World Heritage **24BUR**

Distribution limited **WHC-2000/CONF.202/8**
Paris, 17 May 2000
Original : English / French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fourth session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, (Room IV)
26 June - 1 July 2000

Item 6.1 of the Provisional Agenda : Report of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

SUMMARY

At its twenty-third session held in Marrakesh, Morocco 29 November – 4 December 1999, the World Heritage Committee established the following groups and requested that they present the results of their work to the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau:

Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention	**This document (WHC-2000/CONF.202/8)**
International Expert Meeting on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (Canterbury, UK, 10-14 April 2000)	WHC-2000/CONF.202/9
Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List	WHC-2000/CONF.202/10
Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee	WHC-2000/CONF.202/11

The Task Force has recommended a joint meeting of the Chairpersons and Rapporteurs of the above groups in order to ensure integration and synergy and to overcome overlaps and duplications. At the time of preparation of this document the exact date and venue of this joint meeting had not been finalised.

Action required: In examining this document and formulating recommendations for decision by the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee, the Bureau may wish to note links between the four documents listed above and with WHC-2000/CONF.202/13 (Report on the Evaluation of International Assistance provided under the World Heritage Fund).

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Executive Summary

Terms of Reference

As agreed by the World Heritage Committee in Marrakesh, the terms of reference were:

> To identify and propose for consideration of the Bureau in June 2000 priority practical measures for more effective operation of the Convention taking account of pressure over the next 10 years. Those measures, some of which would be applicable in preparation of and during the Committee meeting of December 2000, will focus on:
> - The organisation and running of the statutory meetings,
> - The procedures for decision making,
> - The information and documentation management
> - The Operational Guidelines
>
> The Task Force will take into account and build upon all discussions in previous General Assembly, Committee and Bureau meetings, the management review and financial audit, and proposals made by State Parties.

Membership

The Task Force was chaired by Canada and included Australia, Belgium, Hungary, Morocco, Mexico, South Africa, Thailand, and the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN) and a representative of the World Heritage Centre. Australia acted as rapporteur.

Working Methods

It was agreed by the Committee at Marrakesh that the Task Force would attempt to work, as much as possible, through electronic means. An internet site was established, on which draft papers were posted and comments received, leading to further redrafting. [In total five drafts were posted on the site before the Task Force report was finalised.]

Some members of the Task Force who were invited to the Canterbury expert meeting on 10-14 April met informally under the chairmanship of Canada. The meeting involved the Chair of the World Heritage Committee (representing Morocco), the Director of the World Centre, the advisory bodies, Australia, Hungary, as well as observers from the UK and USA.

The first meeting of the Task Force took place at UNESCO on 17 April chaired by Australia, with South Africa acting as rapporteur. The meeting included Australia, Belgium, Benin, Canada (by telephone), Egypt, Finland, Greece, Hungary, South Africa, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS and ICCROM.

Process

The mandate of the Task Force has not yet been carried through and work remains to be done (e.g. the development of a concrete proposal on a subcommittee system, treatment for referral and deferral of nominations for inscription, modalities for the reactive monitoring activities, methods to reduce the volume of documents).

The work of this Task Force has been carried out in parallel with three other groups (Representativity of the World Heritage List; Representativity of the World Heritage Committee and an expert meeting held in Canterbury at the request of the Committee to discuss revisions to the Operational Guidelines). The Task Force attempted to avoid duplication of the work of these working groups but issues were raised that would affect the work of other groups. It is also clear that recommendations of other working groups and the recommendations of the Canterbury experts meeting may affect the Bureau and Committee handling of the work of the Task Force.

- **It was proposed at the Paris meeting that a meeting of the Task Force and the Chairs and rapporteurs of the three Working Groups and Expert Meeting would be useful on the day before the Bureau meeting in Paris in order to ensure integration and synergy and to overcome overlaps and duplications**.

If the recommendations of the Task Force are accepted by the Bureau, they will need to be harmonised with the recommendations of other Working Groups. Following this exercise there may be a need for consequential amendments to the Operational Guidelines or Rules of Procedure.

Once the Bureau has given direction on the recommendations, the Center should develop an action plan to follow up on the decisions. The action plan should include performance measures, responsibilities, a timetable and a procedure to monitor progress.

Explanatory Notes

Recommendations in the report of the Task Force have been prioritised and are categorised:

- '**A**' Priority practical measures that the Bureau can decide upon at its June meeting. These might be implemented for the December 2000 meeting of the Committee in order to ensure visible results of benefit to the Committee.

