

Distribution limited

WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.20

Paris, 30 June 1999

Original : English/French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION**

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

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Twenty-third session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters (Room X)
5 - 10 July 1999**

**Information Document : Evaluation of International Assistance provided within the
framework of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.**

SUMMARY

At its twenty-second session, held in Kyoto (Japan) from 30 November to 5 December 1998, the World Heritage Committee decided that an evaluation of international assistance be carried out in 1999 within the framework of the implementation of the Convention. A budget of \$40,000 had been approved, subject to the decision of the Bureau, based on this proposal submitted by the Secretariat.

Action by the Bureau : The Bureau may wish to take note of this Document and authorize the Secretariat to utilize the US\$ 40,000 accordingly.

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of international assistance provided within the framework of the implementation of the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage

At its twenty-second session, held in Kyoto (Japan) from 30 November to 5 December 1998, the World Heritage Committee decided, within the framework of the Convention, to implement an evaluation of international assistance, in 1999. For this evaluation a budget of \$40,000 has been approved. The utilisation of this budget is subject to the decision of the Bureau on the basis of the proposal being prepared by the Secretariat in close co-operation with UNESCO's Central Programme Evaluation Unit (BPE/CEU).

1. Context

The Convention describes international assistance, its overall goals, its financing and its management principals in Articles 13 and 19 to 26. It stipulates that "the World Heritage Committee shall receive and study requests for international assistance formulated by the States Parties (...) with respect to property forming part of the cultural or natural heritage, situated in their territories, and included or potentially suitable for inclusion in the lists (...). The purpose of such requests may be to secure the protection, conservation, presentation or rehabilitation of such property. The requests (...) may also be concerned with identification of cultural or natural heritage property (...) when preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would

International assistance, financed by the "World Heritage Fund" and approved by the Committee could take the following forms:

- (a) "studies concerning the artistic, scientific and technical problems raised by the protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage (...);
- (b) provision of experts, technicians and skilled labour to ensure that the approved work is correctly carried out;
- (c) training of staff and specialists at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage;
- (d) supply of equipment which the State concerned does not have or does not possess or is not in a position to acquire;
- (e) low-interest or interest-free loans which might be repayable on a long-term basis;
- (f) the granting, in exceptional cases and for special reasons, of non-repayable subsidies."

Paragraphs 94-121 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (WHC 99/2) are concerned with requests for international assistance. They stipulate, giving the principals and conditions of support for the five forms of assistance available:

- preparatory assistance;
- emergency assistance;
- training;
- technical co-operation;
- assistance for promotional activities

Explicit principals also govern the priorities regarding the support for international assistance, the division between cultural and natural heritage, as well as the competence of the respective governing bodies regarding the approval of requests (a summary of these principals: cf. WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev).

In his *Report to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Study of the Management of the World Heritage Convention*, presented in November 1997, the External Auditor makes a number of observations and recommendations concerning international assistance (WHC-97/CONF.208/CONF.5 Annex B paras. 85 to 106). He states that the management of international assistance needs to be further developed and rationalised and recommends the establishment of a data bank within a management information system, along with an update of the *Operational Guidelines* which should be supported by a strategic overview. Outlining briefly an evaluation of the different forms of international assistance, the External Auditor states that there are no satisfactory answers to the fundamental questions on the pertinence and impact of supported projects. On this basis, he recommends that the Committee “ask the Centre to have an external evaluation carried out on the relevance and impact of the international assistance provided.” This information, he continues, “should serve as a basis for a follow-up evaluation in

2. Main Issues

After 25 years’ functioning of international assistance, the World Heritage Committee is confronted with the following difficulty: despite the increase in the amounts allocated to Chapter III of the Fund (Technical implementation of the Convention; see table below), the amounts allocated are not sufficient to respond satisfactorily to States Parties’ requests. This is the result of the increasing number of sites on the List and the growing number of requests lodged by the States Parties.

Year	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Amount, Chapter III	\$1,380,000	\$1,352,000	\$1,410,000	\$1,945,000	\$2,440,000	\$2,626,000
Growth		-2%	+4%	+38%	+25%	+8%

In addition to the above, the sluggishness and shortcomings of the management of international assistance as revealed by the External Auditor calls for more focused strategic and operational action.

From now on, the evaluation exercise will be seen as an opportunity to lead this action and to propose new directions. Rather than being a summative evaluation of past activities, this evaluation will be formative, providing valuable information, which will be concerned with the appraisal and improvement of the existing elements of efficiency and effectiveness in international assistance. In this sense, the main questions will refer to:

- the overall goals and functions of international assistance:

Are the expected results clear and realistic? Is the use of the amounts allocated within the framework of international assistance well defined and known? In what ways do the operational results contribute to the overall goals of the Convention? In what way are the mobilised resources in line with the overall goals?

