World Heritage reports

11

Periodic Report and
Regional Programme

Arab States
2000-2003

Periodic Report and Regional Programme

Arab States
2000-2003

Preface

Since its adoption in November 1972, the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage *–also known as the* World Heritage Convention*– has allowed the inscription of 754 sites on the World Heritage List (582 cultural, 149 natural and 23 mixed properties in 129 States Parties). The* World Heritage Convention *recognises the "importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, to whatever people it may belong." This inscription on the World Heritage List therefore provides for the protection of heritage of "outstanding universal value" against the dangers which increasingly threaten it, and its passing on to future generations.*

The Arab Region comprises eighteen States signatories to the World Heritage Convention*, distributed in three geographical sub-regions: North Africa, the Arabian Peninsula, and the Middle East. Today, in 2004, the Arab Region total 57 cultural and natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, which is our duty to preserve according to the principles set out by the* World Heritage Convention*.*

World Heritage properties in the Arab Region, however, are with few exceptions subject to development pressures linked to urban and agricultural expansion, tourism, pollution and the exploitation of natural resources (oil, mining industry, fishing…). Other factors threaten these properties, such as armed conflict or the illicit traffic of cultural property (looting, illicit destruction and sale of cultural and historical objects). Such dangers to the preservation of heritage have led to the inscription of six properties in the Arab Region on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1988.

With a view to monitoring the state of conservation of these properties, and in line with Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention*, which requests States Parties to provide information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted for the application of this Convention, the* Periodic Reporting *exercise was therefore designed. Besides assessing the state of preservation of World Heritage sites and the implementation of the* World Heritage Convention *by the States Parties, this new tool was meant to identify the main conservation needs of each participating country, through the compilation of two extensive questionnaires. The first to undertake this exercise was the Arab Region in 2000. Based on this information, and further to a specific request from the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre implemented a series of actions and developed a* Programme for the Conservation of World Heritage in the Arab Region*.*

This document presents the results for this first step of the Periodic Reporting*. It provides an overview of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties in the Arab Region and assesses the resources available for the conservation of the properties, management training and awareness-raising of all the national and local persons concerned. In addition, it explains how the results of Periodic Reporting enabled the drafting of a* Regional Programme for the Arab Region*, aiming, through combined efforts and cooperation between the States Parties and the World Heritage Centre, for the enhancement of preservation and protection measures for heritage in the Arab Region.*

Francesco Bandarin
Director
World Heritage Centre
UNESCO

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents _____

Introduction

This document was prepared by the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre, following the request of the World Heritage Committee that an analytical summary of the Periodic Reporting exercise be prepared for the Arab Region in view of its publication. This report aims at evaluating the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab Region, on the basis of the Periodic Reports submitted by the States Parties in 2000 and of information collected by the Secretariat in the framework of its activities. In addition, it discusses follow-up actions since 2000, and includes information on the drafting of a Regional Programme for the Arab Region in an effort to respond positively to the requests and needs expressed by the States Parties during the exercise.

The objective of the Periodic Reporting exercise was to monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage in the Arab Region to enable the World Heritage Committee to identify strategic needs and priorities, and to allow both the Committee and the States Parties to work together towards improving management and protection. Thus, the exercise provided:
- An updating of the World Heritage Committee's information on the properties inscribed to record possible changes in the circumstances and in the state of conservation of properties;
- An assessment of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention by the States Parties;
- An assessment as to whether the World Heritage values of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List were maintained over time;

At the State Party level, the exercise also allowed:

• To contribute to the improvement of the States Parties'[1] implementation of the World Heritage Convention;
• To the better drafting of national heritage policies and property management programmes with improved identification of regional and national priorities;
• To the active involvement in the preservation effort by the local and national officials and the populations;
• To provide a mechanism for regional and international cooperation and for an exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the Convention and the conservation of World Heritage.

Discussions on the most appropriate means to establish this up-to-date information were initiated in 1982 and continued since then. The reflection on the periodical reports led to the definition of a process of periodical submission of reports during the twenty-first and the twenty-second sessions of the World Heritage Committee in 1997 and 1998. A consensus was reached that, in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, the States Parties would provide periodic reports on the application of the Convention and the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. A regional approach was recommended to encourage regional cooperation and the exchange of information amongst States Parties, and a rigorous

---

1. See: WHC-03/27.COM/6B

and flexible monitoring methodology was devised to enable consideration of the particularities and regional characteristics. Document WHC-99/CONF.209/12, presenting the action plan for the Arab Region, was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session from 24 November to 4 December 1999, in Marrakesh.

Periodic Reports, presented in the form of a questionnaire in two parts, comprise two complementary aspects:
• Section I, which will be analysed in Chapter I, is the State Party's report on the implementation of the Convention, including the identification of properties of cultural and/or cultural value; the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage; international cooperation and fund-raising; and education, information and awareness building;

• Section II, which will be analysed in Chapter II, focuses on the evaluation of the state of conservation of each of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The local authorities and property managers submit an assessment of the situation at the property level in order to study whether the World Heritage values for which a property was initially inscribed on the World Heritage List have been maintained over time.

Although all regions will eventually perform this exercise, the Arab states were the first to undergo this exercise. Therefore, in addition to evaluating the state of preservation of World Heritage properties in the Region, it also served as a test for the other regions. Since 2000, the Africa Region (2001-2002), and the Asia and Pacific Region (2003) have also completed this exercise. Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and the Caribbean Region, and the Europe and North America Region are planned for 2004 and 2005-2006 respectively.

Regarding the Arab Region, only States Parties holding properties that were inscribed on the World Heritage List up to and including 1992 were invited to participate in the exercise. This criterion would enable the updating of information received by the Committee at the time of inscription. Other properties, inscribed after 1992 were deemed too recent to require updating.

© UNESCO/Technical services Banc d'Arguin

The Banc d'Arguin National Park in Mauritania, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1989, is one of the three Natural World Heritage properties in the Arab Region. The Park stretches over 12000km2 and hosts over a hundred different species of birds, and several endangered species.

2. WHC-2000/CONF.204/7

All in all, within the Arab Region, 12 States Parties (Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, the Sultanate of Oman, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yemen), representing 44 properties (41 cultural, 1 mixed, and 2 natural) were called upon to prepare reports on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention by States Parties (Section I). Only eleven Section I reports were received as one State failed to submit its report: the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Algeria's Section I report was received too late to be included in the analysis of the reports[2] which was presented to the World Heritage Committee during its twenty-fourth session in December 2000 in Cairns (Australia). This publication includes the data received in Algeria's Section I report.
Six other States Parties, signatories to the Convention, were not eligible to participate in the exercise: four States (Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, Sudan), signatories to the Convention, have no properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The United Arab Emirates and Kuwait signed the Convention after the Periodic Reporting exercise, on May 11, 2001 and June 6, 2002, respectively.

*A total of **fourty-four** properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List prior to 1993, and were therefore eligible to submit reports for Section II, with the exception of Jerusalem. Of the **twelve** States with inscribed properties, **three** did not submit reports on all the properties concerned, representing a total of 6 missing reports on Section II: Algeria (1 property), the Sultanate of Oman (3 sites inscribed as 1 property), Tunisia (2 properties), including one of the only two natural properties (Ichkeul National Park in Tunisia). The Section II reports of the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania), the Kasbah of Algiers and the M'Zab Valley (Algeria), which were received too late to be included in the analytical report presented to the World Heritage Committee during its session in Cairns, have been taken into account in this publication.*

The documents received (for both Section I and Section II) are essentially the questionnaires, totalling about 1900 pages of text, occasionally accompanied by documentation. The results of this exercise, the first of its kind, remain very positive. The Committee was informed of the implementation of the Convention by the States Parties and on the state of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The conclusions and recommendations of the analysis of the Periodic Reporting exercise, and the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee, allowed the drafting of a Regional Programme for the Arab States for implementation over a six-year period. This Programme is fully described in Part III.

Table 1 presents the States Parties and properties that participated in the Periodic Reporting of 2000, as well as the evolution of the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List from 2000 to 2003.

Table 1. States Parties, properties and reports					
States Parties	Properties inscribed before 1993	Total Number of Properties in 2000	Total Number of Properties in 2003	Section I Report	Number of Section II reports submitted
Algeria	6 C + 1 C/N	6 C + 1 C/N	6 C + 1 C/N	submitted	6
Bahrain	0	0	0	X	0
Egypt	5 C	5C	6 C	submitted	5
Iraq	1 C	1 C	2 C	submitted	1
Jordan	2 C	2 C	2 C	submitted	2
Kuwait	0	0	0	X	0
Lebanon	4 C	5 C	5 C	submitted	4
Libyan Arab Jamahirya	5 C	5 C	5 C	Not submitted	5
Mauritania	1 N	1 C + 1 N	1 C + 1 N	submitted	1
Morocco	3 C	6 C	7 C	submitted	3
Sultanate of Oman	2 C	3 C + 1 N	3 C + 1 N	submitted	1
Qatar	0	0	0	X	0
Saudi Arabia	0	0	0	X	0
Sudan	0	0	1 CS	X	0
Syrian Arab Republic	4 C	4 C	4 C	submitted	4
Tunisia	6 C + 1N	7 C + 1 N	7 C + 1 N	submitted	5
United Arab Emirates	0	0	0	X	0
Yemen	2 C	3 C	3 C	submitted	2
Total 18 States	40 C 1 C/N 2 N + Jerusalem	49 C 1 M 2 N + Jerusalem	52 C 1 C/N 3 N + Jerusalem	11 Section I Reports submitted	39 Section II Reports submitted

C: Cultural property; **N**: Natural property; **C/N**: Mixed Cultural and Natural property

© UNESCO

© UNESCO / F. Allacchér

Implementation of the World Heritage Convention by the Arab States Parties

Implementation of the World Heritage Convention by the Arab States Parties

The application of the World Heritage Convention is dependent on the knowledge and application of its specific concepts and procedures (preparation of Tentative Lists, Nomination Dossiers, International Assistance Requests…). The States Parties' efforts to increase the number of World Heritage properties in their countries, to provide a legal and institutional framework in which to apply the values of the Convention, to promote training, international cooperation and fund-raising for increased preservation efforts, and to uphold education, information and awareness-building to encourage a better understanding of the World Heritage concept, are key indicators of the efforts made towards the implementation of the Convention.

This chapter refers to the data collected from the Section I reports of the eleven participating States Parties: Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Mauritania, the Sultanate of Oman, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Yemen, during the *Periodic Reporting* exercise of 2000. Details are also given on the efforts and progress to help solve the issues on which the States Parties expressed concern.

1 Identification of the properties

The existence of national inventories, tentative lists and the submission of nomination forms, represent key markers of the implementation of the Convention by any State Party. These three stages in the identification of heritage properties are a compulsory step towards their inscription on the World Heritage List, and the organisation of preservation programs adapted to their needs. The answers received for questions focusing on national inventories, tentative lists and nominations therefore enabled the assessment of the States Parties' efforts to identify and inscribe new properties on the World Heritage List.

1.1. National inventories

National inventories, drafted by each State Party or all relevant national and local authorities, are provisional lists of cultural and/or natural heritage of national significance. The drafting of national inventories forms the basis for the identification of possible World Heritage properties. The following set of questions therefore aimed at assessing whether States Parties had regularly up-dated and reviewed these lists.

1.1. **National inventories**				
National inventories	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Does the State Party hold an Inventory of Cultural sites?	10	0	1	**91%**
Does the State Party hold an Inventory of Natural sites?	1	10	0	**9%**
Is there an Inventory of mixed sites (Natural and Cultural)?	0	0	11	**0%**
Is there an institution responsible for the preparation and update of national inventories?	11	0	0	**100%**

With the exception of Yemen, which stated that it did not yet hold an inventory for cultural properties, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, all States Parties (Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Mauritania, the Sultanate of Oman, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia), had prepared national inventories at the time of the *Periodic Reporting* exercise in 2000. These inventories remained for the most part under preparation, and no date had been set for their completion.

Although these responses received were satisfactory, efforts regarding the identification of natural heritage properties were not considered as adequate. In fact, 91% of States Parties possessed solely an inventory of cultural heritage. Only the Sultanate of Oman was in the process of establishing an inventory for natural heritage.

The answers obtained for the natural heritage and mixed heritage inventories revealed that these concepts

were probably not fully understood – an issue that the occasional confusion between national inventory and listing seemed to confirm. The absence of information on the modalities of the inventories, and of the incidences of the inventory on the nomination process also supported this view. Similar conclusions appeared from the study of the answers regarding Tentative Lists and nominations.

1.2. Tentative lists

Each State Party is due to prepare and submit a Tentative List presenting an inventory of properties suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List. Properties must have been identified, described and delineated in accordance with the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Committee. In the following set of questions, States Parties were invited to provide information on their tentative list.

1.2. Tentative lists				
Tentative lists	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Has the tentative list been submitted?	8	2	1	**73%**

Are:
  • local authorities;
  • the community
associated with the process?
	2
	3
		5
		4
			4
			4
				18%
				27%

Existence of a responsible institution?	7	0	4	**64%**

The results of the *Periodic Reporting* exercise showed that national authorities did not give equal importance to their Tentative List. Only 73% of States Parties in the Arab Region presented Tentative Lists complying with the Operational Guidelines. Preparation of Tentative Lists remained for the most part a closed process, with neither the local authorities nor the population being consulted. The only exception was Morocco, which had begun to work in a consultative manner with the local authorities and population. Twenty-seven per cent of States Parties still needed to revise or submit a new Tentative List.

The World Heritage Centre has worked towards better informing the national bodies and assisting them in the implementation of the Convention by translating the Convention, the Operational Guidelines, the format for the Tentative List, the format for nominations, the documents for *Periodic Reporting* and all the forms for requests for international assistance, into Arabic in 1998. The Periodic Reports showed that the harmonisation of Tentative Lists was still needed at the sub-regional level and in the Arab Region, perhaps through the organisation of regional and sub-regional meetings between the responsible parties. Some were indeed organised, such as in Amman in 2002, and in Cairo in 2003 as will be further discussed in Chapter III.

By September 2003, the number of States Parties holding Tentative Lists had risen from eight to thirteen, and special efforts were noted from several countries to re-establish a balance between the number of cultural, natural and mixed (C/N) properties on their Tentative Lists: particularly Yemen and Egypt. UNESCO gladly noted that the property of the St. Catherine Area (Egypt, South Sinai) was added to the World Heritage List in 2002, and encourages States Parties in the Arab Region to present natural and mixed properties on their Tentative List, and in their applications for nominations. The following table presents the current number and nature of properties inscribed on the tentative lists and the World Heritage List.

Nature of Properties on the Tentative Lists and Status of Inscribed Properties, by State Party, for the Arab Region in 2004.		
States Parties	**Nature of Properties on Tentative Lists**	**Properties inscribed on WH List**
Algeria	5 C + 1 C/N	6 C + 1 M
Bahrain	4 C + 1 N	0
Egypt	23 C + 7 N + 1 C/N	6 C
Iraq	6 C	2 C
Jordan	11 C	2 C
Kuwait	No Tentative List	0
Lebanon	8 C + 1 N	5 C
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	No Tentative List	5 C
Mauritania	3 C	1 C + 1 N
Morocco	10 C + 5 N	7 C
Sultanate of Oman	5 C	3 C + 1 N
Qatar	No Tentative List	0
Saudi Arabia	No Tentative List	0
Sudan	6 C	1 C
Syrian Arab Republic	15 C	4 C
Tunisia	No Tentative List	7 C + 1 N
United Arab Emirates	No Tentative List	0
Yemen	5 C + 3 N + 3 M	3 C
Total **18 States Parties**	**101 C + 17 N + 5 M**	**52 C + 1 M + 3 N** **+** **Jerusalem**

Implementation of the World Heritage Convention by the Arab States Parties

1.3. Proposals for inscription

Once a property has been added to the National Inventory, then included in the Tentative List, States Parties may submit nominations for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List. Each year, the World Heritage Committee assesses these proposals and may choose to accept, refuse, or defer the nomination to the States Parties for revision of the dossier. The following questions focus on the States Parties' proposals for inscription in 2000.

1.3. **Proposals for inscription**				
Proposals for inscription	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Does the State Party hold properties which have been proposed for inscription on the World Heritage List?	8	0	3	**73%**
Has the State Party engaged in an analysis of collaboration and cooperation with local authorities and the population regarding nomination?	4	1	6	**36%**
Has the State Party described the preparation process for nominations?	6	0	5	**55%**
Has the State Party encountered obstacles and difficulties met during the process?	4	2	5	**36%**

As the requirements for the inclusion of new properties on the World Heritage List become stricter, the relative percentage of Arab properties on the List is currently in decline, which hints at a lack of knowledge of the Convention and its procedures. Since 1998, the region has registered an average of only one inscription per year. As noted in the case of National Inventories, Tentative Lists and the proposals for inscription concerned mostly cultural properties, and therefore did not adequately represent the diversity and characteristics of the heritage of the Arab Region. The situation was especially cause for concern in the Gulf Region where very few States had submitted Tentative Lists.

As noted for the Tentative Lists, the *Periodic Reporting* exercise showed that the preparation of nominations rarely included consultation with the local authorities and population, which was only reported in 36% of cases. Only little detail was given regarding the obstacles, difficulties encountered, advantages perceived and lessons learnt from the nomination process, which not only supported the observation that the consultation process was not well developed, but also suggested that the authorities in charge of nominations lacked understanding of the need to cooperate with local authorities. In fact, this set of questions revealed that the principal actors engaging in the drafting of the nomination applications were the national decision-makers who choose the properties to be inscribed depending on their historical, prestige, or tourist criteria, with only little involvement of local authorities.