- '**B**' Measures that the Bureau could submit to the Committee for Decision, either in their present form or with further work by the Task Force before the December 2000 meeting.

- '**C**' Ideas which need more time for examination. The Bureau may recommend to the Committee the establishment of possible new processes to pursue these issues.

A summary table is presented for convenience.

_____CONTENTS_____

A: Summary table of recommendations

TOPIC	A: For Consideration by Bureau, July 2000	B: For Committee, November 2000	C: For Further Development
1 STATUTORY MEETINGS **1.1 General Assembly of States Parties**		1.1.1 The following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly • strategic policy issues and report on performance; • implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions • report on international assistance 1.1.2 The Committee hold its regular meeting immediately before the General Assembly 1.1.3 The Committee meet immediately after the General Assembly to elect office bearers. 1.1.4 To save time during voting in the General Assembly, Secretariat and scrutineers collect ballots instead of inviting participants to come forward and vote. Rotational/regional voting could be introduced	
1.2 Bureau Meetings	1.2.1 The Task Force on Implementation to continue work after the Bureau meeting in order to develop concrete proposals for a subcommittee system , to start functioning in 2001 and replace the present system of Bureau/ Committee. The Task Force to report on proposals to the Committee in November 2000. 1.2.2 On a trial basis (pending any Committee discussion of a sub-Committee structure): the Bureau meeting in November 2000 should • not discuss or receive presentations on nominations which have been deferred or referred back, but allow them to proceed to the full Committee. • Enable a working party, prefiguration of a subcomittee for the budget, to prepare the discussion of the budget by the Committee in November 2000 1.2.3 The Rules of Procedure (22) defining the order and time-limit of speakers should be firmly applied by the Chair.	1.2.4 Committee agrees to a system of subcommittees to replace the Bureau, meeting only once a year just before the meeting of the Committee (to commence during 2001).	

TOPIC	A: For Consideration by Bureau, July 2000	B: For Committee, November 2000	C: For Further Development
1.3 Committee Meetings	1.3.1 The agenda of the Committee should have as a permanent item general strategic policy matters, including the Strategic Plan and its implementation (see2.1.1). 1.3.2 Working documents for the Committee should be distributed 6 weeks prior to meetings and should not be read aloud during the meetings. 1.3.3 The Committee agenda should be structured to ensure adequate time for discussion of strategic policy issues shared by States Parties (eg managing tourism impacts, legislative approaches).	1.3.4 The Committee should change its meeting cycle, with every second meeting in Paris prior to the General Assembly of States Parties. 1.3.5 Working groups on implementing the Convention should be made open to all States Parties and those relating to decisions to be made by the Committee should be restricted to Committee members. 1.3.6 The Committee should refrain from creating too many working parties and from approving, by giving them the support of the Center and of the Advisory Bodies, too many groups or experts meetings established by the State Parties. Furthermore, the mandates of the groups or meetings created or approved by the Committee should be very clear and exclude any overlapping.	1.3.7, 1.3.8. outline potential relations between the Committee and sub-committees on inscriptions, nominations and periodic reporting
2 DECISION-MAKING			
2.1 Strategic Planning		2.1.1 The Committee should commence a review to formulate a Strategic Plan with clear timelines and milestones for the period 2001-2005, based in part on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolution endorsing the Orientations.	
2.2 Tentative Lists	2.2.1 In order to encourage a Committee process of strategic planning, the Bureau reminds all state parties of the necessity to prepare tentative lists and to specify the order in which they would propose the inscription of the sites.		
2.3 Nominations	2.3.1 The Center should implement and distribute to all State Parties, a checklist for the preparation and assessment of nominations to ensure that nominations are complete before they are sent to Advisory Bodies for evaluation. 2.3.2 Advisory Bodies should present their recommendations for inscription in a consistent format: assessing outstanding universal value , relationship to the priorities of the Global Strategy, using a check-list to support recommendations, and identifying potential or existing threats and protective actions. 2.3.3 The results of Advisory Bodies' evaluations of nominations	2.3.4 Section B of the Operational Guidelines should clarify that incomplete or late nominations are the responsibility of the States Party and will not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle.	

