but also to work jointly with UNESCO on financial strategies that contribute to the sustainability of World Heritage</p>
Comoros	Africa	No response received
Congo	Africa	No response received
Cook Islands	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Costa Rica	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Côte d'Ivoire	Africa	La soumission d'un bien à inscription au patrimoine mondial devrait pouvoir être condition par le versement frais de soumission par l'Etat partie. Le fonds pourrait soutenir par des prêts des activités génératrices de revenus avec un taux d'intérêt de remboursement aux sites du patrimoine mondial.
Croatia	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Cuba	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Cyprus	Europe and North America	0
Czechia	Europe and North America	The sustainability of the World Heritage Fund should be ensured primarily by mandatory contributions of all State Parties. Those not meeting their obligations should probably be more visible in the WHC documents, at the best in comparison of their other activities devoted to the WH agenda. Some SPs are helping in other ways so the real contribution could be more obvious if WHC prepares a complex review of voluntary workshops, participative activities, international, especially regional activities, etc. The most developed countries should voluntarily abstain from submitting applications to the WH Fund as much as possible.
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	No response recieved
Denmark	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Djibouti	Africa	No response recieved
Dominica	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Dominican Republic	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Ecuador	Latin America and the Caribbean	One mechanism to ensure the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund should be through the NGOs that interact in the World Heritage sites, we believe that they can contribute with an annual fund.
Egypt	Arab States	No response recieved
El Salvador	Latin America and the Caribbean	Through the contributions of national and local tourism entities, for instance through special taxes for world heritage sites.
Equatorial Guinea	Africa	No response recieved
Eritrea	Africa	No response recieved
Estonia	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Ethiopia	Africa	No response recieved
Fiji	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Finland	Europe and North America	No response recieved
France	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Gabon	Africa	No response recieved
Gambia (the	Africa	Solicitation from individual more financially endowed countries or philanthropists
Georgia	Europe and North America	N/A
Germany	Europe and North America	§§ 225 - 230 of the Operational Guidelines encourage States to promote the establishment of national, public and private foundations or associations aimed at raising funds to support World Heritage conservation efforts and international cooperation. In order to mobilize additional technical and financial resources and partnerships in support of the World Heritage Convention, best practice examples like the German World Heritage Foundation should be acknowledged and promoted. Founded by the World Heritage Sites Historic Centres of Stralsund and Wismar, the German World Heritage Foundation supports endangered World Heritage sites outside of Germany and thus contributes to the balance of the World Heritage List.
Ghana	Africa	No response recieved
Greece	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Grenada	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Guatemala	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Guinea	Africa	No response recieved
Guinea-Bissau	Africa	No response recieved
Guyana	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Haiti	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Holy See	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Honduras	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved

Country	Region	Response
Hungary	Europe and North America	Before examining further possibilities for sustaining the World Heritage Fund we should consider the introduction of measures to encourage all State Parties concerned to fulfil their payment obligations – such as blocking the submission of new nominations until the arrears are paid in full. Hungary also recommends that State Parties having more than ten sites inscribed on the World Heritage List should provide direct support for the Least Developed Countries in the preparation of new nominations (in the framework of the Upstream Process).
Iceland	Europe and North America	No response received
India	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Indonesia	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Iraq	Arab States	0
Ireland	Europe and North America	Our view is that we would prefer the contribution to be raised to ensure sustainability, rather than to have to organize voluntary contributions annually.
Israel	Europe and North America	No response received
Italy	Europe and North America	No comments
Jamaica	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response received
Japan	Asia and the Pacific	0
Jordan	Arab States	No response received
Kazakhstan	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Kenya	Africa	No response received
Kiribati	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Kuwait	Arab States	No response received
Kyrgyzstan	Asia and the Pacific	it is advisable to pay a voluntary contribution by the World Heritage sites, having a high income and stable funding
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Latvia	Europe and North America	-
Lebanon	Arab States	No response received
Lesotho	Africa	No response received
Liberia	Africa	No response received
Libya	Arab States	No response received
Lithuania	Europe and North America	0
Luxembourg	Europe and North America	/
Madagascar	Africa	No response received
Malawi	Africa	Individual site properties in Malawi are still unable to raise enough resources on their and continue to depend on central government funding and hence cannot make the annual voluntary contributions. There is a policy that only central government pays all subscriptions or contributions to international bodies which delays the process considerably so that Malawi is usually in arrears on contributions.
Malaysia	Asia and the Pacific	1) Higher contribution can be imposed to the World Heritage Sites from rich countries. 2) Very minimum contribution can be imposed to all World Heritage Sites as a yearly basis (less than USD500 per site, per year)
Maldives	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Mali	Africa	No response received
Malta	Europe and North America	No response received
Marshall Islands	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Mauritania	Arab States	No response received
Mauritius	Africa	No response received
Mexico	Latin America and the Caribbean	Peut-être invitant les États parties qui le font, ne pas donner seulement le minimum de ses contributions à l'UNESCO. Le Mexique es le 10ème. collaborateur à l'UNESCO, pour cette raison ne peut, pour le moment, augmenter leur contribution annuelle.
Micronesia (Federated States of)	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Monaco	Europe and North America	No response received
Mongolia	Asia and the Pacific	No response received
Montenegro	Europe and North America	No response received