Aware of these shortcomings, some countries have requested overall assistance for the establishment of the nomination file including the preparation of relevant documentation. It has indeed been observed that the quality of the nomination dossiers was not very satisfactory due to the lack of essential information (maps, documentation, management plans, etc.). The inscription criteria seemed not to have been clearly understood, or were not always mentioned.

Two studies carried out in 1999 and 2002 concerning International Assistance indicated that, since 1993, the number of requests received on behalf of the States Parties of the Arab Region had increased by more than 70 percent. However, this increase was inferior to that registered for other regions. The requests for International Assistance were often incomplete and required substantial revision before they could be submitted for approval to the World Heritage Committee.

In conclusion, the answers received from the States Parties regarding National Inventories, Tentative Lists and nominations, revealed that some countries still lacked knowledge of the World Heritage Convention and of the concepts which are at the root of its implementation, such as the nomination process. Chapter III will discuss how the Regional Programme for the Arab Region was designed to develop solutions to these shortcomings.

2 Legal and institutional framework

The inscription of properties on the World Heritage List requires the need to develop adequate legislation and institutional frameworks to ensure their safeguarding and conservation according to World Heritage standards, as stated in the World Heritage Convention. These legislations, encompassing both local and national measures, must include provisions for the identification, protection, conservation, renovation, presentation, and rehabilitation

of Heritage, through the adoption of an adequate general policy, the promotion of scientific and technical studies and the support of regional and international cooperation. States Parties were therefore invited to provide an assessment of the efficiency of their legal and institutional framework related to the management of their properties.

2.1. Adoption of a general policy and integration of heritage into sustainable development

Articles 4 and 5 of the World Heritage Convention recall the States Parties' 'duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage…situated on its territory,' and insist that 'each State Party to this Convention shall endeavour, in so far as possible, and as appropriate for each country: to adopt a general policy which aims to give cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes.' The following set of questions were aimed at assessing States Parties' application of the above articles.

2.1. Adoption of a general policy and integration of heritage into sustainable development				
Adoption of a general policy and integration of heritage into sustainable development	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Were efforts made to integrate Heritage in a national management and development policy at:				
• a national level?	6	2	3	**55%**
• a provincial level?	5	0	6	**45%**
• a local level?	5	0	6	**45%**
Are policies and plans aiming at assigning a function to cultural and natural heritage in the life of the community:				
• Existing;	4	3	4	**36%**
• Operational;	1	0	10	**9%**
• Being established;	3	0	8	**27%**
• Envisaged?	3	0	8	**27%**
Are these plans integrated in a general planning and/or national conservation strategy?	7	2	2	**64%**
Was progress noted since their adoption?	4	0	7	**36%**
Has the State Party identified fields where improvement would be desirable?	7	0	4	**64%**

The non-responses and negative answers (from 45% to 55%) concerning the efforts made to integrate heritage in a national management and development policy, demonstrated that this process was still in the making in the Arab Region. Its concept was perhaps not fully

*The **Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) often hosts restoration works and excavations, performed in cooperation with foreign scientific missions.*

© UNESCO/Claude Michel

understood or taken into account by the States Parties. However, some States Parties made a true effort towards integrating heritage into a national management and development policy framework. Jordan, for instance, imposed a 5% tax on all building studies to the benefit of heritage. Tunisia adopted very modern legislation, the "Code for Heritage Protection" of 1994, even if difficulties remained for its strict application, in spite of all the benefits of this Code for the safeguarding and integration of heritage.

Despite considerable initiatives and numerous, very positive adaptations, only a minority of States Parties (45%) had taken steps towards giving cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community. In Mauritania, for instance, the Counsel of Ministers had recently defined a cultural policy integrating a strategy for the preservation of heritage. The development of such policies indicated that some States Parties had taken heritage into consideration not only for its cultural, natural,

and environmental aspects, but also for its economic and social values, and its contribution to development. In other States Parties (27%), such as Egypt, the creation of such a policy was still in the process of being elaborated, but such efforts were not systematic amongst Arab States Parties.

Although 64% of States Parties declared that plans to give cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community had been integrated in a general planning or conservation strategy at a national level, links between such programs and a national strategy remained unclear. Only the Sultanate of Oman mentioned both a development plan and a national strategy for conservation. In some cases, such as Jordan, the integration of heritage was restricted to the field of tourism development.

Attempts and projects aiming at developing such a policy were achieved in several fields, and progress was noted in some areas. In the case of Morocco, better means for protection and specialised institutions were created (The Institute of Cultural Heritage, and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage, established respectively in 1985 and 1988). Similarly, Tunisia valued the role of heritage in development, and was establishing, through World Bank funding, a global strategy study, for the integration of heritage into planning and economic and social develop-

ment. Mauritania had also integrated heritage into sustainable development programmes.

However, 64% of the States Parties mentioned the need for financial, logistical and technical resources (Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen); a better restoration of national heritage (Jordan, the Sultanate of Oman); and a wish for new archaeological discoveries (Iraq).

The answers received for this set of questions revealed that the integration of heritage into a management and development policy at the national level was still being elaborated, and a true effort was noted on behalf of most countries. However, heritage had not yet been integrated into the functional life of the community or linked to a national strategy.

2.2. Status of services for protection, conservation and presentation

Each State Party is responsible for designing specific services within its territory focusing on the protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage. The following set of questions aimed at providing information on the setting up, modification or improvement of these services, including assessing the level of staff and the means available to discharge their functions.

2.2. **Services for protection, conservation and presentation**				
Services for protection, conservation and presentation	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Do the services responsible for conservation depend on: • a ministry; • an interministerial committee; • a multisectoral committee?	8 1 3	1 1 0	2 9 9	**73%** **9%** **27%**
Are these services responsible for the: • protection/conservation ; • presentation ; • exploitation ; of the property?	9 8 5	0 0 0	2 3 6	**82%** **73%** **45%**
Has the State Party identified fields where improvements would be desirable?	11	0	0	**100%**

The Periodic Reports revealed that institutional framework in the Arab Region was very centralised and lacked "horizontal" coordination between the governmental institutions and the services in charge of the conservation of the properties, especially at the local level. Despite their demonstrated goodwill to perform their task, often under difficult circumstances, the Heritage Services in the Arab Region were largely under-equipped to meet the needs for the preservation of heritage. These services appeared to suffer from a lack of integration of their activities into a wider development arena, as noted in the previous paragraphs.

According to the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, efforts were made by States Parties to promote protection, conservation and presentation of properties. Mauritania, for instance, possessed a National Heritage Council in charge of the co-ordination of programmes and strategies implemented by the executive structures, such as the National Foundation for the Safeguarding of Ancient Cities. In some States Parties, the central authorities had sometimes given management responsibility to other governmental agencies, with a view of integrating heritage resources into the framework of economic

and social development, thus separating the responsibilities for conservation from those for presentation between two distinct authorities, with loss of coherence and efficiency. For instance, the Ministries for Culture (Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Lebanon...), of Tourism and Antiquities (Jordan), for Culture and Tourism (Yemen) ensured the responsibility for the services in charge of Cultural Heritage. In certain cases, these responsibilities were decentralised to local governments. Occasionally, the highest authorities of the State took the initiative of creating inter-ministerial committees to harmonise the actions concerning specific properties, as noted in 27% of cases, but they did not always function efficiently.

While institutional bodies for the preservation of cultural heritage have existed for several decades in the Arab Region, natural heritage did not always benefit from institutionalised structures in several States Parties. When they exist, the Ministries for Environment often manage natural heritage. In the Sultanate of Oman, for example, it is the Ministry of Regional Municipalities and Environment which is responsible for the natural heritage.

The reports indicated that institutional structures in the Arab Region mainly concentrated on implementing their original mandate, often limited to archaeological excavations, the sale of tickets, museum administration, etc. Established for the most part during the first half of the 20th century, at a time when heritage was less threatened, the Antiquities Departments were conceived as archaeological institutes and, a best, as guardians of the properties, sometimes carrying out restoration activities. Consequently, these institutions were not equipped or

did not have the mandate to meet the new challenges that the cultural and natural heritage must face today: in particular, urban development, tourism, education, and economic activities, but also looting. It should also be noted that the budget of conservation services' was much lower than those of the other States agencies. The lack of equipment and especially financial resources were frequently emphasised. Mauritania, Morocco and Yemen furthermore regretted the lack of co-ordination between the different actors responsible for heritage protection.

The answers regarding the state of protection, conservation and presentation services, confirmed the results of the previous section indicating that there were no clear policies and procedures for integrating the heritage in the process of sustainable development. Moreover, the reports indicated that further efforts were required to develop national preservation strategies, not only to enable better conservation programs and coordination, but also to allow easier access to the material means (staff, training, equipment, financial resources) which, for the moment, are not readily available to the heritage protection services.

2.3. Scientific and technical studies and research

State Parties are required to develop significant scientific and technical studies or research projects on their World Heritage properties. These are needed to increase scientific knowledge regarding the properties, and consequently to allow the drafting of adequate protection and presentation programmes. In the following set of questions, States Parties were invited to provide information on past or ongoing research projects.

2.3. Scientific and technical studies and research				
Scientific and technical studies and research	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Have scientific and technical studies, or research projects been undertaken on World Heritage properties?	10	0	1	**91%**
Are results of this research available to directors of properties or to the local population?	9	0	2	**82%**
Are there fields where improvement would be desirable and upon which the State Party is concentrating its efforts?	8	0	3	**73%**

Apart from one non-response to the first question (Algeria), all States Parties declared that scientific and technical studies had been undertaken on World Heritage properties in their countries (91%). In a majority of cases, these studies were carried out by foreign missions. However, the studies and research cited remained, for the most part, of an archaeological or historical

nature. Studies devoted to the fields of conservation, restoration and presentation were rarely undertaken. Similarly, little attention was paid to natural resources or the eco-biological aspects of the properties. This echoed the remarks made concerning National Inventories, Tentative Lists and nominations, that States Parties may not be sufficiently attentive to the need to represent the

true diversity, wealth and characteristics of the cultural and natural heritage of the region.

Studies were, for the most part, undertaken by private individuals or local authorities -usually local researchers in cooperation with national or foreign universities and research centres- rather than through government or national initiative. Therefore, the studies mentioned by the States Parties, were usually articles, theses, monographs or seminar reports. Special efforts were noted from Tunisia, which had undertaken a global strategy study on « Heritage and Development » with assistance from the World Bank.

However, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Mauritania reported problems on the availability of documentation and the management of foreign missions. The foreign missions had unfortunately rarely delivered their mission reports, studies, publications, reports or other documents undertaken bilaterally, to the competent national authorities (even in a photocopied form). In some cases, as Yemen mentioned, the lack of communication and coordination between national and local authorities would not allow studies to be automatically transmitted to the services responsible for Heritage, even if foreign missions made them available to the States Parties. In other States Parties, results were made available and published, such as in Lebanon, or disseminated through seminars, congresses and the media (Morocco, Sultanate of Oman).

In terms of scientific and technical documentation, there was little mention of the existence of specialised research units within official heritage departments. Exceptions include Egypt, which holds a Documentation Centre for Cultural and Natural Heritage (CULTNAT), which is however not part of the Ministry of Culture, and Tunisia, where the Association for the Safeguarding of the Medina of Tunis has a Documentation Centre specialising in the historic city.

When questioned on their desire for improvement concerning studies and research, a majority of States Parties mentioned the need to carry out more in-depth studies on property management, preservation and safeguarding strategies, presentation, and the elaboration of action plans. Some Periodic Reports stressed that this research should be given priority, and should be based on regional cooperation. Morocco, for instance, proposed to finance a study of World Heritage properties aiming at updating the declarations of value (including criteria), involving all levels of heritage services, proposing participative management, and integrating the heritage potential of properties within development policies.

The answers received for these questions demonstrated that almost all countries had undertaken research projects and scientific studies on heritage. However, research on natural aspects was still inadequate. Furthermore, regional cooperation needed to be developed, as well as national initiatives, since most studies are still carried out by foreign missions. Encouraging changes and efforts were noted.

2.4. Identification, conservation, presentation and promotion measures

Legal and administrative measures, undertaken by the State party or relevant authorities, provide for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of cultural and natural heritage as required by the Convention. Other international conventions for the protection of cultural and natural heritage may also have been signed by the State Party and integrated to national policies and planning. The following questions aimed at obtaining a clearer view of legislative and policy measures regarding the preservation and presentation of World Heritage.

2.4. Identification, conservation, presentation and promotion measures				
Identification, conservation, presentation and promotion measures	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Are there specific legislation measures for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation, and promotion of heritage?	8	1	2	**73%**
Are restoration and conservation a priority consideration in terms of: • actions undertaken to identify properties; • actions undertaken to encourage participation; • actions undertaken to involve the private sector?	4 6 7	1 1 1	6 4 3	**36%** **55%** **64%**
Is a reform of the general policy and/or legal policy necessary?	6	5	0	**55%**
Is the State Party signatory to other international conventions signed?	8	0	3	**73%**
Are appropriate scientific and technical measures undertaken for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and promotion of cultural and natural heritage?	8	1	2	**73%**
Is the media used?	8	0	3	**73%**
Are there areas where improvement would be desirable?	10	0	1	**91%**

The cultural heritage of the Arab Region is protected by specific national laws. In 73% of cases, States Parties had developed specific legislation measures for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation, and promotion of heritage. Yemen was the only country for which no such measures have been developed.

However, some of the existing laws mentioned in the Periodic Reports were relatively old and, although they were never judged inoperative, they probably required updating, such as the 1933 legislation in Lebanon. Others had already been updated such as those of the Syrian Arab Republic, which declared that the Antiquities law was being revised. Similarly, Mauritania promised a strengthening of its institutional framework. In Algeria and Tunisia, these laws had been entirely revised. In fact, all the States Parties had understood the necessity of adapting their legislation measures to modern needs, and were preparing, envisaging or completing the reorganisation or improvement of their laws.

In a majority of cases (64%) efforts were being made to involve the private sector for restoration and conservation in the role of provider of services, free or remunerated. With regard to participation of the local community, the measures most often cited were the use of local labour.

Opinions diverged on the issue of the need to reform the general policy and legislation frameworks relating to the conservation of cultural heritage, with 55% of States Parties favouring reform. Indeed, the legal instruments, designed for the protection of the properties or individual monuments, did not suffice to ensure the control of urban transformations for the safeguard of the heritage values. Where it existed, the application of legislation protecting urban heritage was confronted with issues of contradictory duplications between traditional, religious and civil rights.

The desired changes, as expressed by the States Parties, focused more on the operational management structures than the legal ones, especially in Yemen and Mauritania, which encouraged the implementation of an action plan to respond to fundamental problems. One of the negative responses to this question came from Tunisia as this country was already undergoing a reform on its Heritage Code and operational, institutional, training, funding measures. Rather than an opposition to the concept of reform, Tunisia was therefore signalling that it was already in the process of implementing such changes. Consequently, 64% of States Parties –rather than 55% as stated above– judged reforms necessary.

Eight States Parties had adopted other international conventions to reinforce their legislations, with an average of 5 conventions per country. Still, almost all the authors of the Periodic Reports, with the exception of Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic, judged that the safeguarding of heritage was not considered a priority by the public bodies despite the devotion and professionalism demonstrated by the services directly responsible for the properties. Although this is not without consequence on conservation, it did not signal negligence, abandon or lack of interest. The responses received proved that national authorities should undertake further efforts to grant preservation and conservation a higher place on their list of priorities and to increase awareness of the heritage concept amongst the population. Eight countries stated that they use the media for such means.

The scientific and technical measures for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and promotion of cultural and natural heritage are numerous and diverse, but were often judged insufficient. However, progress was reported in all fields of conservation, even if improvement was widely desired, especially on the use of new technologies (GIS, computerisation, Internet) scientific publications, visitor control of properties, information, education and increasing public awareness through wide use of the media.

*Conservation, presentation and promotion measures must be adapted to the characteristics and values of individual properties as much for cultural landscapes such as **Ouadi Qadisha and the Forest of the Cedars of God** (Lebanon), and for archaeological sites such as **Hatra** (Iraq).*

3.1. Training				
Training	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Are mechanisms developed or envisaged to increase cooperation between the various institutions responsible for the conservation and protection of World Heritage?	6	2	3	**55%**
Have the training needs for institutions or individual concerned been identified?	6	1	4	**55%**
Do training opportunities exist?	7	1	3	**64%**
Are there WH training modules and programmes?	1	5	5	**9%**
Is natural and cultural heritage training available for staff?	4	3	4	**36%**
Are measures taken to encourage scientific research in support of training and education activities?	6	2	3	**55%**
Are there fields where improvements would be desirable and for which the State Party is concentrating its efforts?	8	0	3	**73%**

3 Training

States Parties are required to develop and implement training and educational strategies for professional capacity-building. These are to include the creation of national or regional centres for training and education in the protection, conservation, and presentation of cultural and natural heritage that must be integrated within the existing university and educational systems.

Training is one of the vital elements enabling successful World Heritage protection and is necessary in all fields of preservation, conservation and presentation. The training problem was given consideration by the eleven countries, which participated in the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, indicating the high level of concern that this problem generates with the heritage conservation authorities in the Arab World. The authors of the reports repeatedly complained, in 82% of cases, on the lack of human resources. States Parties' global remarks on the areas in which improvement was desirable, largely converged on the training and recruitment of competent professionals in all fields.