TOPIC	A: For Consideration by Bureau, July 2000	B: For Committee, November 2000	C: For Further Development
	should be made available to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee, in a timely manner.		
2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List	2.4.1 The agenda for Bureau and Committee meetings should group the presentation of, and decisions on, similar nominations for efficiency. 2.4.2 The assessment documents of the Advisory Bodies and Center should be presented in a single summary table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, and rejection).	2.4.3 The Task Force on Implementation should present proposals for the process of treating referral and deferral of nominations for inscription. 2.4.4 The number of nominations for inscription that the Committee and the other bodies of the convention examine each year should not exceed *[40*].	
2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation	2.5.1 Working documents on monitoring should be distributed early to relevant bodies and States Parties, so Committee has time to discuss issues. They should not be read aloud during meetings. 2.5.2 Reactive monitoring reports should be presented in a single document in a consistent format to facilitate discussion and consideration (standardised formats). 2.5.3 Presentations on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites should be encouraged to use images and maps to improve comprehension.	2.5.4 In reviewing the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee should examine reports on periodic monitoring, focusing on general trends and developing broad strategies to improve the state of conservation. 2.5.5 The Task Force on Implementation should prepare between the Bureau of July 2000 and the Committee of 2000 proposals on the reactive monitoring activities including the role of the Centre, advisory bodies and other UNESCO sectors. The Task Force will also prepare Criteria for a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring.	2.5.6 Proposed approach to state of conservation reporting using sub-committees.
2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List		2.6.1 The Committee should develop clear indicators (based on statements of value agreed at inscription) to report on conservation and management. These indicators should be followed in a consistent way (including preparation of checklist to enable comparative analysis). 2.6.2 Funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List. For each site on the In Danger list a precise action plan and a reporting mechanism shall be established. 2.6.3 Operational Guidelines to more clearly (paras 86 & 87) stress State Party involvement (and where appropriate responsibility) in the action planning process, and the need to designate responsibility for implementing the actions.	2.6.4 The Committee should carry out systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of inscription on the World Heritage in Danger List and related assistance in the protection of sites.

TOPIC	A: For Consideration by Bureau, July 2000	B: For Committee, November 2000	C: For Further Development
2.7 World Heritage Fund	2.7.1 The Center should present the budget in a single document with several columns according to category of delegation (Chair, Committee, Bureau, Center). The budget proposals should be in line with the strategic priorities. The budget will indicate, per objective of the strategic plan , the resources requested and the results expected. Every 6 months (or every year if the budget becomes biennial), the Centre will present a document reporting on the expenses actually made and the results achieved. 2.7.2 Budget items should be supported by related working documents; each working document with budgetary implications should be cross-referenced to the budget. 2.7.3 The Bureau should encourage all parties to respect the Operational Guidelines provisions for international assistance especially on deadlines and follow up to previous projects. 2.7.4 The Center should identify opportunities to harmonize funding and conclude cooperation agreements with other organizations involved in world heritage activities.	2.7.5 The Committee should allocate international assistance in line with strategic priorities (eg. World Heritage In Danger, Global Strategy). It should consider establishing principles and procedures for assessing requests for international assistance. 2.7.6 The Committee should require periodic (every 6 years) independent evaluations to assess the relevance and effectiveness of international assistance, their impact on sites and the balance between natural and cultural sites.	2.7.7 The Committee should move to a biennial budgeting for the World Heritage Fund to harmonize with the UNESCO budget cycle.
3 INFO & DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT			
3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents	3.1.1 Committee documents should be reduced in volume and improved in format • the use of single documents for each agenda item • table of contents be prepared for long documents • the same paragraph numbers for English and French versions • cross–reference documents with the budget and Operational Guidelines where appropriate for clarity • supplementary information tabled at the meeting should be limited to new information • revisions should be made clear (e.g. bolding, revision mode) • use of tables instead of plain text to be encouraged • use of CD ROMs and other electronic media where practical (note some states do not have) • Decisions should be drafted in	3.1.4 The Committee should encourage wide distribution and promotion of information on best conservation practices, including through web linkages. 3.1.5 The decisions and resolutions of the Committee and the General Assembly as well as the text of the Global Strategy should be regrouped in one single document. The countries which have just ratified the Convention as well as the new members of the Committeee should be handed documents containing complete information.	3.1.6 Clear rules should be developed to clarify rights of access to documents. Rules to be consistent with the objective of minimising the production and duplication of documentation, while encouraging and supporting transparent and open decision-making.