- the procedures and structures in place:
Are the current mechanisms of submission-evaluation-approval-follow up of requests for international assistance satisfactory, particularly regarding the quality and timeframe of the processing of the requests?
- the protagonists:
Are the roles of the different parties (States Parties, Committee, Bureau, Chairperson, Centre, advisory bodies, and beneficiary bodies) clearly defined and strictly adhered to? To what extent are these protagonists satisfied?
- the regulatory mechanisms:
How does the submission of accounts of projects operate? Is there any steering by results? Under what conditions are *a priori* and *a posteriori* evaluations of the activities likely to improve the quality of international assistance?
- the cost-effectiveness:
What is the total cost related to the management of international assistance? Is the current relationship between costs and services provided the right one?

Based on a systemic approach and taking into account of the current dynamics, the evaluation will have to propose operational recommendations, which will meet the objectives of the Committee.

The precise wording of the questions as well as the detailed methodology, work plan and budget will be drawn up jointly by the evaluation steering body and the consultants. (See below).

3. Methodology

To carry out this evaluation the following will be undertaken:

- a document study¹ a sample will be chosen from the files of requests for international assistance presented over the last three accounting periods (approved *and* rejected requests). This examination of a limited number of cases will allow a substantial analysis of the quality of the requests and of the processing carried out by the decision-makers.
- semi-directive interviews with the people in charge of reception, processing and decision-making regarding the requests: members of the Bureau and the Committee, members of the Secretariat and members of the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM). These interviews will illuminate the principle parameters of current practice, the strengths and weaknesses and the threats to, and opportunities for, the current system.
- group interviews with the key people in the current system. This group work will facilitate the discovery of any dysfunction and the elaboration of solutions.

¹ Thanks to the ongoing computerisation of the dossiers, certain statistical studies will be easy to execute: the evolution of the type of requests; the evolution of the amounts requested and allocated; the geographical distribution; the rapidity of processing of the requests, etc.

- a survey by questionnaire of a sample of beneficiaries of requests for international assistance. These outside points of view will make possible an appreciation of the degree of satisfaction with the contributions of the World Heritage Centre in the framework of international assistance.

4. Sharing of Responsibility

The World Heritage Committee is the co-ordinator of the evaluation. Once these Terms of Reference have been approved, it will delegate this responsibility to an *ad hoc* steering body which will be made up of a member of the Secretariat, a representative of the Bureau and a member of UNESCO's Central Programme Evaluation Unit. This steering body will see to the smooth progress of the evaluation and act as an interface between the consultants and the World Heritage Centre. As such, it will be responsible for the choice of consultants and for the precise definition of the tasks, methodology and schedule.

The co-ordination of the evaluation will be entrusted to a senior consultant who will be competent in, and have significant experience of, programme evaluation, following organisational change and multilateral co-operation. A junior consultant who will work continuously in Paris for a four to five-month period will assist him. He will be charged, under the direction of the principal evaluator, with the documentary analysis and the administration of the investigation.

5. Conditions for Realisation

Once the Committee has approved these Terms of Reference, the evaluation can start.

The Secretariat will give the evaluators all help necessary for the smooth progress of the evaluation: making the dossiers available; provision of a work area and computer facilities; availability, etc..

A provisional version of the evaluation report will be presented to the steering body who will consider it in the light of the quality criteria expected for this type of exercise. The operational character, in particular, of the recommendations will be verified within the framework of the steering body. The final report will be presented for debate and decision to the Bureau at its twenty-fourth session.

The provisional budget breaks down as follows:

1. Documentary analysis	\$8,000
2. Semi-directive interviews	\$5,000
3. Group interviews	\$7,500
4. Survey by questionnaire	\$8,500
5. Writing of preliminary report	\$5,000
6. Writing of final report	\$1,500
7. Co-ordination and final presentation	\$2,500
8. Miscellaneous costs	\$2,000

TOTAL

\$40,000

6. Provisional Timetable

- July 1999: approval of the Terms of Reference by the Bureau
- July – August 1999: choice of consultants
- September – October 1999: documentary analysis
- October – November 1999: individual and group interviews
- September – December 1999: survey by questionnaire
- January 2000: presentation of a provisional version of the report to the steering body
- February 2000: finalisation of the evaluation report
- June 2000: presentation to the Bureau for debate