Without being negative, the evaluation of training in the fields of heritage protection, conservation, restoration, management, presentation and promotion, indicated the existence of certain shortcomings. Rather than the quality and availability of training courses, it was the failure to pinpoint specific needs and to identify relevant training opportunities, which was called into question. Thus, a rigorous study, both quantitative and qualitative, of needs and priorities as well as the identification of existing training opportunities would be essential. As stated earlier, this indicated that efforts were required to encourage coordination and 'horizontal' communication between the national authorities responsible for the heritage and the local authorities, to allow the sharing of information.

However, positive aspects were identified such as the high number of training opportunities available in the Arab Region. Several countries reported the existence of training opportunities at universities, on-the-job training and short or long-term training abroad, including courses and lectures. Regional training courses had also been developed. These courses included the Tunis Course designed for Heritage Architects, or archaeological and traditional arts conservation courses in Rabat and Algiers. In Amman, the 'Technical School for Training' offered training courses on mosaics, while other courses, reserved for Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic, focused on the management of properties. Although rather limited in capacity and funding, these regional courses, often supported by UNESCO, the European Union, ICCROM and countries such as France or Italy, are examples to follow and strengthen. UNESCO also encourages the Baghdad Centre for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage, created in 1970 for the Arab Region by ALECSO and ICCROM, to resume its activities.

The Mauritanian report requested the creation of multi-disciplinary training centres in each country, offering training opportunities in all the fields of science and technology relevant to the preservation of cultural and natural heritage. However, it would seem preferable to develop the existing structures (courses, workshops…) already specialising in one or several of the different fields of preservation, and to encourage regional cooperation and exchanges. Another solution may be the 'recycling' of professionals, completing their existing skills and knowledge with additional training in fields adapted to the specific needs of their countries. Similarly, measures undertaken for research in the Arab Region remained limited and the States Parties placed more emphasis on bilateral or international activities than on those carried out at the national level.

The States Parties identified the need for improved training opportunities in all fields of activity linked to cultural heritage, including scientific research (Iraq, Egypt), specialist training (Sultanate of Oman), and documentation and promotion (Mauritania). In a majority of cases, except perhaps for the Sultanate of Oman, the main problem was the lack of funding hampering the development of training courses, and the reports strongly underlined their expectations in the way of international cooperation and financial support. However, the provision of funds cannot be a substitute for

the lack of human resources, including qualified professional staff, researchers or scientific personnel. The identification of the needs of each State Party is required to develop solutions and new strategies, and should be given more thought.

4 International cooperation and fund raising

Within the framework of the Convention, States Parties are strongly expected to cooperate with other States Parties for the identification, protection, conservation and preservation of the World Heritage located on their territories. Measures are to be taken to avoid direct or indirect damage to the properties, and national, public and private foundations or associations as well as the State Party itself are encouraged to raise funds and provide assistance for the preservation of World Heritage property. Through the following questions, States Parties were requested to assess the efficiency of cooperation and fund raising initiatives.

4.1. International cooperation and fund raising				
International cooperation and fund raising	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Has the State Party developed cooperation with other States Parties for the identification, protection, conservation and preservation of cultural and natural heritage situated on its territory?	9	1	1	82%
Does the State Party possess documentation which could help other countries to promote and improve the application of the World Heritage Convention?	2	1	8	18%
Are there bilateral or multilateral activities for the protection and conservation of World Heritage?	4	2	5	36%
Are World Heritage properties twinned with others at the national and international level?	2	5	4	18%
Were national and private foundations or associations created to encourage fund-raising and donations for World Heritage protection?	8	1	2	73%
Are there annual grants for the protection and conservation of the World Heritage properties at the State Party level?	7	4	0	64%
Has your government set up a programme for assistance?	2	7	2	18%
Is there a coordinating mechanism between World Heritage administrative authorities and education/training?	2	6	3	18%
Has your government made voluntary contributions other than the mandatory ones to improve the work of the Convention?	0	8	3	0%

© UNESCO/Nenadovic

© UNESCO/Dominique Roger

The **Nubian monuments** (Egypt and Sudan) were saved from the rising waters of the Nile thanks to the International Campaign launched by UNESCO, in the 1960s and 1970s. This rescue campaign was at the root of the concept of a common heritage for all humanity that paved the way for the adoption of the World Heritage Convention in 1972.

According to the data communicated through the Periodic Reports, the Arab States did not appear to have, except in rare cases, a recognised and ongoing framework for cooperation in the field of heritage. They benefited from assistance from diverse sources, but not sufficiently from neighbouring Arab States. The most frequent cooperation programmes involved archaeological missions, mainly in the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan, Lebanon, the Sultanate of Oman and Yemen. However, several countries (Tunisia, Morocco, Mauritania, Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, Sultanate of Oman) indicated a need for greater diversity of cooperation programmes, mainly in the fields of conservation, restoration and presentation of properties, as well as regarding museology.

France, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United States and Canada were the most commonly cited in terms of cooperation with the Arab Region. Since the creation of the MEDA Programme, the European Union has increasingly become an influential actor and partner promoting networking. It encourages North-South exchanges by involving specialised official institutions and civil society of the non-profit sector. Tunisia was also involved in the UNIMED Programme devoted to the project for Computerised Heritage Cartography.

Tunisia and Morocco placed emphasis on the Maghreb courses of Rabat (Morocco), Algiers (Algeria) and Tunisia, for conservation and restoration training. However, assistance and cooperation between Arab States Parties needed to be further developed. The ongoing cooperation efforts between Morocco and the Sultanate of Oman, and Jordan's participation to excavations in Saudi Arabia and aid to Bahrain, are examples to be followed.

Local associations and foundations for Heritage Protection were reported as numerous and varied. They included the National Egyptian Heritage Revival Association (NEHRA), the Petra National Trust in Jordan, the Shibam Welfare Association in Yemen, over twenty Associations for the Safeguarding of the Medina in Tunisia, and several similar foundations in Lebanon and Mauritania. These associations were often funded through government grants and various regional and local community sources. Foundations and private initiatives for the safeguarding and presentation of the monuments and properties remained rare and limited in scope, with only very little support from public bodies. They had not yet been given sufficient importance within the Arab Region for their role in protecting and safeguarding natural and cultural heritage, and strongly deserve to be developed by the States Parties.

A stated obstacle to adequate fund-raising and international cooperation was the lack of communication, both at a national and local level, with regard to the NGOs, the international partners and the potential donors, which could constitute very important political and financial support groups for the safeguarding of World Heritage properties. For example, international cooperation in the field of heritage had existed in almost all the countries of the region for decades, but it remained too focused on scientific research aspects (archaeological excavations, etc.) or occasionally on a restoration intervention, bearing only exceptionally on management and property conservation aspects. Those responsible for conservation did not seem to have either the mandate or sufficient capacities for communication to identify potential donors and increasing fund raising.

Despite some positive experiences recorded in the area of international cooperation and fund raising, some shortcomings were reported regarding communication, organisation, the diversification of resources, and the means available. The reports showed that regional cooperation could be further developed as suggested by the success of some regional initiatives such as the Maghreb courses and similar ongoing projects.

5 Education, information and awareness-raising

States Parties are requested to take appropriate steps to raise awareness of decision-makers, property-owners, and the general public regarding the protection and conservation of cultural and natural heritage. Such programmes should be aimed at all levels of education, from schools to universities, but also target the general public through the development of information programmes. Such means strengthen popular appreciation and respect for the heritage and keep the public broadly informed of the dangers threatening it as well as of activities carried out in pursuance of the Convention. In the following questions, States Parties were invited to provide information on these issue.

5.1. Education, information and awareness-raising				
Education, information and awareness-raising	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Are there awareness-raising measures for decision-makers, property owners and the public at large on heritage protection and conservation?	9	2	0	**82%**
Are there education and public awareness-raising programmes on heritage protection and conservation?	3	3	5	**27%**
Are there education and public awareness programmes on threats to the heritage and the application of the Convention?	6	3	2	**55%**
Does the State Party participate in the Special Project 'Participation of Young People in the Preservation and Promotion of World Heritage'?	5	1	5	**45%**

The Periodic Reports revealed that local communities and authorities were rarely involved in the inscription process or conservation of World Heritage properties. Both lack the necessary understanding of heritage as a development resource. In the case where the immediate needs of the local communities are not being met, these communities might even be considered as a direct threat for the conservation of properties. Yet, if they were consulted and better informed through educational and awareness-raising programmes, the local communities could have a role to play in protecting the heritage. Therefore, the education of the local population and authorities is as important as that of political actors, and efforts are required to facilitate and develop information and to increase awareness of World Heritage values.

Educational, information and public awareness actions on heritage protection and conservation, as described in the Periodic Reports, included the use of the mass media (press, Radio, T.V.), school visits, documentaries, brochures, conferences, targeted at all levels of society and particularly young people. The principal initiators of this effort to promote information were the State and civil society, but the phenomenon had not reached the same level in all the countries and its level of influence and impact on society largely differ. The difference was significant between countries having a long experience in this field (school educational programmes and regular public awareness-raising events) and others requiring greater efforts to implement a real education and awareness-raising policy.

Some of the most positive initiatives, regarding awareness-raising measures for decision-makers, property owners and local authorities on heritage protection and conservation, included the Heritage Month in Tunisia and Algeria, and the events during International Days for Monuments and Properties (18 April) and Museums (18 May) in Morocco, which were celebrated simultaneously with the Heritage Days in Europe. Efforts were also made, on a smaller scale, to develop workshops and seminars in Jordan and Mauritania, or to involve the media for the promotion of World Heritage concepts in the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq, with particular emphasis on schools. Lebanon and the Sultanate of Oman encouraged private initiatives for protection, restoration and conservation. However, such initiatives were scarce, limited in scope, and still insufficient. In most Arab States Parties, public education and information on the issue of the protection of heritage have not yet become a national priority.

Only three countries possessed organised education and information programmes on threats to the heritage for the public at large. The other awareness-raising measures reported by the States Parties were sporadic and followed private initiatives rather than organised government programmes. In Algeria, Iraq and the Sultanate of Oman, they were mainly aimed at the younger generation, through guided school visits to properties and museums. Jordan organised shows, seminars and festivals.

The answers received regarding the existence of information or educational programmes on the application of the Convention, or specific measures for the integration of World Heritage values into educational programmes, also showed that few measures had been developed regarding these issues. According to the answers received, no country possessed any such programme or activities. Only sporadic educational measures were mentioned for adults and young children including the insertion of the notions of conservation and threats to the heritage into school and university teaching manuals. Algeria, Lebanon, Iraq, Tunisia had included (notably, in the history classes) national heritage values into their education programs mainly in history classes. Other countries, such as Yemen and Mauritania announced their intention to follow this lead. The Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan, and Morocco intended to consolidate existing information in their countries.

Specific measures introducing the concepts of the World Heritage Convention to younger generations and to the public at large have not yet been developed in most States Parties. In fact, according to their Periodic Reports, only five countries had joined the Special Project for the Participation of Young People in the Preservation and Promotion of World Heritage. Large-scale educational information programmes for the spreading of Heritage values are needed to allow future generations to take part in the preservation of World Heritage.

© UNESCO/Dominique Roger

The World Heritage Convention, in Article 27, stresses that educational and information programmes form an integral part of the safeguarding and protection of World Heritage. Schoolchildren in the **Medina of Fez** (Morocco) are taught about the Convention and its concepts to strengthen appreciation and respect of the cultural and natural heritage by the population, especially the younger generation.

The **Ksar of Ait Ben Haddou** (Morocco) and **Petra** (Jordan) are developing management systems to address the combined effects of development and neglect.

Implementation of the World Heritage Convention at the Property Level

2

The aim of the Section II Reports was to provide an account on the state of implementation of the World Heritage Convention regarding the different properties within the Arab Region. This opportunity for site managers to share their experience of property management, to discuss their aims, the means available, the problems encountered, and to present requests for improvement, allowed the evaluation of each property's specific needs. The data received, in addition to observations and recommendations expressed by the National authorities of the States Parties in Section I, contributed significantly to the elaboration of adequate regional, national or local programmes for improved preservation, protection and conservation measures as will be discussed in the next chapter.

This chapter aims at assessing the evolution of state of conservation of the properties with respect to the values and criteria provided at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List, including the potential emergence of threats due to social and economic development. Indirectly, this exercise also enables the World Heritage Committee to evaluate the property managers' acquaintance with the criteria and the justifications used for the inscription, including the boundaries of the nominated areas. Thus, the Committee is able to respond adequately to the needs expressed in the reports and to facilitate the preservation of heritage.

The Arab Region numbers 12 States Parties (Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, the Sultanate of Oman, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Yemen), holding properties inscribed on the World Heritage List prior to 1993 and eligible to submit reports for Section II, with a total of 44 properties (41 cultural, 1 mixed, and 2 natural).

Amongst the *44* properties, one (Jerusalem) was not solicited to prepare a report on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention at the property level (Section II). Of the *12* States Parties participating in the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, *3* did not submit reports on all the properties concerned, representing a total of 4 missing reports for Section II: Algeria (1 property: Tassili N'Ajjer), the Sultanate of Oman (1 property: Archaeological properties of Bat, Al Khutm and Al Ayn)[3], Tunisia (2 properties: Medina of Sousse and Ichkeul National Park), including one (Ichkeul National Park in Tunisia) of the two natural properties in the Arab Region. The reports of the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania), the

Kasbah of Algiers and the M'Zab Valley (Algeria), were received too late to be included in the initial analytical report which was presented to the World Heritage Committee during its session in Cairns. However, they have been taken into account in this publication.

This chapter is therefore based on an analysis of the thirty-nine reports received for Section II:

1. Algeria: 6 properties (Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, the Kasbah of Algiers, the M'Zab Valley, Timgad, Tipasa and Djemila)
2. Egypt: 5 properties (Islamic Cairo, Memphis and its Necropolis –the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahsur, Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis, the Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae, and Abu Mena)
3. Iraq: 1 property (Hatra)
4. Jordan: 2 properties (Petra and Quseir Amra)
5. Lebanon: 4 properties (Byblos, Tyre, Anjar and Baalbek)
6. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: 5 properties (the Archaeological Site of Sabratha, the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna, the Old Town of Ghadames, the Archaeological Site of Cyrene and the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus)
7. Mauritania: 1 property (the Banc d'Arguin National Park)
8. Morocco: 3 properties (the Medina of Fez, the Medina of Marrakesh, the Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou)
9. Sultanate of Oman: 1 property (Bahla Fort)
10. Syrian Arab Republic: 4 properties (the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Aleppo, the Ancient City of Bosra and the Site of Palmyra)
11. Tunisia: 5 properties (the Medina of Tunis, the Site of Carthage, the Amphitheater of El Jem, the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis, and Kairouan)
12. Yemen: 2 properties (the Old City of Sana'a and the Old Walled City of Shibam).

This chapter therefore tackles themes similar to those developed in the previous chapter but with special emphasis on the characteristics and needs of each property. In the Section II reports, the persons in charge of heritage conservation at the site level were invited to comment on the same issues as the national authorities in Section I, and to provide their point of view on preservation and conservation.

3. The archaeological properties of Bat, Al-Khutm and Al-Ayn were included as one inscription onto the World Heritage List.

1 Identification of natural and cultural heritage properties

According to Article 11 of the World Heritage Convention, a natural or cultural property must "have outstanding universal value" in order to find its place on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee indicates its World Heritage values by deciding on the criteria for inscription. Each property must fulfil at least one of the selected criteria regarding the cultural and/or natural value of the property. In this chapter, site managers were requested to recall the criteria for which the properties were listed on the World Heritage List and to assess whether these criteria had been maintained over time.

1.1. Information provided at the time of inscription

The following table, and the questions it relates to in the Periodic Reports, recall the criteria, evaluations and recommendations made at the time of inscription for each site. The aim of this section was to summarise the data and important facts concerning the World Heritage properties in order to facilitate comparison with the present state of the property.

1.1. Information at the time of inscription				
Information at the time of inscription	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Is the author (site manager) familiar with: • the justifications given for the inscription of the property at the time of the inscription? • the criteria retained by Committee at the time of the inscription? • the observations made by the advisory body for evaluation at the time of inscription? • WH Committee observations at the time of the inscription?	37 38 20 23	0 0 13 0	2 1 6 16	**95%** **97%** **51%** **59%**

This exercise of recalling the criteria for which the properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List, proved particularly useful as it was discovered that none of the persons in charge of the properties had direct access to the inscription files. UNESCO had to provide the authors of the Periodic Reports with relevant information on their sites, and copies of the inscription files. A large part of the report writers failed to reply to the last two questions, indicating their difficulty in analysing the files, which they were not familiar with.

The exercise revealed that the centralisation of data at the national level in institutions, organisms or administrations responsible for the preservation of properties, induces a lack of communication between the national authorities responsible for the heritage and the local site managers, which only hampers efforts to coordinate preservation and conservation efforts both at the State and regional levels.

1.2. Updating of the Statement of Value

According to the Operational Guidelines, a revision and re-submission of the statement of value may be envisaged following the substantive revision of the criteria by the World Heritage Committee or when improvements were made regarding the identification or knowledge of specific outstanding universal values of the property. The delimitation of the World Heritage property and of its buffer zone may be modified by revising or extending relevant boundaries to ensure the protection and conservation of the World Heritage property, and must be approved by the World Heritage Committee. The following set of questions aimed at assessing whether the statements of significance still reflected the World Heritage values of the properties or needed to be revised.