TOPIC	A: For Consideration by Bureau, July 2000	B: For Committee, November 2000	C: For Further Development
	such a way to enable monitoring of implementation. The Task Force on Implementation should after the Bureau in July 2000, work with the Centre to identify practical means to achieve such a reduction. 3.1.2 Deadlines established for document production and submission of material should be strictly adhered to by all parties. Items should not be referred to the Committee if materials arrive too late for adequate synthesis. 3.1.3 All documents/ Access to certain documents to be decided by the Committee in November 2000 should be available in French and in English, including on the internet web site.		
3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites	3.2.1 The Center should initiate a data capture project to seek out all evidence of early Committee activities and integrate them within a contemporary electronic record, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure the survival of a complete record of all Committee decisions and supporting rationale	3.2.2 A report should be prepared for the Committee on the status of the Information Management System improvements being currently undertaken, especially relating to information on sites, and improved strategies for access by all stakeholders identified. The Committee may wish to establish a working group to guide developments. 3.2.3 A list of sites for which international assistance has been granted should be published, and updated regularly. The list will report outcomes and results.	
4 OTHER MATTERS			
4.1.The Roles of Advisory Bodies and the Centre	4.1.1 The Committee should review the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies in relation to the Committee, the Center, and possibly UNESCO, leading to MOUs as appropriate.		
4.2 Contract Development and Management		4.2.1 The Committee, as a high priority, should direct the Center to improve the timeliness of contracts and contract payments.	

B: Issues and Recommendations

1. STATUTORY MEETINGS

1.1 General Assembly of States Parties

Issues

Time spent on election and administrative issues is at the expense of policy/strategic discussions.

Insufficient weight given to, and follow-up of, General Assembly resolutions.

Timing of the General Assembly (October), one month before Committee is more costly for travel and increases the workload for Center.

Recommendations

1.1.1 B
The following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly

- strategic policy issues and report of performance;
- Implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions;
- Report on international assistance

1.1.2 B
The Committee should hold its regular meeting immediately before the General Assembly every second year. (As the Assembly elects replacement members of the Committee, there are practical impediments to it meeting after the General Assembly - candidates would have difficulties in confirming travel and other plans, and candidates would not be able to adequately prepare for the meeting).

1.1.3 B
The Committee should meet immediately after the General Assembly to elect office bearers. (Note concern over capacity of small delegations to handle workload)

1.1.4 B
To save time during voting in the General Assembly, Secretariat and scrutineers should collect ballots instead of inviting participants to come forward to vote. Rotational/regional voting could be introduced.

1.2 Bureau Meetings

Issues

Although the participation of those with observer status is helpful to the understanding of the mechanisms of implementing the convention, Bureau/ Committee /Subcommittee meetings could proceed more efficiently if mechanisms were identified and applied to limit the necessity for lengthy interventions by observers.

The Bureau is intended to take pressure off Committee meetings by preparing its work, but Committee meetings duplicate the work of the Bureau because there is no real delegation.

The responsibility of the Bureau (to simplify the work of the Committee by undertaking detailed preparatory work) is not always being met as content is often recycled through the Bureau and then the Committee and discussed at length.

The size, complexity and timing of paperwork causes great strain on members of the Bureau, Committee and staff of the Center.

The valuable time of Bureau and Committee members as well as advisory bodies is not utilised effectively, as presentations are repeated up to three times over the course of an annual meeting cycle.

Recommendations

1.2.1 A
The Task Force on Implementation to continue work after the Bureau meeting in order to develop concrete proposals for a subcommittee system, to start functioning in 2001 and replace the present system of Bureau/ Committee (Note: some consider should start in 2002). The Task Force to report on proposals to the Committee in November 2000.

The sub-committees are intended to free the Committee from detailed administration and to allow more time on strategic direction and to follow focussed and practical work programs and responsibilities, as delegated by the Committee.

1.2.2 A
On a trial basis (pending any Committee discussion of a sub-Committee structure):
the Bureau meeting in November 2000 should

- not discuss or receive presentations on nominations which have been deferred or referred back, but allow them to proceed to the full Committee.
- Enable a working party, prefiguration of a subcomittee for the budget, to prepare the discussion of the budget by the Committee in November 2000

1.2.3 A
The Rules of Procedure (22) defining the order and time-limit of speakers should be firmly applied by the Chair, allowing the representatives of organisations, individuals and observers to address the meeting with the prior consent of the Chairman. Observers should be encouraged to work through their regional representatives on the Committee.

1.2.4 B
Desiring on the one hand to reduce the number of statutory meetings which constitute a ***useless and heavy burden*** and on the other hand to facilitate the work of the Committee by preparing it efficiently, the Bureau recommends to the Committee a system of subcommittees/ committee, subcommitttees meeting only once a year just before the meeting of the Committee (to commence during 2001. (Note some suggest 2002, and others that Bureau members as sub-chairs, could chair sub-committees).