Country	Region	Response
Morocco	Arab States	La viabilité du Fonds du patrimoine mondial ne saurait être effective qu'à travers la contribution des Etats parties, et pour parvenir à l'adhésion de ces Etats pour appuyer financièrement le Fonds il faut s'assurer de garantir une meilleure gestion des bien du patrimoine mondial. Il faut dans un premier temps exiger la création par les Etats parties des structures de gestion et de se doter de systèmes de gestion viables pour ceux qui n'en ont pas. C'est le seul moyen de pouvoir développer un bien et d'en augmenter les recettes qui permettraient par la suite la contribution au Fonds du patrimoine mondial.
Mozambique	Africa	No response recieved
Myanmar	Asia and the Pacific	Nowadays, Myanmar is a country of trying to transform and establish for democratic nation. She also attempts to set up the country of peace and economic stability. We hope that we will be ensured to fully participation and collaboration in very near future.
Namibia	Africa	Annual fund raising evens to solicit funds from the philanthropists, donors and partners.
Nepal	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Netherlands	Europe and North America	No response recieved
New Zealand	Asia and the Pacific	0
Nicaragua	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Niger	Africa	No response recieved
Nigeria	Africa	We wish to suggest that part of the funds raised could be invested. In addition, the World Heritage Centre could reach out to wealthy individuals and multinational who love to promote heritage to donate to the World Heritage Fund.
Niue	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Norway	Europe and North America	WH Properties could more offensive promote the Fund, and encourage donations to be given. Big operators in the tourism industry (cruise-, airlines etc.) seem to gain profit from offering experiences in WH Properties far beyond their financial contributions through fees and taxes. As far as the tourism industry is international, it could or should be encountered by a demand from the international society as it is constituted in organisations like UNESCO to contribute to the WH Fund, which are there to safeguard the most valuable destinations in the World.
Oman	Arab States	No response recieved
Pakistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Palau	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Palestine	Arab States	No response recieved
Panama	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Papua New Guinea	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Paraguay	Latin America and the Caribbean	The decision 40 COM is considered appropriate for the sustainability of the World Heritage Committe
Peru	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Philippines	Asia and the Pacific	Voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund may fixed at the ratio of project total maximum expected contribution per year over number of sites inscribed per State.
Poland	Europe and North America	There is a potential, but more efforts should be spent on capacity building and contacts with Site Managers/local authorities within the World Heritage system to explain them needs and convince the to the proposed solutions that could possible result in the fundraising.
Portugal	Europe and North America	A voluntary contribution made by World Heritage properties to the World Heritage Fund seems the most feasible solution
Qatar	Arab States	Nil, No.
Republic of Korea	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Republic of Moldova	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Romania	Europe and North America	The respondents suggested as possible sources for the World Heritage Fund: - voluntary State Party contribution instead of individual contributions for each inscribed property - involving and encouraging the visiting public to donate - directing a percentage of the tickets to the World Heritage Fund *Important note: for the serial positions we did not receive similar answers from all 6 to 8 component properties, therefore the clear majority was considered for providing the answers.
Russian Federation	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Rwanda	Africa	No response recieved
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Saint Lucia	Latin America and the Caribbean	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Samoa	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
San Marino	Europe and North America	No response recieved