1.2. Updating of the Statement of Value				
Updating of the Statement of Value	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Does the statement of value reflect the WH values of the property?	38	1	0	**97%**
Is a new submission of the nomination dossier required?	4	34	1	**10%**
• Are the boundaries of the buffer zone appropriate? • Is the boundary of the property appropriate?	32 31	6 7	1 1	**82%** **79%**
Should a revision or an extension of the property be envisaged?	3	32	4	**8%**
Is a new statement of value necessary?	12	1	10	**31**%

The Periodic Reports demonstrated that many of the nomination files drafted prior to 1993 did not contain clear statements of significance. Although the statement of significance is an essential element required for the adoption of the selective criteria and the inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, in a majority of cases this concept did not appear to have been fully understood. Repeated confusion between the statement of value and the general historical considerations of the properties confirmed that the authors were unfamiliar with the two concepts.

Despite these shortcomings, the answers received provided clear indication of the factors affecting the maintaining of values at the property level. While twelve report writers judged that the submission of a new statement of value was necessary, only four thought that the submission of a new nomination dossier was required. The latter included the Libyan properties of the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna, the Old Town of Ghadames and the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus -although no explanation was offered to justify their claim- and the World Heritage property of Petra in Jordan.

The properties for which a new submission of the statement of significance was needed included the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco), Hatra (Iraq), the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus, the Old Town of Ghadames, the Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Timgad, Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, Tipasa (Algeria), and the Site of Carthage (Tunisia). The Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus, for instance, stressed that new discoveries had been made and the Old Town of Ghadames pointed at the disappearance of buildings.

Although six to seven report writers considered the boundaries of the property and/or the buffer zone inappropriate, further contradictions were noted on the issue of property boundaries. The majority of reports stated that a revision of the boundaries was not needed. However, Islamic Cairo (Egypt), the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia), Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad (Algeria) and the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) considered their buffer zone to be inadequate, while the Archaeological Site of Cyrene, the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna, the Old Town of Ghadames (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco) and Timgad (Algeria) stated that the boundary of their properties were inappropriate.

The answers showed that the territorial boundaries and buffer zones of the sites were often disputed and not well defined, preventing the control of the deterioration factors of the properties (urban expansion, road systems, agriculture and urbanisation). Since the nomination dossiers submitted prior to 1997 rarely contained up-to-date topographical maps, presenting geographic coordinates, photos, or recent bibliographies provided by the Conservation Services and responsible authorities, the authors of the Periodic Reports were requested

to produce these documents to up-date the information on the properties available to the World Heritage Committee. However, only very few reports provided appropriate maps and measurements defining the boundaries and buffer zones. This lack of information may be very detrimental to the conservation of heritage properties as it prevents the establishment of a coherent system of legal protection, monitoring and maintenance.

The following table presents the results of an inventory, undertaken in February 2004 by the World Heritage Centre, of the status of the maps submitted with the original nomination dossiers of the thirty-nine sites that participated in the *Periodic Reporting* exercise. This study revealed that only two sites had submitted maps responding to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee regarding the nomination dossiers, i.e. showing the perimeter of the nominated World Heritage areas with clear topographical data. Twenty-eight per cent of nomination dossiers included maps that were either unclear, imprecise, unreferenced or which did not respect the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. In 67% of cases the nomination dossiers did not include maps showing the perimeter of the site.

4. This is the only site for which a buffer zone is indicated.
5. The map shows the topography of the site, but it is in Arabic.
6. The map does not show the topography of the site. It is however very precise.

Maps available in the nomination dossiers for the 39 sites inscribed prior to and including 1993, and which participated in the Periodic Reporting exercise of 2000 (12 States Parties)

State Party	World Heritage Property	Date of inscription on the World Heritage List	The nomination dossier for this property includes a map showing clear delimitations of the perimeter of the site (with clear topography).	The nomination dossier for this property includes a map showing only unclear delimitations of the property, and with no legend and/or topographical data.	The nomination dossier for this property includes a map but the perimeter of the site or its buffer zone are not shown.
Algeria	Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad	5 / 09 / 1980			X
	Djemila	17 / 12 / 1982			X
	Kasbah of Algiers	14 / 12 / 1992		X	
	M'Zab Valley	17 / 12 / 1982			X
	Timgad	17 / 12 / 1982		X	
	Tipasa	17 / 12 / 1982			X
Egypt	Islamic Cairo	26 / 10 / 1979		X	
	Memphis and its Necropolis –the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahsur	26 / 10 / 1979			X
	Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis	26 / 10 / 1979			X
	Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae	26 / 10 / 1979			X
	Abu Mena	26 / 10 / 1979			X
Iraq	Hatra	6 / 12 / 1985			X
Jordan	Petra	6 / 12 / 1985			X
	Quseir Amra	6 / 12 / 1985			X
Lebanon	Anjar	2 / 11 / 1984			X
	Baalbek	2 / 11 / 1984			X
	Byblos	2 / 11 / 1984			X
	Tyre	2 / 12 / 1983			X
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Archaeological Site of Cyrene	17 / 12 / 1982		X	
	Old Town of Ghadames	28 / 11 / 1986			X
	Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna	17 / 12 / 1982		X	
	Archaeological Site of Sabratha	17 / 12 / 1982			X
	Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus	6 / 12 / 1985			X
Mauritania	Banc d'Arguin National Park	15 / 12 / 1989		X	
Morocco	Medina of Fez	30 / 10 / 1981		X	
	Ksar of Ait Ben Haddou	11 / 12 / 1987			X
	Medina of Marrakesh	6 / 12 / 1985		X	
Sult. of Oman	Bahla Fort	11 / 12 / 1987		X[4]	
Syrian Arab Republic	Ancient City of Aleppo	28 / 11 / 1986			X
	Ancient City of Bosra	5 / 09 /1980		X	
	Ancient City of Damascus	26 / 10 / 1979			X
	Site of Palmyra	5 / 09 / 1980	X[5]		
Tunisia	Site of Carthage	26 / 10 / 1979	X[6]		
	Amphitheater of El Jem	26 / 10 / 1979			X
	Kairouan	9 / 12 / 1988		X	
	Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis	6 / 12 / 1985- 28 / 11 / 1986			X
	Medina of Tunis	26 / 10 / 1979			X
Yemen	Old City of Sana'a	28 / 11 / 1986			X
	Old Walled City of Shibam	17 / 12 / 1982			X
Total	**39**		**2 (5%)**	**11 (28%)**	**26 (7%)**

1.3. Statement of authenticity / integrity

Properties must satisfy the test of authenticity and conditions of integrity in order to be accepted for inscription on the World Heritage List. These conditions are applied to ensure that the significant attributes through which the outstanding universal value of a property is expressed are not compromised and are represented in their entirety by the property. Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes. The *Periodic Reporting* exercise aimed at assessing whether the authenticity and integrity of the property at the time of inscription had been retained over time.

1.3. **Statement of authenticity / integrity**				
Statement of authenticity / integrity	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Have there been modifications in the authenticity /integrity of the site since its inscription on the World Heritage List?	6	29	4	**15%**
Is it likely that changes of authenticity / integrity of the property will take place in the near future?	8	29	2	**21%**
Have the values under which the site was inscribed, been maintained?	34	0	5	**87%**

The answers received showed that not all States Parties had fully understood the notions of authenticity - integrity. Confusion was often made with the state of conservation. Thus, reports tended to evoke the present state of the property rather than its state at the time of inscription, which the majority of writers were unfamiliar with, as previously noted. Despite this shortcoming, most authors agreed that the state of conservation of the properties might be cause for concern, especially regarding the existing or upcoming changes in the authenticity/ integrity of the properties.

Two types of changes were reported entailing different effects on the upkeep and preservation of the World Heritage properties. Positive changes encompassing legal measures, restoration work, and presentation in favour of maintaining authenticity/integrity, were cited, for example, in Kairouan, the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia), Bahla Fort (Oman), the Archaeological Site of Sabratha (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and Djemila (Algeria). Negative changes due to man and/or nature were reported in several properties, including: the Ancient City of Aleppo, the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic), the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco), the Archaeological Site of Cyrene, the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus, the Old Town of Ghadames (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad and Timgad (Algeria), the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia), the Old City of Sana'a and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen). The threats that induce these changes will be assessed in a subsequent section of this chapter. Despite these threats, there was no mention of irreversible loss of value likely to trigger a process of delisting of some of these properties, even the most threatened.

However, some changes affecting properties were cause for concern. For instance, the property manager of the Algerian property of Tipasa requested that the property be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger with the launching of an adequate safeguarding campaign due to illicit construction and to the deterioration of the site. Tipasa was indeed added to the List of World Heritage in Danger on June 28, 2002.

Occasionally, a combination of positive and negative factors were reported on the same property, creating both favourable conditions for the maintenance of values and negative conditions which have the potential to develop into real threats to the property. This situation of imbalance or instability could be observed in the majority of sites.

Despite the existence of these threats, 87% of the authors of the reports judged that the values under which the sites were inscribed on the World Heritage List had been maintained although some modifications to the authenticity/integrity of the properties had occurred. Although most of the changes described remained minor, this only underlined the need to analyse their cause in order to evaluate and counter any potential negative consequences to the preservation of the property and to prevent the development of these threats.

2 Management of the properties inscribed

The preservation of the values described in the statement of significance at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List is conditional upon adequate management of the World Heritage proper-

ties. Management includes the establishment and implementation of effective protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level, the maintaining of contractual or traditional protection, and the development of appropriate conservation and monitoring policies for each of the property concerned. The following set of questions allowed an assessment of the management systems in place at the site level.

2.1. Legal and institutional framework

The adequate preservation of World Heritage requires the existence of adapted legislation and capable responsible institutions within each of the States Parties, designed according to the needs of each of the properties. In the Periodic Reports, property managers were invited to comment on existing legislation and to assess the effectiveness of the management mechanisms.

2.1. Legal and institutional framework				
Legal and institutional framework	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Is the property inscribed within an effective legal or institutional framework, including contractual or traditional protection, specific management mechanisms and/or planning control?	39	0	0	**100%**
Are there any measures foreseen for the preservation of values described in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value?	35	0	4	**90%**

According to the answers received for this set of questions, all properties were inscribed within a legal and/or institutional framework defining both the legal status of the property and the management plan for the preservation of its World Heritage value. However, the answers betrayed some confusion perhaps due to the phrasing of the question in the *Periodic Reporting* questionnaire. The responses faithfully described the legal framework in place but offered no evaluation of the effectiveness of the existing measures. One must recall that the Arab Region was the first to undergo the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, which may account for much of the occasional confusion or lack of clarity of the questions.

The information received provided a survey of the legal statuses of the properties. In most cases, the archaeological sites are the property of the State although they are occasionally privately held. On the contrary, in the case of historic cities, ownership is shared between private, State, regions and communities and, often, religious authorities or Waqf (endowment). The State is responsible both directly and indirectly for the protection, management and planning through specialised organisms or state ministries. Occasionally, the responsibility for heritage may be shared with local authorities and communities, especially for historic urban centres. Thus, in addition to the national law for Antiquities and Museums, the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List can also be protected by safeguarding measures at the local and community level in the framework of development and urban plans.

Progress was reported on some aspects of the legislative framework related to the preservation of World Heritage properties, and general efforts to enhance legislation were noted. In Tunisia, legislation was improved with the

Heritage Code (1994), comprising safeguarding clauses for historic cities, with specific statutes and protective measures. The new Algerian Law of 1998 also constituted an important progress in comparison to earlier legislation. However, some reports noted that conflicts of authority had arisen during decision-making and the elaboration of common strategies. They reported a lack of cooperation between all levels of the relevant authorities hampering preservation efforts.

Thirty-five properties (90%) announced that measures had been undertaken for the preservation of the values for which the properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List. Reports showed that the authors were clearly aware of the need to elaborate management plans, but the persons responsible for the heritage did not always have tangible knowledge of their terms and conditions and the means to elaborate and implement them. The measures stated included legal steps, restoration and presentation programmes, studies for future management plans, and global strategies for safeguarding, economic integration and tourism development. These measures were implemented through tangible and permanent actions including strengthening of guards and control of the access to the property, as well as systematic actions for restoration, rehabilitation and presentation.

The answers received regarding the legal and institutional framework for the preservation of heritage demonstrated that site managers were well aware of the importance of legislation for the correct management of the properties although the means of implementation varied. The plans for management, safeguarding and presentation were, for the most part, described as envisaged or under preparation.

Implementation of the World Heritage Convention at the Property Level

2.2. Management and planning

Management and planning are fundamental elements of the preservation of properties and the values for which they were inscribed on the World Heritage List. Through the following set of questions, the site mana-

gers were invited to recall the changes that have occurred since the inscription, and to provide information on the level at which the management of the site was exercised and on the existence and nature of management plans for each property.

2.2. **Management and planning**				
Management and planning	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**% of positive answers**
Have any notable changes occurred since the inscription in relation to:				
1-Type of ownership	8	12	19	**21%**
2-Legal status	8	9	22	**21%**
3-Protection measures	18	6	15	**46%**
4-Boundaries	8	11	20	**21%**
5-Resources made available	14	3	22	**36%**
Is management organised at:				
6-the site level	19	1	19	**49%**
7-the local level	9	1	29	**23%**
8-the central administration level	14	0	25	**36%**
Is the author of the periodic report aware of any relevant documentation, such as:				
1-Legal texts,	6	1	32	**15%**
2-Management plans and/or work plans (annual) for site administration and management	8		31	**21%**
3-Conservation plan	17	6	16	**44%**
4-Authority plans (national, local, regional)	15	3	21	**38%**
5-Tourism development plan?	9	4	26	**23%**

The most common changes regarding management and planning at the site level concerned protection measures, in 46% of cases, and the resources made available for the protection and conservation of the site (36%). Other changes involved the boundaries, the type of ownership and the legal status of the property, in 21% of cases respectively. In the majority of cases, the replies reflected a decrease in available resources, and a critical lack of funds. Only Morocco, Mauritania and Tunisia reported an improvement in the resources available, and the Banc d'Arguin National Park declared that government funding had almost doubled from 1999 to 2000.

In Algeria, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic, expropriation or legal measures had been undertaken for a better definition of the limits of the properties or the buffer zones. The Ancient City of Bosra and the Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic), for instance, witnessed numerous expropriations. However, several privatisations of properties were also reported, such as in the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen). Improvements regarding the legal status of sites were mentioned by Tunisia (the Site of Carthage), the Syrian Arab Republic (reinforcement of protection measures), and Algeria (creation of the 1998 law). Byblos and Baalbek (Lebanon), the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic), Petra (Jordan) and the Medina of Fez (Morocco), also noted municipal measures to increase control of construction permits.

Some authors provided documentation to complete their answers concerning legal texts or relevant management, conservation, or development plans. Morocco, Lebanon, Yemen and Tunisia provided legal texts while others, such as the Medina of Fez, the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco), Islamic Cairo (Egypt), and Jordanian and Yemeni properties attached documentation on conservation, and tourism development plans.

The documentation provided revealed that several management plans were being envisaged or in the process of

© UNESCO

*Inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1987, **Bahla Fort** (Sultanate of Oman) is being carefully restored. A management plan is also being prepared to control development in the surrounding oasis.*

being designed. These include plans, occasionally specific to a property, for restoration, presentation, the setting up of new local management and monitoring structures. Examples cited included management plans for development and urbanism in Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, Timgad and Djemila (Algeria), with a permanent safeguarding plan for the latter; conservation measures in Memphis and its Necropolis (Egypt), and Byblos (Lebanon); a rehabilitation study in Baalbek and Tyre (Lebanon); a risk-preparedness map in Islamic Cairo (Egypt); a development plan at the Ksar of Ait Ben Haddou, the Medina of Fez (Morocco) and the Site of Carthage (Tunisia), and a tourism development plan in Anjar (Lebanon).

The answers received for this set of questions revealed general concern regarding management and planning at the site level, despite some very positive changes such as the reinforcement of protection measures and legal sta-

tuses for some properties. However, a majority of sites reported a lack of funds for the implementation of management plans and a decrease in available resources as will be further discussed in Chapter III.

2.3. Management plan of the site

A management plan, usually adopted for a period of five to ten years, is a fundamental instrument designed to organise the conservation of properties and to orchestrate development and preservation measures specific to the needs of each property. Managers were requested to assess the effectiveness of the management plan of their properties, with regards to the legal and financial aspects of preservation, consultation with the population, cooperation with relevant organisms and institutions, the development of training and monitoring, and the definition of priorities in relation to the various uses of the property (tourism, etc.).