1.3 Committee Meetings

Issues

There is insufficient strategic direction-setting by the Committee, partly because of the administrative workload.

There is not enough time to handle workload in plenary sessions.

The proposal to increase efficiency by dealing with inscriptions one year, and monitoring the next has some support. The proposal may improve efficiency by focusing the work of the Center and Committee. However, the potential for this system to decrease monitoring flexibility has been raised as a concern.

Annual meetings in different regions are costly and time-consuming. A proposal that the Committee meet in Paris every second year, immediately before the General Assembly, has advantages of time and cost effectiveness. Belgium has stated a conviction 'that in the end the actual system has more advantages than disadvantages.'

Duplication of effort between Advisory Bodies and the Center has been identified.

Rules of membership and access to the documents of the various working groups that are set up by the Committee and other bodies of the convention are not clear.

Recommendations

1.3.1 A
The agenda of the Committee should have as a permanent item general strategic policy matters, including the Strategic Plan (see 2.1.1) and its implementation and other policy matters.

1.3.2 A
Working documents for the Committee should be distributed 6 weeks prior to meetings and should not be read aloud during the meetings.

1.3.3 A
The Committee agenda should be structured to ensure adequate time for discussion of strategic policy issues shared by States Parties (eg managing tourism impacts, legislative approaches).

1.3.4 B
The Committee should change its meeting cycle, with every second meeting in Paris prior to the General Assembly of States Parties.

1.3.5 B
Working groups on implementing the Convention should be made open to all States Parties and that those relating to decisions to be made by the Committee should be restricted to Committee members.

1.3.6 B
The Committee should refrain from creating too many working parties and from approving, by giving them the support of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies, too many groups or expert meetings established by State Parties. Furthermore, the mandates of the group or meetings created or approved by the Committee, should be made very clear and exclude any overlapping.

1.3.7 C
To scale back the workload, the Committee should examine inscriptions and periodic monitoring, following their preparation in subcommittees. The Committee should only examine reports on reactive monitoring on an exceptional basis.

1.3.8 C
Depending on other decisions (on sub-committees and Operational Guidelines) the Committee may wish to revise the calendar for nominations. One proposal is offered for consideration:

- 1 April Year 0: nominations to be lodged with the WH Center. Nomination check list completed and incomplete nominations sent back to the nominating state.
- 1 May Year 0: nominations sent to the Advisory Bodies (incomplete nomination proposals are sent back to the WH Center, who refer back to the nominating state); Advisory Bodies to collaborate with the nominating State Party(ies) in the preparation of the assessment including in relation to logistics for the assessment missions. If required, the Advisory Bodies to seek, in a timely manner, further information from the nominating States Party(ies) to allow the assessment process to be completed.
- 1 July Year 1: Advisory Bodies assessments sent to WH Center;
- 1 August Year 1: Advisory Bodies assessments sent to nominations Subcommittee, and nominating State Party(ies);
- October Year 1: meetings of subcommittees, followed by Committee meeting.

2. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

2.1 Strategic Planning

Issues

The 1992 Strategic Orientations with its action plan was relevant but did not achieve its goals because no mechanism was introduced for assigning responsibilities for implementation, no timelines were identified and no process for monitoring and updating goals and objectives was introduced.

Recommendations

2.1.1 B
The Committee should commence a review to formulate a Strategic Plan for the period 2001-2005, based in part on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolution endorsing the Orientations. The Strategic Plan to contain at a minimum:

- a vision
- goals
- objectives
- action plan
- timelines
- reporting mechanisms
- accountable parties
- a review cycle

2.2 Tentative Lists

Issues

Many (40%) of States Parties have no tentative list, or their existing list is out-of-date. They are not required for natural sites, (although IUCN support the proposal)

This affects the ability of the Committee to plan strategically and the Advisory Bodies flexibility to allocate resources.

The Task Force notes that there may be outcomes of other working groups on this issue that may affect the implementation of procedures in the Bureau and Committee. In particular, the development of a systematic mechanism to limit and prioritise the assessment of nominations (to be considered by the Working Group on the Representativeness of the World Heritage List) has potential to affect the practical work of the Committee.

Recommendations

2.2.1 A
In order to encourage a Committee process of strategic planning, the Bureau reminds all state parties of the necessity to prepare tentative lists and to specify the order in which they would propose the inscription of the sites

2.3 Nominations

Issues

While other working groups may make recommendations on the issue of the preparation of nominations, the practical work of the Bureau and Committee is directly affected by current practice.