Country	Region	Response
Sao Tome and Principe	Africa	No response recieved
Saudi Arabia	Arab States	0
Senegal	Africa	No response recieved
Serbia	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Seychelles	Africa	<p>The World Heritage Fund is a very important tool to assist World Heritage Site especially in countries or situations we budget allocations from local , regional and national authorities are very limited or non-existent. It is important that a "business plan" or strategic plan is developed which identifies the present situation of the fund, maps potential sources of funding in addition to voluntary contributions by states.</p> <p>It should also review and consider the possibility of philanthropical, cooperate funding and connect these to specific projects submitted to the fund. In the case of the natural World Heritage properties a close collaboration with other funding mechanism such as the GEF should be investigated.</p>
Sierra Leone	Africa	No response recieved
Singapore	Asia and the Pacific	<p>Perhaps state parties with multiple inscriptions should be subject to an added contribution per site before any new inscription nomination can be considered. Those countries which default on annual subscription should also be held back from any new inscription. This will Ensure UNESCO 's limited resources are not unduly pressured by state parties which are not responsible members. Exceptions may be made for sites at risk if state parties can show that they are unable to pay their dues.</p>
Slovakia	Europe and North America	0
Slovenia	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Solomon Islands	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
South Africa	Africa	No response recieved
South Sudan	Africa	No response recieved
Spain	Europe and North America	No response recieved
Sri Lanka	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Sudan	Arab States	No response recieved
Suriname	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Swaziland	Africa	No response recieved

Country	Region	Response
Sweden	Europe and North America	<p>The sustainability of the World Heritage Fund has been discussed for many years and many proposals have been made. The situation is well reflected in the working documents and the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly. It is therefore difficult to come up with something new, but we would like to reiterate a few of the more recent proposals made.</p> <p>A more stable financial situation can only be achieved by securing income from the yearly contribution of the States Parties, stable income from extra budgetary sources, cost saving measures, optimization of existing funds, and an awareness of the financial consequences of decisions taken by the Committee and thus providing funds for them.</p> <p>States Parties should pay their annual contribution and pay on time. Since this is a problem that has remained unresolved for years the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly may have to consider introducing measures/rules if States Parties do not pay or do not pay on time. The Committee could, for instance, decide not to consider nominations from States Parties that have not payed or who have arrears at its annual sessions.</p> <p>Given the difficult financial situation extra budgetary funding will still be an important source of income. As decided by the committee (40 COM 15) partnerships should continue and the partnership strategy reviewed, a Forum of Donors as suggested by the Committee's Ad Hoc Working Group should be investigated (40 COM 13A). Some kind of crowd-funding or other simple and modern mechanism needs to be established and a future "Friends of the WH" could be a very important pressure group also nationally.</p> <p>Further cost saving measures should be considered and implemented, bearing in mind the Committee's decision that conservation of World Heritage Properties should be prioritized. The annual limit on the number of nominations the Committee will review, including nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions of the Committee, extensions (except minor modifications of limits of the property) should be lower than the current 35. To have real effect the number should be at the most 25, as proposed by the World Heritage Centre.</p> <p>In this strained financial situation new tasks, reports and meetings requested by the World Heritage Committee need to come with designated funding. In short: The Committee should not take decisions without considering the financial consequences.</p> <p>The lack of resources is a serious problem for all of UNESCO, in part related to the significant number of MS who are in arrears. The pressing financial situation and the recurrent problems with solving it in a sustainable way should be communicated to the Executive Board, for Board to be fully informed about the urgent and dire consequences this has to the work of the World Heritage Convention.</p>
Switzerland	Europe and North America	0
Syrian Arab Republic	Arab States	No response recieved
Tajikistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Thailand	Asia and the Pacific	<p>World Heritage Centre should provide;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Motivations for States Parties to pay compulsory contributions to the World Heritage Fund within the prescribed time. 2.Appropriate distribution of assistance to States Parties who contributed funds to the World Heritage Fund.
the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Europe and North America	0
Timor-Leste	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Togo	Africa	Le Koutammakou est le seul bien du Togo sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Le financement de l'Etat est une contribution en matériel et fournitures techniques pour le fonctionnement du site.
Tonga	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Trinidad and Tobago	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Tunisia	Arab States	No response recieved
Turkey	Europe and North America	Social, cultural, physical, environmental and natural balance must be taken into consideration while ensuring the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, and also if available, the human tissue must be preserved.
Turkmenistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Uganda	Africa	Annual Fees and Fundraising Activities
Ukraine	Europe and North America	0
United Arab Emirates	Arab States	No response recieved
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Europe and North America	no

Country	Region	Response
United Republic of Tanzania	Africa	1. Through State Party commitment by paying annual contribution on time 2. despite of No. 1 above, the World Heritage might think of charging special fees for having more site on the World Heritage List and during the request for inscription
United States of America	Europe and North America	0
Uruguay	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Uzbekistan	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Vanuatu	Asia and the Pacific	No response recieved
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of	Latin America and the Caribbean	No response recieved
Viet Nam	Asia and the Pacific	0
Yemen	Arab States	No response recieved
Zambia	Africa	No response recieved
Zimbabwe	Africa	No response recieved