2.3. Management plan of the site and statement of the objectives				
Management plan of the site and statement of the objectives	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Does a functional management plan exist? • Is it under preparation or being updated?	6 20	19 7	14 12	**15%** **51%**
Does the management plan: • involve consultation with the local population; • take into account existing human resources; • take into account existent funding resources; • include the problem of staff training; • take into account zoning and multiple uses of the property; • take into account defined buffer zone; • include regular monitoring activities of the property?	9 14 19 14 18 22 23	17 15 25 11 7 4	13 10 20 10 10 12	**23%** **36%** **49%** **36%** **46%** **56%** **59%**
Is the local population involved in the implementation of the management plan?	13	10	16	**33%**

This set of questions revealed that a total of 76% of properties had developed a management plan described as either completed or, in the majority of cases, in the process of being prepared or updated. However, management plans were operational in only 15% of cases, including the Archaeological Site of Cyrene, the Archaeological Site of Sabratha, and the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), the M'Zab Valley (Algeria) and the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania). Occasionally, reports mentioned the existence of a management plan for one aspect of the site, and the preparation of one or several other plans related to other aspects. The report for the M'Zab Valley, for example, indicated that a management plan existed for Ksar d'El-Atteuf, and that three more preservation plans were under preparation for the Ksar of Bounoura, the Ksar of Ghardaia and the Ksar of Melika. Management plans were only succinctly described. This lack of precision in the answers reflected some misunderstanding in the definition of the objectives, methods and means of action

of Management Plans, perhaps due to the fact that, in 51% of cases, these plans were still in the process of being prepared, updated, or modified, and were therefore incomplete.

Most reports mentioned that managers had experienced difficulties -sometimes overwhelming- in the drafting of the management plan, regarding the technical, legal, financial, methodological aspects of its preparation. Such difficulties hampered the elaboration of management plans in the Medina of Tunis, Kairouan (Tunisia), the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic), the Old City of Sana'a, the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen). Several States Parties called for bilateral cooperation or assistance through UNESCO, the UNDP and other international organisms.

The answers received showed that the Conservation Services and property managers often lack communication policies and capacities as regards the links with the

different local actors and concerned parties. This is all the more a reason for concern as the governments and other local institutions play a very important role in the management of most of the World Heritage properties by being, in certain cases, directly involved in the conservation activities. Sometimes, the relationships between these local institutions and the Conservation Services were even described as conflictual.

Site managers were also requested to assess the involvement of the population in the implementation of management plans. The consultation of the local population for the elaboration of management plans did not appear as common practise since only 23% of reports declared that populations had been consulted, and the local population was directly involved in the implementation of the management plan in only 33% of cases. The population was therefore only rarely involved in conservation and presentation actions, notably as regards historic cities.

The answers received for these questions revealed that site managers had understood the importance of developing adequate management mechanisms. Management plans had been drafted for a majority of properties and were in the process of being implemented or updated to meet the needs of the sites, despite some shortcomings and occasional obstacles identified by the authors, which still remain to be solved.

2.4. Capacities in financial and human resources at the property level

While the previous set of answers demonstrated general concern amongst the authors of the reports regarding financial resources available for the elaboration and implementation of their management plans, this section allowed a more specific assessment of the capacities in human and financial resources at the property level. Site managers were requested to give specific details on human resources including staff training needs, fields in which training is required, and financial resources, including management-generated income and other funding sources related to site management.

The preservation and restoration of World Heritage properties requires the knowledge and skills of experts from various disciplines.

According to the information received, several sources come into play to finance preservation programmes of World Heritage sites. They include national contributions from the state budget, usually through the ministries of Culture, complemented by the provincial and local authorities, especially for properties situated in heavily populated and/or predominantly urban areas. Some additional income is provided by Associations, Foundations and private individuals, or by foreign missions engaged in historical and archaeological research and excavations. However, these sources are sporadic and irregular. With the exception of Bahla Fort, the authors of the Periodic Reports agreed that financial resources were highly insufficient.

Management income, such as entrance fees, was also mentioned in several reports including Islamic Cairo, the Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae (Egypt), Quseir Amra, Petra (Jordan), the Archaeological Site of Cyrene, and the Archaeological Site of Sabratha (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya). In Algeria, (Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, Timgad, Djemila, Tipasa), management income was said to be transferred to the National Agency for the Protection of Historic Sites and Monuments (ANAPSMH), while, in Tunisia, it went to the National Agency for Heritage and Cultural Development and was invested in projects related to heritage and cultural development.

Although, with the exception of Yemen and Mauritania, no figures were provided to evaluate the real budget levels, a majority of reports stressed the fact that the inscription of these sites on the World Heritage List had not significantly contributed to the mobilisation of substantial budgets for their preservation at the national level. These reports demonstrated that the scarcity of financial sources remained a considerable handicap in the development of a conservation strategy as repeatedly mentioned in Section I and Section II reports.

Answers received for the question on human resources engaged in management activities included several complaints concerning the insufficient level of training for personnel as well as the number of staff available. In a majority of cases the expertise required for the protection and conservation of World Heritage properties was insufficient at the local level. The Directorates of Antiquities, Heritage Institutes and specialised National Agencies cooperate with the national universities, research and professional training institutes and laboratories in the country to respond to the need for ongoing or occasional training. Specialised institutes for heritage sciences and techniques remained rare in the Arab World and usually failed to cover all the fields of preservation or to respond to the needs of property personnel. This explains in part the difficulties encountered in the accomplishment of preservation projects at the site level, including the most basic conservation tasks.

Eighty-five per cent of the reports provided details on the number of professional staff (architects, archaeologists,

© UNESCO/Claude Michel

administrators...) and non-supervisory personnel, for maintenance, control and surveillance. A majority of authors stressed the need to increase the staff and personnel numbers judged insufficient, and reported a need to multiply training schemes to improve professional qualifications. Only the report received from Bahla Fort described its personnel as satisfactory in both numbers and competence.

The answers received conveyed a wish for training and technical assistance in several fields including heritage sciences and techniques for the conservation of monuments, land and underwater excavation techniques, urban and/or property management, maintenance, presentation and exploitation of properties, computer skills and documentation, and legal matters. Most reports indicated the need for training of high-level technicians in restoration of monuments and objects: stone masons,

wooden, earthen, plaster, constructions, mosaics, ceramics, and work managers. Requests for short-term training included seminars, round-table refresher courses for local staff or the training of young recruits, but several reports also called for long-term training programmes. However, only few reports clearly evaluated the number of professionals to be trained at short-, medium- or long term.

2.5. Cooperation on protection/conservation

In this section, property managers were requested to provide information on external sources of assistance or existing programmes regarding funding, training, protection and conservation, technical assistance, and on forms of bilateral cooperation at the local and national levels.

2.5. Additional information concerning protection and conservation				
Additional information concerning protection and conservation	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Has the property benefited from external assistance concerning: 1-Sources of expertise and training techniques; 2-Protection measures and implementation means; 3-Established local programmes; 4-Policies and programmes for safeguarding the site; 5-Funding (origin, amount)?	23 24 19 21 18	6 1 2 4 2	13 14 18 14 19	**59%** **62%** **49%** **54%** **46%**
Has the property benefited from: 1-Technical assistance through United Nations system; 2-Technical assistance provided by bilateral cooperation?	22 20	6 5	11 14	**56%** **51%**

This section of the *Periodic Reporting* exercise revealed that site managers were concerned with the urgent need for the strengthening of bilateral and multilateral cooperation amongst States Parties, including additional multilateral staff training programmes.

Several training programmes have been developed to respond to this need for increased expertise, such as the three long-term training courses in the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia), Algiers (Algeria), and Rabat (Morocco), organised by ICCROM, in collaboration with UNESCO (WHC) and other organisations, foundations or European institutions, designed to train architects and specialised scientific personnel from the Maghreb Region in restoration and conservation techniques. These courses are exemplary and could be multiplied and developed in order to offer specialised training courses adapted to the various fields of preservation. Several authors mentioned international funding and assistance provided by the World Bank, UN agencies such as UNESCO and UNDP, Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (FADES), Arab Cities Organisation.

Occasionally, the local authorities responsible for the heritage may request technical and scientific assistance, either

through bilateral or multilateral programmes. Such collaboration and assistance were at the origin of successful international preservation campaigns in the Site of Carthage (Tunisia), the Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae (Egypt), the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) and Tyre (Lebanon). These campaigns have not only contributed to the safeguarding of these World Heritage properties, but also increased awareness of World Heritage values within the Arab Region. Other fruitful cooperation programmes included bilateral agreements and partnerships, or multilateral programmes with France, Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the United States etc. Some authors reiterated their interest in developing training opportunities within the framework of bilateral and multilateral relations, especially with Europe.

On average, the reports demonstrated that regional cooperation for conservation remained still very limited. However, some exceptions were reported. Thus, productive cooperation has existed for many years between the Sultanate of Oman and Morocco, which allowed the restoration of several Omani monuments, including Bahla Fort, through cooperation programmes.

Answers received for this set of questions highlighted the existence of a network of multilateral partnerships achieved through cooperation programmes with international institutions or foreign countries. The reports showed that the regional cooperation programmes were few but fruitful, and could perhaps be multiplied.

2.6. Scientific, technical and educational studies

Research in the scientific and technical fields is a central tool of management allowing the identifica-

tion of the needs of properties and the designing of adequate protection measures. In parallel, educational activities addressed to young people or to the general public must be developed to increase popular awareness and the transmission of World Heritage values. Site managers were invited to assess the efficiency of ongoing studies and activities in these two areas, as well as the means and facilities available, and the response of the local population.

2.6. **Scientific, technical and educational studies**				
Scientific, technical and educational studies	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Has the property hosted scientific studies?	8	30	1	**21%**
Has the property hosted research/development programmes?	20	12	7	**51%**
Have new management techniques been applied to the property, including computer equipment, electronic mail, Internet access and GIS?	8	30	1	**21%**
Are educational activities offered at the property level, including school visits, educational programmes targeted at schools, environmental education policy, or education policy for Cultural Heritage-themes?	34	1	4	**87%**
Are efforts made to promote public information targeted at both the public at large and the local residents?	34	4	1	**87%**
Are efforts made to promote awareness-raising and the transmission of WH values to residents and visitors?	3	35	1	**8%**

The answers received regarding the scientific studies carried out at World Heritage sites, and the existing research projects and programmes, did not appear to reflect reality as such projects are known to be more numerous than admitted. Negative answers were received from properties known to have been the object of reports or development programmes such as the Medina of Fez, the Site of Carthage, Qusaïr Amra, etc. The authors of the reports may simply not have been aware of programmes that were perhaps undertaken before their taking office. In fact, only few reports referred to scientific studies carried out on the properties, while most mention only expert missions. A majority of the authors of the Periodic Reports agreed that the lack of human resources and scientific materials hampered efforts to undertake such studies, and called for the development of bilateral cooperation as a solution to these shortcomings.

Several scientific studies were undertaken through bilateral cooperation. In Lebanon, for instance, Tyre hosted six research programmes, while three more were undertaken in Byblos and Baalbek in cooperation with the Institut Français d'Archeologie du Proche-Orient (IFAPO). In Algeria, a study of the irrigation system, and a program-

me of archaeological research using geophysical and seismic methods, were undertaken in Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad and Tipasa, respectively. Further research programmes were cited concerning biodiversity and hydrology studies in Petra (Jordan), and research on amphitheatres in the Amphitheatre of El Jem (Tunisia).

According to the Periodic Reports, new information management techniques such as computerised management, data-bases, use of electronic mail, access to Internet or GIS, remained at an embryonic stage. While most sites possessed computer equipment, no real computer databases had yet been set up. Byblos and Anjar (Lebanon), the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania), the M'Zab Valley (Algeria) and Kairouan (Tunisia) possessed electronic mail. The Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania), Islamic Cairo and Memphis, and its Necropolis (Egypt) reported that GIS was being installed. GIS was also under consideration at Bahla Fort (Oman).

Site managers were also requested to provide information on educational activities aimed at school children, and awareness-raising campaigns targeted at the public at large. The responses received regarding the educational

activities and awareness-raising campaigns confirmed the information received in Section I reports that these were largely insufficient and that efforts should be made by national authorities to encourage information and communication programmes.

No property presented any real educational activities addressed to young people, besides the occasional mentioning of school visits. Statistics concerning the number of school visits and students are scarce. Such visits may be seasonal such as in the Ksar of Aït Ben Haddou (Morocco); may number several hundred individuals in Hatra (Iraq) or several thousands in the M'Zab Valley (Algeria); may even be sporadic in the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Aleppo, the site of Palmyra, or the Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic), the Old City of Sana'a and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen) or inexistent in Islamic Cairo, Memphis and its Necropolis, Ancient Thebes, Abu Mena (Egypt) or the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania). On average, the remaining educational programmes and the awareness-raising policies for environment and heritage mentioned correspond to the normal national education programmes. Most authors of the Periodic Reports understood the need to establish and promote such programmes. Islamic Cairo, Memphis and its Necropolis, and Ancient Thebes (Egypt), for instance, mentioned their wish to cooperate with international authorities on such matters.

Several reports cited actions for the promotion of information for the general public and for the streng-

thening of public awareness, indicating that property managers were well aware of the need to promote dialogue with the local population. Most reports mentioned the use of the media (radio, T.V., newspapers), and cooperation with the national authorities and specialised national institutions to facilitate the dissemination of information through guides, brochures, short documentaries, scientific publications, exhibitions, conferences, congresses, and festivals. Other actions included Internet resources, such as Tipasa (Algeria) which possesses a Web page. Local associations for the defence of World Heritage properties may also be involved in awareness-raising programmes -such as the association for the Safeguarding of the Medina in Tunisia- and whose influence vary from one property to the next.

The reports demonstrated that not all authors had understood the importance of research for the designing of management programmes targeted at the specific needs of each property. In most cases research studies were hampered by lack of means, not lack of want. Similarly, educational activities and awareness-raising campaigns remained scarce or limited in scope.

2.7. Facilities, tourism and promotion

This section aimed at assessing the effects of inscription on the World Heritage List in terms of sustainable tourism development at the property level. Property managers were requested to provide details on visitor facilities, and on promotion and presentation efforts.

2.7. Facilities, tourism and promotion

Facilities, tourism and promotion	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Does the property:				
• hold a World Heritage plaque;	15	17	7	**38%**
• host events and exhibitions?	7	2	30	**18%**
Does the property have:				
• information/interpretation centres for visitors;	17	13	9	**44%**
• a Site Museum;	20	9	10	**51%**
• discovery trails;	10	9	20	**26%**
• hotel structures;	26	2	11	**67%**
• a parking lot;	29	2	8	**74%**
• convenience areas;	24	2	13	**62%**
• first aid centres?	22	6	11	**56%**
Is information material available?	25	2	12	**64%**
Does the property host:				
• Open house days;	11	8	20	**28%**
• Communication actions?	23	7	9	**59%**
Is there a need to revise tourism-related legal and administrative measures for the property?	11	20	8	**28%**

The answers provided to the above questions demonstrated that properties were not yet fully equipped with the necessary facilities for the promotion of the heritage and the reception of visitors. Only 38% of sites mentioned the existence of a World Heritage logo, and very few sites have appropriate signposts announcing access to a site listed as World Heritage. According to these reports the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List had only little effect on multiplying information and awareness-raising activities at the local level, or on developing the receptivity of the local population to World Heritage values. Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad (Algeria) judged World Heritage listing "positive" regarding the multiplication of information and awareness-raising activities at the local level. Similarly, it was judged "very beneficial" at the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia) and reportedly, "drew a greater number of visitors" at the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and the M'Zab Valley (Algeria).

Reportedly, visitor facilities and site management were still inadequate to handle the effects of tourism. Information/interpretation centres for visitors were available in 44% of cases, and 51% of properties possessed a museum, but information and communication material were still described as insufficient. Parking lots and hotel structures had been built in 67% and 74% of properties respectively, and most sites declared that the building of further visitor facilities or discovery trails and the creation of information material, were under consideration or preparation. The Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) reported fruitful efforts to promote the safeguarding of the heritage through local, national and international promotion campaigns and festivals.

Twenty-eight per cent of reports stressed a need to revise legal and administrative measures relating to tourism. The report from Timgad (Algeria) insisted that a global revision of these measures was necessary due to the absence of a national conservation policy and of a clear definition of the roles and competencies of the institutions involved in conservation. The report also called for increased budgets taking into account management needs. The same situation was recorded in Islamic Cairo, Memphis and its Necropolis,

and Abu Mena (Egypt). Revision was underway in Ancient Thebes (Egypt). Reports from Bahla Fort (Oman), Baalbek (Lebanon), the Amphitheatre of El Jem, the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia) or Quseir Amra (Jordan) indicated that no such revisions were necessary. In fact, serious conservation/restoration work and presentation had been carried out since their inscription -and sometimes well before inscription- and consequently fundamental changes in the institutional and legal framework were not required.

The Periodic Reports indicated that the benefits to be reaped from World Heritage inscription in terms of tourism and social and economic development, had not been capitalised, or perhaps fully grasped. World Heritage Listing seemed to be considered a constraint entailing additional expenses, rather than as a source of development and employment. Properties were yet to be considered within the framework of a sustainable development policy, in addition to short-term, seasonal or sporadic activities such as tourism. Occasionally, the presentation of properties to the visitors may have been undertaken by organisations other than the conservation services, which entailed a lack of coordination and gave rise to an inadequate distribution of resources that failed to reflect the true needs at the property level.

3 Factors affecting the property

Several factors may negatively affect World Heritage properties and jeopardise their preservation. These include economic development, environmental pressures, natural catastrophes, and social factors linked to tourism or to local human activities. These factors, whether representing a minor impact or a serious threat to the integrity of the property, are to be fully assessed in order to allow the adoption of preventive or protection measures. Site managers were invited to evaluate the impact of changes or threats to the visual, structural or functional integrity of the heritage.