At each meeting, a number of nominations are discussed by the Committee although the nomination documents are incomplete when they are forwarded by the Center to the advisory bodies.

Committee members nominating sites are advantaged in the nomination process because only Committee members have access to the evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. It is noted that making evaluations available to State Parties that are not Committee members may create an extra work load but will inform the decision making process.

Recommendations

2.3.1 A
The Center should implement and distribute to all State Parties a checklist for the preparation and assessment of nominations to ensure that nominations are complete before sending to Advisory Bodies for evaluation. Only in exceptional circumstances should it not be applied.

2.3.2 A
Advisory Bodies should present their recommendations for each inscription to clearly assess whether sites are of universal value and show the relationship to the priorities of the Global Strategy, in a consistent format from one nomination to the next, using a check-list to support recommendations, and clearly identifying potential or existing threats and any actions needed to protect the values.

2.3.3 A
The results of Advisory Bodies' evaluations of nominations should be made available to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee, in a timely manner.

2.3.4 B
Section B of the Operational Guidelines should clarify that incomplete or late nominations are the responsibility of the States Party and will not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle.

2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List

Issues

The quality of Committee consideration declines when too many nominations are handled each year, and nominations are handled several times due to referral and deferral mechanisms.

There is an excessive and poorly distributed workload for Advisory Bodies and Center due to overlapping cycles of review and evaluation of nominations.

The Committee receives inappropriate or delayed information, due to heavy workloads, affecting its decision-making.

Recommendations

2.4.1 A
The agenda for Bureau and Committee meetings should group the presentation of, and decisions on, similar nominations for efficiency.

2.4.2 A
The assessment documents of the Advisory Bodies and Center should be presented in a single summary table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, and rejection).

2.4.3 B
The Task Force on Implementation should present proposals for the process of treating referral and deferral of nominations for inscription.

2.4.4 B
The number of nominations for inscription that the Committee and the other bodies of the Convention examine each year should not exceed 40. (Note: needs a justification for this number)

2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation

Issues

Introduction of state of conservation periodic reporting is an important new element that must be carefully planned. It will require a substantial increase in Committee time.

While the Committee has now set a regional schedule for periodic reporting on state of conservation, the Committee continues to receive individual, ad hoc reports (reactive monitoring).

Appropriate mechanisms to deal with reactive monitoring need to be adopted. There is duplication among Center, Advisory Bodies, other international organisations and UNESCO sectors in carrying out and reporting on reactive monitoring.

Consideration of reports is impeded by too many sites being reported on and reports being read aloud during Committee meetings.

The strategic use of reports is not well developed; there is no attempt to make comparative studies, nor to group sites with common themes.

Improved and increased use of visual aids in presentations would help Committee consideration of reports.

There are no clear rules of public access to state of conservation reports and to information developed in their preparation.

Recommendations

2.5.1 A
Working documents on monitoring should be distributed early (a minimum of 6 weeks prior to meetings) to relevant bodies and particularly to States Parties, so Committee has time to discuss issues in an informed manner. They should not be read aloud during meetings.

2.5.2 A
Reactive monitoring reports should be presented in a single document with a focus on practical recommendations to facilitate discussion and consideration (standardised formats).

2.5.3 A
Presentations on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites should be encouraged to use images and maps to improve comprehension.

2.5.4 B
In reviewing the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee should examine reports on periodic monitoring, focusing on general trends and developing broad strategies to improve the state of conservation. The Committee should only examine reports on reactive monitoring on an exceptional basis.

2.5.5 B
The Task Force on Implementation should prepare between the Bureau of July 2000 and the Committee of 2000 proposals on the reactive monitoring activities including the role of the Centre, advisory bodies and other UNESCO sectors. The Task Force will also prepare Criteria for a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring

2.5.6 C
Each year the State Parties of one region shall submit to the Centre their periodic report on the state of conservation of their sites. The Centre will examine those reports inter alia in the light of the results of the earlier examination of the same sites and establish a document summarising the reports and commenting on the state of conservation of the sites. That document of the Centre shall be submitted to the subcommittee which will then identify the sites where no problems, minor problems or major problems exist. The Committee will then examine the report of the sub-Committee but limiting the discussion to the sites with major problems. Any member of the Committee will however, have the right to demand a discussion on a site considered by the Subcommittee as being with no or only minor problems. The same procedure will apply to the reactive monitoring, but the Task Force on implementation, still has to make proposals to the Committee on those reactive monitoring

2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List

Issues

The In Danger List is a tool for improving conservation of threatened properties.