© UNESCO/Michel Claude

© UNESCO/E. Barrios

*Site museums are an important aspect of promotion, both in terms of attracting tourism and increasing awareness of the local population to the values and richness of World Heritage sites. The above pictures show fine examples of wall paintings at the museum of **Sabratha** and a sculpture of Diana the Huntress at the site museum of **Leptis Magna** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).*

3.1. Degree of threat linked to development and to the environment

The preservation of World Heritage depends on the maintaining of a fragile equilibrium between human needs and activities, including the spread of urbanisation, industries and related infrastructures, and the maintaining of World Heritage standards indispensable for the protection and safeguarding of properties. In this section, authors were requested to report on the impact of development on the properties, and to assess the risk of natural catastrophes affecting the heritage.

3.1. Degree of threat linked to development and to the environment				
Degree of threat linked to development and to the environment	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Is the property subject to development pressures affecting its: • Visual aspect/integrity; • Structural aspect/integrity; • Ability to function (functional integrity)?	23 21 10	5 5 14	11 13 15	**59%** **54%** **26%**
Is the property subject to environmental constraints affecting its: • Visual aspect/integrity; • Structural aspect/integrity; • Functional integrity?	6 6 5	13 13 11	20 20 23	**15%** **15%** **13%**
Could natural catastrophes affect the integrity of the site?	26	7	6	**67%**

The Periodic Reports demonstrated that the authorities responsible for the heritage at the property level were largely concerned by the effects of development on the visual and structural integrity of the properties, in 59% and 54% of cases respectively. Amongst the factors affecting the visual integrity of the site, the reports often mentioned illegal constructions and the deterioration of natural landscapes surrounding the properties.

Urban pressure and illegal constructions were reported around Bahla Fort (Oman) and the Site of Carthage (Tunisia), and within the World Heritage properties of Byblos, Anjar, Baalbek, Tyre (Lebanon), Tipasa, the M'Zab Valley, the Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria), Islamic Cairo, and Memphis and its Necropolis (Egypt), affecting not only the visual integrity of the properties but also, potentially, the preservation of the values for which they were inscribed on the World Heritage List. Other properties reported changes to the visual integrity of the sites including in the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco) and the Archaeological Site of Sabratha (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); the deterioration of gardens within and/or around the site in the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco), the M'Zab Valley, the Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria), the Old City of Sana'a and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen); or even the spoiling of fallow land with rubbish around the Site of Carthage (Tunisia) and several properties in Algeria.

 A majority of reports mentioned threats to the functional integrity of properties. Poorly integrated infrastructure were the most commonly cited, and involved the spreading of automobile and motor traffic within the site, the building of new roads or motorways, and the degradation of networks in Baalbek (Lebanon), Quseir Amra (Jordan), the Site of Carthage, the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia), the Ancient City of Aleppo, the Ancient City of Bosra, the Site of Palmyra, the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic), Islamic Cairo, Memphis and its Necropolis, Ancient Thebes (Egypt), the Old City of Sana'a, and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen). Threats of fires due to human activities were reported in the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic), the Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen), the Medina of Fez (Morocco), Byblos (Lebanon), and the Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria). Other reports mentioned the problem of illegal settlements on properties such as in Petra (Jordan), Ancient Thebes, Memphis and its Necropolis (Egypt), and the Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic).

*Like all World Heritage properties located in or nearby great cities, the ksour of the **M'Zab Valley** (Algeria) have to face up to the pressures of urbanisation and growing demography.*

The most preoccupying threats linked to development and urbanisation concerned polluting industrial activities, such as air pollution in Ancient Thebes (Egypt); the development of industries in the areas of the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic), the Medina of Marrakesh, the Medina of Fez (Morocco), and the Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria). The activities of oil companies in the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) were also considered as threatening the property. Other threats were linked to the spreading of local economic activities, such as the 'soukisation' or the development of arts and crafts shops or other traditional commercial activities in the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen), the Medina of Fez (Morocco), the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia), and Byblos (Lebanon). The Archaeological Site of Cyrene also reported the occasional use of the property by the population for cattle grazing.

Multiple threats related to the environment were reported in various properties. Although the impact of environmental threats may, at first sight, be less obvious to observers, these natural factors may, in the long term, affect and endanger the preservation of properties. Commonly cited natural factors affecting heritage, for instance, include wind erosion in the Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic) and Petra (Jordan); sand storms in the Old Town of Ghadames and the Archaeological Site of Sabratha (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); desertification, the drying up of springs, and climate changes in the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna, the Old Town of Ghadames (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), the Site of Palmyra, and the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania); and the loss of animal species affecting the biodiversity of properties in Quseir Amra (Jordan) and the Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania).

The Periodic Reports listed several potential natural catastrophes that may affect properties, or had affected them in the past. Earthquakes threaten the Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria), the Medina of Fez (Morocco), Petra (Jordan), Byblos (Lebanon), the Site of Palmyra, the Ancient City of Damascus, the Ancient City of Aleppo, and the Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic). Other natural catastrophes cited involved violent rains and floods in the Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), the Old City of Sana'a, the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen), Kairouan (Tunisia); land slides in Petra (Jordan), Anjar (Lebanon), the M'Zab Valley (Algeria); waves against cliffs in the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia); cliff rock falls in the Ksar of Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco); erosion and corrosion by sea water in the Archaeological Site of Sabratha, the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and droughts in the Medina of Marrakesh, and the Ksar of Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco).

The answers received concerning threats likely to affect the World Heritage properties for the Arab Region revealed that these threats were numerous and varied. Regular assessments are necessary to develop protection measures and minimise their impact on the properties.

3.2. Degree of threat linked to the development of tourism and to local human activities

Human activities often represent the greatest threat to the preservation of heritage, and are at the root of many factors of modification at the property level. Threats may originate from demographic growth or from the pressure of tourism in and around the property, affecting conservation in various ways. Site managers were invited to assess the impact of threats posed by these human activities on the state of conservation of the properties.

3.2. **Threats linked to external and local human activities**				
Threats linked to external and local human activities	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Is the preservation of the property affected by the pressure of tourism?	11	17	11	**28%**
Are statistics available regarding the number of visitors?	34	1	4	**87%**
Has the local population been evaluated in terms of numbers, the distribution of human habitat, cultural and socio-economic characteristics, threats and insecurity?	25	0	14	**64%**
Are there other factors linked to human activity affecting the property?	14	0	25	**36%**
Were measures undertaken to counter these threats at the property level?	23	5	11	**59%**
Has the tendency/impact of these factors been evaluated?	15	12	12	**38%**

Several reports, such as the Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic), Baalbek, (Lebanon) the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia), Timgad, and Tipasa (Algeria) recorded their concern over the effects of the trampling of vestiges by visitors. This type of damage is indicative of the lack of tourist facilities, such as the absence of visitor circuits and discovery trails, which was noted earlier. Uncontrolled access to the properties may cause erosion, overcrowding, damage, and render protection, conservation and monitoring more difficult.

However, local human activities were judged a more important threat to the preservation of heritage than the pressure of tourism. Thirty-six per cent of reports claimed that local human activity entailed negative effects on conservation. The report from the M'Zab Valley (Algeria) recorded the development of illicit construction or modification of existing structures in or around the property. Other factors cited included the illicit use of properties for the grazing of cattle, and the existence of poaching and illicit fishing. Similarly, vandalism, looting, and thefts were reported in the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus, the Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Hatra (Iraq), the Medina of Fez (Morocco), Baalbek, Anjar (Lebanon), Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, Timgad, and Tipasa (Algeria). Several properties witnessed an increase in local insecurity, such as Hatra (Iraq), Baalbek, and Anjar (Lebanon). Complaints concerning the presence of waste and rubbish in or around properties emanated from Islamic Cairo, Memphis and its Necropolis (Egypt), Petra (Jordan), the Old Walled City of Shibam, the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen), the Ancient City of Bosra, the Ancient City of Aleppo, the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic), Byblos, Anjar, Baalbek, Tyre (Lebanon), Timgad, Tipasa (Algeria), the Medina of Tunis, the Site of Carthage (Tunisia), and Quseir Amra (Jordan).

Several reports had adopted specific measures designed to counter these threats to the properties. The Ancient City of Aleppo, the Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic), Byblos (Lebanon) announced the adoption of measures to prevent fire. Similarly, the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco) claimed that it had taken measures to halt deforestation in the oasis. Petra (Jordan), Baalbek (Lebanon), the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Kairouan (Tunisia) and Ancient Thebes (Egypt) announced increased protection against flooding. The renovation of existing networks was under way in the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen), and efforts were undertaken to reduce automobile traffic in the Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic) and Petra (Jordan). Djemila, and Tipasa (Algeria) stressed their desire for an increased control of constructions and for a more rigorous application of legislation.

In order to be effective, these measures must be based on a careful study of demographic pressure. Sixty-four per cent

of reports provided details on the population, including approximate figures. In most cases, the figures cited had not been updated for several years and the analysis of the social background indicated that no serious studies had been undertaken in the recent past regarding the socio-economic context of local populations.

Similarly, measures were adopted to monitor tourism and reduce the negative effects of visitors on the preservation of properties. Surveillance was being strengthened in Hatra (Iraq), Petra (Jordan), the Amphitheatre of El Jem and the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia). Quseir Amra (Jordan) and Tyre (Lebanon) pledged a better control of tourism-related activities. The Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia), the Archaeological Site of Sabratha and the Archaeological Site of Leptis Magna (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) announced specific efforts to reduce trampling.

In conclusion, the answers received regarding threats linked to the development of tourism and local human activities demonstrated that site managers had, for the most part, understood the importance of identifying and countering these threats through adequate protection measures. Adequate monitoring techniques are necessary to assess the impact of these threats on conservation.

4 Monitoring and preventive conservation

Numerous factors may hamper conservation efforts and generate irreversible degradation to the properties. The monitoring of the impact of these threats on the state of preservation of the properties, and the corresponding design of preventive conservation programmes where applicable, are therefore essential. The following set of questions focused on the site managers' assessment of the efficiency of monitoring systems at the site level.

4.1. Regular monitoring

The regular monitoring of the state of conservation of the heritage is a means of ensuring that the values for which they were inscribed on the World Heritage List have been maintained over time, and is essential to plan the appropriate conservation measures that might be required.

4.1. Regular monitoring				
Regular monitoring	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Are regular monitoring activities undertaken on the property regarding the flora and vegetation, the local fauna, the landscape, constructions, buildings and cities?	33	3	3	85%
Are key indicators used to assess the situation at the property level?	21	6	12	54%
Have monitoring activities involved: 1- Monitoring partners 2- Administrative arrangements for monitoring 3- Evolution of methodology	16 15 1	5 4 7	18 20 31	41% 38% 3%
Were measures undertaken following the observations and/or recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau?	8	5	26	21%

The reports showed that most of the properties possessed technical and scientific teams to carry out maintenance work and to ensure continuous monitoring on the state of conservation at the property level. In the majority of cases, monitoring was said to be "regular," carried out by full-time staff from the central administration or the local municipality, urban agencies, specialised centres and organisations, and local or national laboratories and universities. However, these teams engaged mainly in sporadic or emergency restoration work such as reinforcing walls and ceilings threatening to collapse in isolated monuments and archaeological sites. Representatives of foreign institutions cooperating with the national authorities were also sometimes cited as monitoring partners, as well as UNESCO and World Heritage Centre consultants and experts in the context of their reactive monitoring missions to the properties in collaboration with the national authorities.

However, several properties, including the M'Zab Valley (Algeria), Islamic Cairo, Ancient Thebes, Abu Mena (Egypt), the Medina of Fez (Morocco), and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen) indicated that they did not possess any monitoring system. Others, such as the Site of Carthage, the Amphitheatre of El Jem (Tunisia), Hatra (Iraq), Bahla Fort (Sultanate of Oman) did not respond to this question, which probably indicated that they had not developed a monitoring system or that it was not yet fully functioning. Monitoring remained "weak because of the low level of means and budgets" in Timgad and Djemila (Algeria), and "insufficient" in the Medina of Fez (Morocco) for lack of appropriate means.

Only 21% of reports claimed that the States Parties had undertaken measures regarding monitoring following the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. This low response rate may be explained by the fact that the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee did not apply to all properties since some had already spontaneously implemented the recommended measures for the preservation of heritage. Occasionally, in cases where the property had been subject to recommendations, the information failed to reach the local authorities responsible for conservation, due to lack of communication and coordination at the State Party level, as was the case for the Old City of Sana'a and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen). The archiving and updating of information and the organisation of documentation systems concerning World Heritage properties are crucial for adequate preservation and monitoring activities.

The concept of key indicators was perhaps not well understood or implemented, since very few key indicators were cited, presenting only basic and limited techniques. These included plaster witnesses used to measure the movement of cracks in monuments, direct visual observations of cracks, land slides, rock subsidence, salinity, and erosion, but only little detail was provided on the use of the equipment to assess these phenomena. Visual observations were often the only means for the local staff to monitor the progress of damage, when measuring tools, laboratory analyses, statistics or other means of detection and scientific control of the phenomena were unavailable. Usually, although the property managers and authorities in charge of preservation were aware of the importance of monitoring and key indicators, the lack of financial resources, staff and technical means had hampered the development of monitoring activities at the property level. In addition, only very few properties possessed what can be called a "base-line survey" at the time of inscription against which to measure the possible changes which had occurred over time. This lack of data represented a great handicap to monitoring.

In conclusion, although 85% of reports claimed that monitoring systems had been developed on the properties, it appeared that the efficiency of these systems remained limited, with lack of coherence, and appropriate documentation.

4.2. Prevention of human and natural threats ans pressures				
Prevention of human and natural threats and pressures	Yes	No	No Response	% of positive answers
Have preventive methods for threats and pressures been applied to the property, regarding: 1- Natural catastrophes 2- Industrial pollution 3- Vibrations 4- Vandalism, theft, looting 5- Modification of the physical context 6- Industrial infrastructures 7- Constructions 8- Urbanism 9- Tourism	16 4 4 14 5 1 4 11 17	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	**41%** **10%** **10%** **36%** **13%** **3%** **10%** **28%** **44%**
Is an assessment of the increase or reduction of the impact of these factors on the property provided?	17	7	7	**44%**
Are any measures undertaken or foreseen in the future to remedy this situation?	20	2	2	**51%**

4.2. Prevention of natural and human threats and pressures

Protection measures regarding natural and human threats to the heritage should be inscribed within long-term planning and designed to meet the specific needs of each property. Site managers were requested to assess the effectiveness of protection planning efforts, based on the identification of threats linked to human activities or natural factors, and the evaluation of their potential impacts on sites. As discussed earlier, threats to the heritage vary according to the nature and characteristics of the properties. The reports indicated that archaeological sites were mainly subject to threats and pressures such as natural catastrophes, vandalism, theft and looting, and tourism, and, to a lesser degree, pollution and the modification of the physical context. The situation is different in historic cities, where the principal threats and pressures concerned visual encroachment, uncontrolled building activities, vibrations and pollution. Natural catastrophes were only rarely stated as threats likely to affect historic cities. Natural heritage was also subject to several threats, including pollution, wastes, tourism, mining and natural catastrophes.

Despite the multiplication of threats, the reports showed that only a minority of countries had adopted specific measures for the preservation of heritage. However, 51% of reports indicated that such measures were either foreseen or under way -although only little detail was provided. The main areas of action included tourism (44%), natural catastrophes (41%) and vandalism (36%). Although in the previous set of questions 36% of authors had declared that factors linked to human activity were affecting the property, protection measures for threats linked to urbanism and local human activity remained relatively rare (3% to 28%). The answers received showed that site managers were aware of the need to improve and diversify preventive measures in order to adapt them to the reality of the threats likely to affect the properties. Several reports indicated that a positive effect on the preservation of properties had been noted following the adoption of specific measures. Heightened security, intensification of visitor control, increased public awareness were amongst the positive changes recorded in Kairouan, the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia), the Medina of Fez, the Medina of Marrakesh (Morocco), and Bahla Fort (Oman).

However, some experiences were less successful. Several authors reported that the protection measures undertaken had not halted the impacts of threat factors on the heritage, heightening the risks of damage to the properties. This increase in negative tendencies was recorded in Hatra (Jordan), the Ksar of Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco), Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, Timgad, and Tipasa (Algeria), but remained a relatively rare phenomenon. According to the reports, this aggravation of conservation conditions was restricted to limited aspects of preservation, and did not question the legitimacy of the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. This included thefts and loo-

ting as a result of armed conflict, or degradation due to an unforeseen increase in visitor numbers. In the light of these difficulties, several authors of the Periodic Reports claimed the protection measures to be insufficient.

Other properties such as the Site of Palmyra, the Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic), the Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis (Tunisia) and Djemila considered the situation to be stationary. Details provided on the issues of protection measures, and the existence and funding of local policies and programmes for the safeguarding of properties, were scarce. Several authors regretted the lack of an adequate budget and of appropriate equipment to implement the protection measures on the properties, mainly in Timgad (Algeria), the Ancient City of Bosra, the Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic), Abu Mena (Egypt), the Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen). However, the policies and programmes were described as very restricted, keeping within the framework of the allocated budgets. Occasionally, in the absence of specific programmes, some reports referred to day-to-day protection measures. Only Yemen provided details of the financial resources available for the preservation of its heritage and produced annual budget figures.

In conclusion, the answers provided in this section demonstrated that it is easier to identify the threats to the heritage and to prescribe remedies, than to measure the effects of these remedies and protection programmes on the state of conservation. The difficulty increases when factors of degradation are multiplied and interlocked, requiring the establishment of precise and reliable key indicators.

Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) and *Ashur* (Iraq) were added to the World Heritage List in 2003.

3

Follow-Up Actions

This chapter aims at presenting the specific actions undertaken by the World Heritage Centre since the adoption of the *Periodic Reporting* on the Arab States in the year 2000, further to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. These actions took also into account the general policies concerning World Heritage formulated by the National Commissions for UNESCO of the Arab countries (Medium-Term Strategy for the Arab Region) and by the World Heritage Committee through its Strategic Objectives, approved in 2002. In particular, this chapter shall present the main concepts and substance of the Regional Programme for the Arab States, as approved by the World Heritage Committee in June 2003.

Recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

A report (WHC-2000/CONF.204/7) presenting an analysis of the answers received in the Periodic Reports was presented to the World Heritage Committee during its twenty-fourth session in December 2000 in Cairns (Australia). The World Heritage Committee congratulated the authors of the reports, as the Committee members successively took the floor to express their satisfaction with the report, which, it was stressed, would serve as a prototype for the other regions.

In Cairns the World Heritage Committee questioned the existence of a system for inventories and queried the reasons why some Arab States had advocated the revision of the statement of value in the nomination forms, or the elaboration of new statements of value. The Committee further underlined the need to take into account, at the time of the revision of the Operational Guidelines, the specific issues arising from changes to the boundaries of the inscribed sites or their buffer zones. The Committee also emphasised the need to evaluate, prior to the inscription of new sites, their management plans and suggested the integration of monitoring into the framework of the global approach to site management.

In concluding, the Committee invited the Director of the Centre to study the proposals contained in the Report, as they were unanimously supported by all delegates, who looked forward to their implementation, in cooperation with the States Parties concerned. In this respect, the Committee requested that a meeting with the Permanent Delegates to UNESCO take place to inform them of the results of the *Periodic Reporting* exercise. This meeting, to which all permanent delegates were invited, took place at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris in April 2001.

1   Actions undertaken since the *Periodic Reporting* exercise (2000-2003)

The following paragraphs describe several activities that have taken place since the *Periodic Reporting* exercise of 2000 according to the recommendations of the Committee expressed during the Cairns meeting. These activities aimed at offering solutions to the problems identified in the Periodic Reports. Other sporadic activities organised at the national levels, were not included in this list.

1.1. National meetings

The *Periodic Reporting* exercise allowed the identification of a certain number of problems affecting World Heritage sites in the Arab Region, especially with regard to the legal framework and conservation practices. States Parties were therefore consulted with a view to discuss and review their problems on an individual basis, in order to identify the appropriate solutions. It was decided that National Review Meetings between local technicians and World Heritage experts would have served the purpose.

Thus, three pilot national workshops were held in Algeria, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Yemen. The objective of these meetings was to understand the problems that the States Parties faced regarding the protection and conservation of heritage as expressed in their Periodic Reports. They provided an opportunity for clarification and a better understanding of practices, especially on the issues of legislation and conservation. They also enabled a frank exchange on the States Parties' obligations regarding the Convention. Furthermore, concrete solutions were found with regard to some of the more urgent problems linked to tentative lists and new inscriptions, legislation, management plans, conservation practices and the boundaries of properties.

1.2. Activities undertaken within the framework of the Global Strategy

Regional Thematic Expert Meeting on desert Landscapes and Oases Systems in the Arab Region (Kharga Oasis, Egypt – 23-26 September 2001)

The World Heritage Thematic Expert Meeting on "Desert Landscapes and Oasis Systems in the Arab Region" was organised by the World Heritage Centre in collaboration with the Egyptian Supreme Council of Antiquities of the Ministry of Culture, and was held at the Oasis of Kharga. The meeting confirmed the relevance of the cultural landscape concept in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and highlighted the potential of desert landscapes, comprising one fifth of the Earth's surface, for World Heritage listing. The meeting recommended that cross-cultural and interdisciplinary studies be carried out in the identification of desert landscapes. The meeting furthermore encouraged States Parties to include desert sites and oasis systems on their tentative lists and to prepare nominations for potential World Heritage listing. The participants considered that the concept of trade routes and itineraries is particularly relevant for desert areas and recommended that States Parties collaborate at the regional level to identify and protect such extended linear sites. As a result from that Meeting, a number of desert landscapes were included in Tentative Lists of Arab countries, including Mauritania, Algeria and Oman.

Arab Meeting for the Harmonization of Tentative Lists of Natural World Heritage Sites in the Arab Countries (Cairo, Egypt – 17-20 February 2003)

A meeting was organised in Cairo in collaboration with the Egyptian National Commission for UNESCO, with the aim of drawing attention to the need to harmonise Tentative Lists of Arab Natural Heritage sites, and of increasing the number of nominations of Arab Natural Heritage sites on the World Heritage List. As noted in the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, only four Arab Natural Heritage sites are inscribed on the World Heritage List, representing a mere 2.3% of the total 172 sites with natural heritage values currently inscribed on the List. The Global Strategy of the World Heritage Committee plans for the recognition and inscription on the World Heritage List of the types and categories of properties currently non-represented or under-represented in the List. Within this framework, the harmonisation of Tentative Lists for the Arab Region and the identification of sites of natural heritage value for this region are of primary importance.

1.3.   Activities undertaken regarding Capacity-Building

Training Workshop on the Application of the World Heritage Convention and the Harmonisation of Tentative Lists in the Arab Region (Amman, Jordan – 5-9 May 2002)

A regional training seminar on the implementation of the Convention, funded by the Government of Italy, was held in Amman in 2002. The workshop was based on the case study of the Umayyad sites of Jordan (Qastal, Mushatta, Kharraneh, Quseir Amra, Azraq and its natural reserve, Allabath).

This Workshop was conceived for officers from public institutions in charge of World Heritage sites (generally from the Department of Antiquities and the Ministry of Environment, or equivalent), who would become focal points for the World Heritage Centre activities in their country. Most of the participants participating in the workshop were in charge of cultural heritage properties, and only a few countries sent participants for natural heritage sites (Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Algeria and Tunisia). Except for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, all the Arab States Parties were represented at the workshop -i.e. 16 out of 17 countries signatory to the Convention at the time. A participant of the Palestinian National Authority was also present as an observer.

The aim of this workshop was to increase awareness of the Convention, its concepts, objectives and procedures, and of issues related to the representation of World Heritage and Tentative Lists in the Arab Region. It increased the capacity for the identification of poten-

tial World Heritage sites (Tentative Lists, Nomination Files) and brought to light the importance of Site Management Plans and protection in view of World Heritage listing. Finally, it consolidated the regional network of cooperation for the implementation of the Convention, and increased motivation for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Workshop: "Information course on the World Heritage Convention for Palestinian experts" (Rome, Italy – 8-13 September 2003)

This information course was organised in collaboration with ICCROM and the UNESCO Office in Ramallah. It aimed at acquainting the participants with the general framework of the World Heritage Convention, and at providing them with a plan of action for incorporating World Heritage concerns into ongoing conservation work. A total of 16 experts from various regions of Palestine (Rammallah, Gaza, Hebron, Nablus and Bethlehem) attended the five-day course. The experts came from both the natural and cultural heritage fields and from various backgrounds (archaeologists, planners, architects, ecologists and civil engineers).

The key issues treated during this workshop included an introduction to the Convention, a presentation of current trends in the Convention, nominations (definitions, tentative lists, preparing and assessing nominations, post-nomination activities), *Periodic Reporting*, statements of significance, and effective monitoring for management. Two visits around the Roman neighbourhood of Trastevere and the World Heritage site of Assisi introduced the participants to the concept of reading changes in the urban fabric as a means of understanding the development of a historic neighbourhood and gave a concrete demonstration of many of the concepts that had been discussed as part of the earlier class work.

Workshop: "Contribution of Remote Sensing to the Management of Cultural and Natural Heritage Sites" (Beirut, Lebanon – 15-17 December 2003)

This workshop, in collaboration with the European Space Agency, EURISY and the National Council for Scientific Research of Lebanon, took place in December 2003 at the facilities of the National Council for Scientific Research located in Beirut. The aim of this workshop was to bring together site managers from the East Mediterranean and Arabian Peninsula to update their knowledge on the potential of satellite images for the management of Cultural and Natural Heritage sites. The applications of this workshop focused mainly on the use of satellite images to assist in the management, development and planning for areas surrounding World Heritage sites as well as for their conservation.

Training Workshop on "World Heritage Information Management for Cultural Sites in the Arab Region": 18 February-4 March 2004 (Cairo, Egypt)

This workshop was developed within framework of project "Development of World Heritage Capacity in the Arab States" developed in collaboration with the Flemish authorities and the UNESCO-Flanders Funding Trust for the Support of UNESCO's activities. This training workshop was organised in collaboration with the Centre for Documentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage (CULTNAT) and the Supreme Council of Antiquities. The thirteen participants (Egypt, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia, Sudan, Yemen, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Jordan) were trained on the use of information technologies (GIS, GPS, Photogrammetry, Total Station…) in collecting data and information, producing 3-D models and maps and implementing monitoring systems in order to improve preservation and the management of the World Heritage Sites in the Arab Region. This enabled them to become acquainted with existing tools and technologies, to understand their specificities and their application for the preservation of heritage.

Other activities foreseen

Further activities will be developed aiming at increasing awareness of the World Heritage Convention and its concepts, and at providing solutions to the problems identified during the *Periodic Reporting* exercise of 2000.

For instance, a workshop is planned for 2004 involving the six countries of the Gulf Region (and perhaps Yemen), in collaboration with ICOMOS and IUCN. As discussed in the previous chapters on the findings of the *Periodic Reporting* exercise of 2000, some countries in the Gulf Region have not yet submitted any Tentative lists and, apart from the Sultanate of Oman, do not yet hold any World Heritage properties. This workshop will therefore include an introduction to the World Heritage Convention aiming at increasing these countries' capacity for its implementation including encouraging the presentation of new sites for nomination (definition of World Heritage concepts, inventories, tentative lists, preparing and assessing nominations, post-nomination activities).

A second workshop, funded by the Government of Norway in collaboration with the Nordic World Heritage Foundation, will take place in 2004, probably in Jordan, and will focus on the preservation of World Heritage in Iraq. Iraqi experts and site managers will be invited to take part in a four to five day workshop including courses on the World Heritage Convention and its implementation, and visits to the World Heritage sites of Hatra and Ashur.

2 The Regional Programme for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab States

Since the *Periodic Reporting* exercise for the Arab Region was undertaken in the year 2000, UNESCO has defined general strategies and programmes aiming at maximising preservation and conservation efforts for World Heritage. These include the UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy for the Arab Region, as established by the UNESCO National Commissions, and the Strategic Objectives and Global Training Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2001 and 2002. The Committee, moreover, by its decision 26 COM 17 B requested that Regional Programmes be developed to apply in practice the above-mentioned Strategic Objectives and Global Training Strategy. The present section presents the Regional Programme for the Arab States developed by the World Heritage Centre, as approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th Session in Paris (June 2003), in the context of the above-mentioned policies.

2.1. Background

Specific problems identified by the Periodic Reporting Exercise and Fields of Action for a Regional Programme

The *Periodic Reporting* exercise for the Arab Region of 2000 not only allowed the updating of information for an overall assessment of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties in the Arab States, but also enabled the identification of a number of priority conservation needs of States Parties at the national, local and regional levels. In response to these needs, five distinct fields of action were determined, in the framework of the elaboration of the Regional Programme for the Arab States. The main identified needs and corresponding five fields of action, which refer also to the Strategic Objectives of the Committee (see paragraph 2.3 below) are summarised again hereafter for the benefit of the reader:

1- Application of the Convention (Credibility):
The application of the World Heritage Convention is dependant on the knowledge of its concepts and on the correct application of the specific procedures of this Convention such as the preparation of Tentative Lists, Nomination Dossiers, International Assistance Requests and Periodic Reports. As mentioned earlier, the percentage of Arab properties on the World Heritage List was in decline at the time of the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, indicating a lack of knowledge of the Convention and its values. Therefore it seemed vital to encourage the presentation of Nomination dossiers from the Arab Region, to reiterate the concepts, values and procedures of the Convention, and to strengthen the States Parties capacities for its application. The exercise also revealed that the true diversity, wealth and characteristics of the cultural and natural heritage of the region were not represented in the inventories mentioned in the reports.

2- Institutional and legislative framework (Conservation):
The study of the legislative and institutional framework for the preservation of World Heritage in the Arab Region revealed that properties were only rarely integrated into a modern concept of heritage management presenting heritage as a resource in the context of social and economic development. However, the *Periodic Reporting* exercise indicated positive changes, such as a growing awareness, amongst the local communities, of the impact of the heritage on their development, on the local sharing of benefits gained from eco-tourism resources, on training, on skills transfer and on management. Nonetheless, heritage management still remained too focused on sporadic protective measures, usually privileging ad-hoc restoration activities as opposed to daily maintenance. Further efforts were also needed to increase and strengthen legislation for the safeguarding of urban heritage, and to develop the institutional and legislative framework for the protection of natural heritage.

3- Management and conservation of the World Heritage Sites (Conservation):
Observations recorded on the management and conservation of the World Heritage properties showed that an appropriate and long-term management approach based on the identification of values, planning, continuous maintenance, presentation and monitoring was still lacking for most properties. The *Periodic Reporting* mentioned the lack of capacity -both financial and human- for the development of conservation techniques and monitoring activities. In addition, the reports revealed that the authorities responsible for heritage still lacked policies and coordination procedures regarding cooperation between conservation agencies and other governmental bodies whose mandate impacts on the state of conservation of the heritage resource.

4- Education, awareness-raising and support, through communication (Communication):
Progress was recorded in the fields of education, communication and awareness-raising, but the existing measures remained insufficient. The reports indicated that further efforts were needed to increase awareness and involvement of the civil society, and especially young people, on the issues of heritage values and the conservation of properties. The reports emphasized the need for increased capacities in communication skills within Conservation Services, for the mobilisation of civil society, donors and public authorities to the benefit of heritage properties.

5- Information Management(Communication/ Conservation):
Adequate communication, coordination and conservation, require appropriate information management in order to enhance the monitoring and promotion of World Heritage properties. As yet, documentation available at the property level remained scarce and World Heritage management and information exchange capacities were still limited. While all Periodic Reports mentioned the existence or recent creation

of documentation and research centres (centralised at the national level), information was not easily available and the use of such centres remained limited. Most of the documentation was produced and held by scientific or academic institutions (often foreign ones) and did not contribute to the establishment of management or site conservation policies. The Conservation Services did not possess an integrated information management system although in some cases the national and heritage services were beginning to develop websites. Information was not exchanged at the regional or international levels, and it appeared that the use of information technology was not widespread.

UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy (2002-2007) for the Arab Region

A regional consultative meeting was held in Rabat (Morocco) in June 2002 with the participation of all the National Commissions of the Arab States, as part of the process for the elaboration of UNESCO's new Medium-Term Strategy (2002-2007) and in agreement with the new decentralisation policy adopted by the Organisation. The final document sets out the Medium-Term Strategy for the Arab States. The National Commissions identified the following three objectives, with some relevance to the aims of the World Heritage Convention, as priority actions for UNESCO:

1. To promote the elaboration and application of normative instruments in the field of culture.
In the framework of the World Heritage Convention, the National Commissions stressed the need for capacity-building in the field of site conservation and protection, particularly concerning the appropriate management and development of tourism. Moreover, the final document stresses the need to increase the number of natural heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and to strengthen the capacity for the preparation of the Nomination Dossiers.

2. To ensure cultural diversity and encourage the dialogue between cultures and civilisations.
Whenever the protection of intangible heritage was considered a priority, the National Commissions recalled the need to identify and enhance the value of the links between tangible heritage, cultural identities and living traditions. The importance of strengthening inter-regional cooperation was underscored.

3. To strengthen links between culture and development, through the exchange of knowledge and capacity-building.
As concerns this strategic objective, the National Commissions insisted that UNESCO should alert all levels of society of the Arab Region to the potential socio-economic benefits of appropriate management of cultural and natural heritage. To this end, UNESCO's efforts will primarily focus on capacity-building and involvement of the local communities in participative activities.

Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee and Regional Programmes

The Strategic Objectives
To follow-up on the Strategic Guidelines adopted at the 16th session of the Committee in 1992, and to the analysis of International Assistance, the 25th session of the Committee, in 2001, discussed the finalisation of the so-called "Strategic Objectives," taking into account the need to draw closer links between the results of the Periodic Reports and the policy for cooperation foreseen in the framework of the Convention. These Objectives, entitled the 4Cs, were formulated and adopted at the 26th session in Budapest, in June 2002. The 4 Cs consist of:

1. To strengthen the **Credibility** of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;
2. To ensure the **Conservation** of the World Heritage Properties;
3. To promote **Capacity-building** for conservation;
4. To increase public-awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage through **Communication**.

These objectives are set out in the "Budapest Declaration" adopted by the Committee on 28 June 2002, and were also incorporated in the new budget proposal of the World Heritage Fund. The Committee further requested the Secretariat to draw up a series of "instruments" entitled the **3Ps** aiming at the above objectives. These instruments include:

1. A new document on the "**Principles**," guidelines for the conservation of the World Heritage;
2. The reorientation of International Assistance using a "**Programme**" approach;
3. A new "**Partnership**" initiative to strengthen support for the conservation of World Heritage.