Inscription on the In Danger List needs to be accompanied by a realistic action plan and practical and achievable measures to improve condition.

There is a lack of clarity about why a site is put on or taken off In Danger List, and resistance to the placement of sites on it.

Sites inscribed on In Danger list do not necessarily get priority for allocation of international assistance.

Recommendations

2.6.1 B
The Committee should develop clear indicators (based on statements of value agreed at inscription) to report on conservation and management. These indicators should be followed in a consistent way (including preparation of checklist to enable comparative analysis).

- A monitoring framework to be developed to identify the threshold levels of threat that trigger nomination to the In Danger List (Operational Guideline paras 80-85)
- A monitoring framework to also specify an action plan and review process that determines when to remove a property from the In-Danger list (paras 92 and 93).

2.6.2 B
Funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List. For each site on the In Danger list a precise action plan and a reporting mechanism shall be established.

2.6.3 B
Operational Guidelines to more clearly (paras 86 & 87) stress State Party involvement (and where appropriate responsibility) in the action planning process, and the need to designate responsibility for implementing the actions.

2.6.4 C
The Committee should carry out systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of inscription on the World Heritage in Danger List and related assistance in the protection of sites.

2.7 World Heritage Fund

Issues

Budget discussions are too lengthy and detailed for the full Committee.

The allocation of international assistance is not related to a clear strategic vision and measurable outcomes. Instead it is proposed on case-by-case basis. Percentage allocations to different categories of aid may inhibit effective use of available funds as allocations are not linked to strategic priorities.

No independent evaluations are prepared to assess the impact of international assistance and measurable outcomes tend to be absent.

Funds cannot meet demand. (Whether there is a lack of funds is not agreed; the concern that the fund is well spent is agreed.)

Efficiencies could be achieved by harmonising the budget cycle with UNESCO; decisions on Fund are made annually although Art 2 of Financial Regulations for WHF states that financial period should be two consecutive calendar years coinciding with financial period of regular UNESCO Budget.

ICCROM has suggested separate discussion of international assistance, for which it has a number of recommendations. ICCROM has provided substantial information on this issue in its submission to the Implementation Task Force.

Recommendations

2.7.1 A
The Center should present the budget in a single document with several columns according to category of delegation (Chair, Committee, Bureau, Center). The budget proposals should be in line with the strategic priorities. The budget will indicate, per objective of the Strategic Plan, the resources requested and the results expected. Every six months (or every year if the budget becomes biennial) the Centre will present a document reporting on the expenses actually made and the results achieved.

2.7.2 A
Budget items should be supported by related working documents; each working document with budgetary implications should be cross-referenced to the budget.

2.7.3 A
The Bureau should encourage all parties to respect the provisions for international assistance in the Operational Guidelines, especially those concerning deadlines and follow up to previous projects.

2.7.4 A
The Center should systematically identify opportunities to harmonize funding allocations with other international organizations that are involved in world heritage activities and conclude cooperation agreements with these organisations.

2.7.5 B
The Committee should allocate international assistance in line with strategic priorities (eg. World Heritage In Danger, Global Strategy). It should consider establishing principles and procedures for assessing requests for international assistance.

2.7.6 B
The Committee should require periodic (every 6 years) independent evaluations to assess the relevance and effectiveness of different categories of international assistance, and their impact on sites and the balance between natural and cultural sites.

2.7.7 C
The Committee should move to a biennial budgeting for the World Heritage Fund to harmonize with the UNESCO budget cycle.

3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents

Issues

Too much documentation is given to the Committee, discouraging discussion of policy issues and strategic decision-making.

Information is often duplicated and confusing.

Late input and compressed schedules prevent Center staff from synthesising reports, and Committee from full consideration.

Information, such as working documents of the Committee and documents related to assistance, are not easily accessible to States Parties that are not Committee Members, or to nations that have not ratified the convention.

Recommendations

3.1.1 A
Committee documents should be reduced in volume and improved in format

- the use of single documents for each agenda item
- table of contents be prepared for long documents
- the same paragraph numbers for English and French versions
- cross–reference documents with the budget and Operational Guidelines where appropriate for clarity
- supplementary information tabled at the meeting should be limited to new information
- revisions should be made clear (e.g. bolding, revision mode)
- use of tables instead of plain text to be encouraged
- use of CD ROMs and other electronic media where practical (note some states do not have)
- Decisions should be drafted in such a way to enable monitoring of implementation.

The Task Force on Implementation should after the Bureau in July 2000, work with the Centre to identify practical means to achieve such a reduction.

3.1.2 A
Deadlines established for document production should be strictly adhered to. Items should not be referred to the Committee if materials arrive too late for adequate synthesis.

3.1.3 A
All documents/ Access to certain documents to be decided by the Committee in November 2000 should be available in French and in English, including on the internet web site

3.1.4 B
The Committee should encourage wide distribution and promotion of information on best conservation practices, including through web linkages.

3.1.5 B
The decisions and resolutions of the Committee and the General Assembly as well as the text of the Global Strategy should be regrouped in one single document. The countries which have just ratified the Convention as well as the new members of the Committeee should be handed documents containing complete information.

3.1.6 C
Clear rules should be developed to clarify rights of access to documents. Rules to be consistent with the objective of minimising the production and duplication of documentation while encouraging and supporting transparent and open decision-making..

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites

Issues

A need to improve management systems and archival storage has been identified:

- information often out-of-date
- need for Center to maintain consolidated site files
- need to link state of conservation reports with international assistance requests/allocations..

There is a need to draw up, keep up-to-date and publicise a list of property for which international assistance has been granted and to report on outcomes and results (responsibility from Convention, art. 13.5).

Reference materials and files for requests (re: international assistance) made before 1992 are not available for consultation within the offices of the Center and are not necessarily retrievable from UNESCO archives.

Issues related to the improvement of information systems are explained more fully below:

There is a need to clarify information on the Working groups or meetings: setting up of groups and meetings, composition of the Groups (clear terms of reference, criteria for the designation of participants) and their working methods (distribution of information) is required.

In the current system, a Committee member making nomination proposals is privileged compared to other State Parties because only Committee members have access to the evaluation by the advisory bodies. Possible solutions could be: providing the results of the evaluation to he State Parties concerned at an early stage.

The World Heritage Center should maintain a policy of continuous improvement in the information systems relating to World Heritage sites, consolidate record keeping to link nomination files, monitoring reports, international assistance and correspondence, linking them electronically to site files of Advisory bodies.

Recommendations

3.2.1 A
The Center should initiate a data capture project to seek out all evidence of early Committee activities and integrate them within a contemporary electronic record, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure the survival of a complete record of all Committee decisions and supporting rationale.

3.2.2 B
A report should be prepared for the Committee on the status of the Information Management System improvements being currently undertaken, especially relating to information on sites, ad improved strategies for access by all stakeholders identified. The Committee may wish to establish a working group to guide developments.

3.2.3 B
A list of sites for which international assistance has been granted should be published, and updated regularly. The list will report outcomes and results.

4 OTHER MATTERS

4.1.The Roles of the Advisory Bodies and Centre

Issue

Differing understandings of the relative roles of Advisory Bodies and the Center exist. These differences impede the effective operation of the Committee.

Recommendation

4.1.1 A
The Committee should review the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies in relation to the Committee, the Center, and possibly UNESCO, leading to MOUs as appropriate.

4.2 Contract Development and Management

Issue

The current process of turning Committee decisions about the allocation of funds into World Heritage Center contracts with States Parties and Advisory Bodies is cumbersome and inefficient.

Recommendation

4.2.1 B
The Committee, as a high priority, should direct the Center to improve the timeliness of contracts and contract payments.

Annex One: ICCROM

ICCROM has suggested separate discussion of international assistance, for which it has a number of recommendations. ICCROM has provided substantial information on this issue in its submission to the Implementation Task Force.

There is no clear rationale for assignment by the Center of requests for international assistance nor its early submission to States Parties and Advisory Bodies for review/comment.

There is no consistent standard for the treatment of such requests by the Advisory Bodies – making it difficult for the Center to synthesis responses.

Criteria used by the Advisory Bodies for assessment of requests have not been reviewed by Committee.

The categories of international assistance are interpreted differently by States Parties, the Center and by the Advisory Bodies. Proper use of the budget provisions established by the Committee requires that the demarcations of activity be clearly defined and respected.

Operational Guideline procedures to manage requests for training assistance are routinely ignored by virtually all States Parties.

Operational Guideline requirements for the preparation of an evaluation of the effectiveness of the training activity is routinely ignored.

Many requests for international assistance forwarded by States Parties have been substantially prepared by staff of the Center, consultants and Advisory Bodies. States Parties, and regions, may be unaware of details of proposals being made on their behalf. Evaluation systems should attempt to ensure that States Parties have ownership of the ideas proposed in their name, and are consistent with regional strategic objectives.

Consistency of treatment of Advisory Body costs is required in the overall budget.