According to this new framework, the establishment of "programmes" for the implementation of the Convention should therefore be based on the results of the Periodic Reports, while simultaneously responding to the priorities established by the Committee. Although the partnership principles and means remain to be defined, the Committee approved, during its 25th session in Helsinki, the continuation of assistance upon request, and four Programmes on Sustainable tourism, Forests, Cities, and Earthen constructions representing 10.5% of the budget of the 2002-2003 biennium.

Additionally, in its Decision **26 COM 17 B**, the Committee invited the Director-General of UNESCO to "develop new Regional Programmes, based on the needs specifically identified through the regional *Periodic Reporting* exercise, with a view to achieve the new Strategic Objectives and to submit these programmes for consideration and adoption at the 27th session of the Committee (June/July 2003)." The Regional Programme developed for the Arab

Region in compliance with this decision is described in the present chapter.

Global Training Strategy
Another important policy adopted by the Committee, and which has been taken into account by the Centre in shaping its approach for the Arab Region, is the Global Training Strategy, adopted by the Committee at its 25th session, in December 2001, in Helsinki.

The Strategy stresses the need for a pro-active approach towards capacity-building, and recommends that, in the evaluation of the International Assistance requests, "preference should be given to pro-active approaches that result in training modules and long-term strategic programmes designed to respond to priority needs."

Amongst the sectors identified as priorities for training are: 1) the implementation of the Convention; 2) the management of the World Heritage sites; and 3) the strengthening of technical, scientific and traditional capacities for the conservation of cultural and natural heritage. Although the Global Training Strategy was adopted by the Committee in 2001, i.e. prior to the Strategic Objectives (2002), three of the 4 Cs were in fact already taken into account by the above-mentioned priorities, and namely Credibility, Conservation and Capacity-Building.

In order to attain these objectives, amongst other initiatives, the Global Training Strategy foresees "the development of ready-to-use Training Modules, designed to be adaptable to specific regional and national contexts." Finally, the Global Training Strategy encourages the States Parties to include training components in their Technical Assistance requests concerning in situ activities.

2.3. The strategy of the Regional Programme

The strategy of this Regional Programme is directly linked to the guidelines set by the Medium-Term Strategy for the Arab States Region (2002-2007), and the strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee (including the Global Training Strategy), described above.

As already mentioned, the actions proposed in this Regional Programme are established in respect with the findings of the *Periodic Reporting*, including the needs identified by the States Parties and properties and the ensuing recommendations. The following paragraphs attempt to explain how the 4 "C"s are integrated into its strategy, how the pro-active principle is interpreted, and how the Programme proposes to mobilise regional and international partners to ensure the sustainability of its impact.

The Synthesis Report on the *Periodic Reporting* exercise presented in Cairns in 2000 identified the principal points and indicated the objectives to be achieved. However, the

Regional Programme for the Arab Region proposes an important new element, by integrating operational mechanisms into its strategy. The three main tools for execution are: the International Assistance Modules, Projects and National Programmes. A mechanism for evaluation and revision (represented by a Monitoring Committee) is also included in the Regional Programme. The following sections explain how these tools are linked to each other in the implementation mechanism, and describe the appropriate steps to attain the expected results.

International Assistance Modules

Taking into account the present mechanisms for International Assistance granted in the framework of the World Heritage Fund (attributed upon request of States Parties), the Regional Programme presents a series of "assistance kits" ready for use and conceived as modules to be reproduced. These kits, which will be referred to here as "International Assistance Modules," respond to each of the needs identified in the *Periodic Reporting* and are organised in accordance with the five fields of action identified in section 2.1 above[11].

These modules will be presented to States Parties in the framework of International Assistance, in a pro-active manner and in accordance with priorities, in a "menu" form. For example, to respond to the problem of lack of understanding of the procedures for the nomination of properties to the World Heritage List, a specific training workshop is developed and presented in this Regional Programme (see Table 8 below). The module in question will contain information on its duration, the number of beneficiaries, a cost estimate and the responsible training institution. These modules will be carefully devised to ensure a long-term approach to the activity and to identify the regional partners and involve them from its conception to its completion.

The International Assistance Modules correspond to the general categories (preparatory assistance, technical cooperation, training) and to the average financial ceilings presently established by the Operational Guidelines for normal International Assistance projects. However, they will be conceived as to be immediately implementable, following the approval of the corresponding request by the Committee, thus considerably improving the efficiency of the World Heritage Centre in the use of the World Heritage Fund resources[12].

Tables 1 to 5 below provide a preliminary list of International Assistance Modules that, for the time being, are simply presented with their title. However, these modules will be entirely developed in collaboration with the advisory bodies (ICCROM and ICOMOS for cultural heritage, and IUCN for natural heritage) with fully detailed and operational proposals, including work plans, human resource requirements, budget and timetable. Furthermore, the most appropriate partner will be identi-

fied for each module and integrated into the activity, after having first taken into account existing national and regional capacities. A complete description of these modules will be available on the World Heritage Centre website, with a link to the partners concerned, in order to facilitate the States Parties' consultation and use of the Modules.

Once completed, these modules will become the basis for long-term partnerships between the World Heritage Centre and a certain number of institutions, professionals, scientists and academics, chosen for their competences and experience in the region and elsewhere, thus benefiting from existing resources.

More importantly, States Parties will have access to a wide variety of assistance activities, ready for implementation and fully explained and tested, from which they may choose depending on their needs. The donors will be able to "envision" the activities, to consider, in advance, which activity would be most appropriate to receive their funding, and to negotiate funding directly with the beneficiary. Of course, States Parties will also be able to request international assistance in the framework of the World Heritage Fund for a specific activity that is not available as a module in the framework of the Regional Programme, as long as its objectives and execution modalities are compatible with the principles indicated in the Guidelines.

Projects

In addition to International Assistance Modules, the Regional Programme envisages the development of a certain number of larger scale activities, or Projects. These projects, aimed at extra-budgetary funding and often targeted at more than one country (sub-regional and regional activities), are developed to complete and strengthen the impact of the international assistance modules already described. They are also in line with the recent decision of the Committee to allocate a percentage of the World Heritage Fund for the execution of specific programmes, thus reinforcing its pro-active principle. As an example of complementarity, the Regional Programme for the development of World Heritage information management capacities in the Arab States, now being executed thanks to funding from the Flemish authorities, could provide a basic infrastructure, whilst an international assistance module could assist a State Party in the preparation of high quality mapping for all its World Heritage sites. While the assistance modules may be reproduced and

11. The fields of action cover the 4 "C "s identified by the Committee as Strategic Objectives, but organise them in relation to the types of action envisaged in this Regional Programme.

12. Over and above the lack of human and financial resources, which constitutes a significant constraint in the use of the World Heritage Fund, lies the inherent difficulty in executing a large variety of technical assistance operations based on a "reactive" approach, because they require the continual redefinition of objectives, the choice of partners and adjustment of modalities for their implementation. The pro-active approach described here is a proposal to rationalise and improve the efficiency of the system.

focus mainly on capacity-building and specific national needs, Projects are generally conceived for one-time implementation, with the aim of strengthening regional and inter-regional cooperation in the framework of the Convention. However, long-term activities requiring substantial investment (such as the preparation of urban conservation plans) may be included in this category. All the projects listed in section 4.3 below will constitute the main 'catalogue' of the Centre's fund raising activities for the Arab Region, as approved by the Committee. Some have already been submitted to donors and have received some funding.

National Programmes

The third component of the strategy for the implementation of the Regional Programme is the definition of National Programmes for each State Party of the region. A national implementation programme will comprise International Assistance Modules and Projects selected by the States Parties amongst those proposed in the Regional Programme according to the specific requirements of each country. These National Programmes will thus represent the planning instrument through which potential activities described in the Regional Programme - including the adaptation and refining of modules and projects dependent upon prevailing conditions in each country- can receive international assistance should the State Party so request. A specific Assistance Module has been designed to support the elaboration of such National Programmes (see section 4).

Another objective of the National Programme includes the establishment of national focal points for World Heritage and the creation of Working Groups for World Heritage in each country of the region, in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee (paragraph VII.32 of the 25th ordinary session, Helsinki, December 2001). These focal points should not be conceived as new institutions, but rather as a means of strengthening national and regional cooperation and coordination for the implementation of the Convention. As an example, tables 7 and 8 illustrate the mechanisms of a possible national programme for the implementation of the Regional Programme, and a form containing a fully developed possible activity module, respectively.

The Monitoring Committee

The Regional Programme plans for the organisation every three years (each year following the submission of periodic reports and again three years later) of regional meetings during which the World Heritage coordinators for each country of the region (see above) and the representatives of the Conservation Services of the cultural and natural World Heritage sites, will meet in order to review the progress made in the application of the Convention in the Arab Region. This group may also act as a Monitoring Committee for the evaluation and revision of the Regional

Programme. The technical partners and the representatives of the donor countries will be also invited to participate. The meeting, coordinated by the World Heritage Centre, will provide recommendations to the World Heritage Committee for possible modifications of the Programme. These regional meetings could be financed through the World Heritage Fund as an integral part of the follow-up to *Periodic Reporting*. The first meeting of the Monitoring Committee is foreseen for 2005 to present the strategy for the Regional Programme to the national authorities. Following this meeting, the Monitoring Committee will meet at regular intervals, in the *Periodic Reporting* year to revise the Programme in the light of this exercise and make recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. Follow-up meetings will then take place every three years.

2.4. Objectives of the Regional Programme for the Arab Region, expected results and indicators

Global Objective

The global objective of the Regional Programme is a more effective implementation of the Convention in the Arab Region, the enhancement of the role of World Heritage as an instrument for identity and a vector for sustainable socio-economic development, promotion of pluralism and inter-cultural dialogue.

Objectives of the Regional Programme

The Regional Programme aims at responding to the needs of the States Parties as identified in the *Periodic Reporting* exercise, according to the five fields of action defined in paragraph 2.1. Thus, the Regional Programme aims at:

- strengthening the application of the Convention;
- contributing to the revision of the legal and institutional framework;
- improving conservation and the management of sites;
- promoting education, awareness and support of World Heritage values;
- improving information and documentation management capacity relating to the World Heritage sites.

As explained above, these objectives correspond to the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee (the 4 "C"s), recognising that capacity-building is integrated into the Regional Programme as an essential tool to attain the expected results.

Expected results, activities and indicators

The results expected from the Regional Programme depend directly upon the major problems identified during the *Periodic Reporting* exercise and are structured around the five fields of action defined in paragraph 2. In order to attain these results and to respond to the problems identified by the Periodic Reports, a series of activi-

ty modules, projects and indicators has been conceived for the evaluation of the progress of the Regional Programme in respect to its objectives, in conformity with the Regional Programme Strategy described above.

For each of the fields of action, the following five tables present an overall view of the problems, results, activities (modules and projects) and indicators. These should facilitate the understanding of the mechanisms of the Regional Programme. The proposed modules and projects are based on the Secretariat's experience in identifying the most important needs and recurrent difficulties encountered in the implementation of the Convention. However, they are not exhaustive. Other types of activities can be developed and added to the list if deemed appropriate.

Table 1. Application of the Convention			
Problems	**Expected results**	**Assistance Modules and Projects**	**Indicators**
• Lack of understanding of the Convention's concepts and procedures, and insufficient capacity for its application; • Gaps in the World Heritage List with regard to the sites inscribed, and in the Tentative Lists in comparison to the wealth and diversity of the cultural and natural heritage of the region.	1. Submission of Tentative Lists and Periodic Reports by all the States Parties; 2. Increase, in number and quality, of the nomination dossiers and requests for International Assistance submitted by the Arab States; 3. Better representation of the wealth and diversity of the cultural and natural heritage of the Region on the World Heritage List; 4. Establishment of the focal points for the application of the Convention within the Governmental Institutions of each country of the region; 5. Development of National Programmes for the implementation of this Regional Programme; 6. Review of progress and updating of the Regional Programme every three years.	■ **Project 1.1** Regional Meeting of the Monitoring Committee (see Chapter 3.4 above) for the evaluation of the progress of the Regional Programme ■ **Module 1.1** National Workshop on the Convention's concepts and procedures ■ **Module 1.2** National Training Workshop on the procedure for nominating properties for inscription on the World Heritage List ■ **Module 1.3** National Training Workshop on drafting Periodic Reports ■ **Module 1.4** Preparatory Assistance for drafting a nomination dossier for a serial, transborder or cultural landscape property ■ **Module 1.5** National Training Workshop for the preparation of International Assistance requests ■ **Module 1.6** Assistance for the establishment or the strengthening of a national focal point for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the preparation of a National Programme for the implementation of the Regional Programme	• Number of States Parties having submitted a Tentative List; • Number of nomination dossiers submitted by the States Parties of the Region; • Percentage of natural sites (or serial, transborder, or cultural landscape sites) in the Arab Region of all the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List; • Number of States Parties with a National Programme for the implementation of the Regional Programme; • Number of requests for International Assistance submitted by the States Parties of the Arab Region and approved by the Committee; • Number of States Parties having established working groups for the implementation of the Convention.

Table 2. Institutional and legislative framework			
Problems	**Expected results**	**Assistance Modules and Projects**	**Indicators**
• Legislation and the institutional framework still focus on sporadic protection actions for the sites or monuments and are not adapted to the modern notion of heritage management integrating the heritage as a resource in social and economic development; • Lack of policies and coordination procedures between the conservation agencies and the other actors intervening at the sites; • Legislation for the safeguarding of the urban heritage still insufficient; • Institutional and legislative framework not sufficiently developed for the protection of the natural heritage.	1. Better integration of the modern concept of heritage management, including cultural and natural properties as a resource for social and economic development in legislation and the institutional conservation framework; 2. Establishment of coordination mechanisms between the governmental, national and local institutions, and the services responsible for conservation; 3. Development of protection mechanisms adapted to the urban contest; 4. Development of legislation for the protection of natural heritage in most of the countries of the Arab Region.	■ **Project 2.1** Evaluation of the legal and administrative frameworks of the Convention ■ **Project 2.2** Development of specific legislation for the protection of a historic city ■ **Module 2.1** Development of policies and coordination procedures for the management of a heritage site ■ **Module 2.2** National Training Workshop on legislation and policies for the protection of natural heritage	• Number of legislation and institutional frameworks developed for the protection of natural heritage; • Number of legal protection mechanisms developed and adopted for historic cities listed as World Heritage in the Arab Region; • Number of coordination procedures developed and adopted between the Conservation Services and other local and national actors.

Follow-Up Actions

Table 3. Management and conservation of the World Heritage Sites			
Problems	**Expected results**	**Assistance Modules and Projects**	**Indicators**
• Lack of an appropriate and long-term methodology for the management and conservation of the sites (identification of values, planning, ongoing maintenance, enhancement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.); • Lack of capacities in conservation techniques and monitoring;	1. Development of an appropriate and long term management mechanism (identification of values, planning, enhancement, maintenance, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) at the World Heritage sites; 2. Management capacities of the sites strengthened; 3. Development or improvement of capacities for conservation techniques and monitoring methods.	■ **Module 3.1** National Training Workshop on the management of World Heritage sites ■ **Module 3.2** National Training Workshop on Conservation Principles ■ **Module 3.3** National Training Workshop on Conservation Techniques and Monitoring Methods[13] ■ **Module 3.4** Technical Assistance and advice for the site management and conservation ■ **Project 3.1** Preparation of a Management Plan for a World Heritage site ■ **Project 3.2** Training course in World Heritage site management	• Number of Arab sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger ; • Number of management plans developed and adopted ; • Number of curators trained in conservation principles and techniques and the use of traditional materials ; • Number of documentation and regular monitoring systems established at the World Heritage sites.

13. Activity modules will be elaborated for each conservation technique, for example for stone, mosaic, earthen architecture, mural painting, etc.

Table 4. Education, awareness-raising and support, through communication			
Problems	**Expected results**	**Assistance Modules and Projects**	**Indicators**
• Lack of awareness of heritage values and participation of civil society, especially young people, in the conservation of properties; • Lack of capacities, of those responsible for the Conservation Services, for communication techniques to mobilise civil society and public authorities for heritage protection.	1. Greater awareness of civil society, local communities, and especially young people, of heritage protection themes. Contribution of this group to the conservation of heritage properties; 2. Establishment of partnerships between schools and managers of the World Heritage sites; 3. Strengthening communication capacities of the conservation services for the protection and support of heritage.	■ **Module 4.1** National training workshop in communication skills for conservators ■ **Module 4.2** Short introductory seminar on the World Heritage Convention for local officials and decision makers ■ **Module 4.3** National training workshop for secondary school teachers in the use of the educational kit "World Heritage in Young Hands" ■ **Module 4.4** National training workshop for site conservators for the creation and drafting of a project and negotiating skills ■ **Module 4.5** Technical assistance for the development and implementation of awareness-raising campaigns for heritage protection	• Number of partnerships developed between secondary schools and site Conservation Services; • Number of conservators trained in communication skills ; • Number of cooperation projects negotiated and resources mobilised by the site Conservation Services; • Number of projects having a negative impact on the values of the World Heritage sites cancelled thanks to the mobilisation capacities of those responsible for conservation.

Table 5. Information management			
Problems	**Expected results**	**Assistance Modules and Projects**	**Indicators**
• Lack of adequate documentation at the sites; • Lack of World Heritage information and management exchange capacities.	1. Documentation on the World Heritage sites (cartography, state of conservation, etc.) updated and integrated in the Nomination Dossiers; 2. Strengthened capacities for World Heritage information management; 3. Establishment of a WEB site in Arabic for better diffusion of information on World Heritage.	■ **Module 1.1** Digitalisation and updating of the cartography of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List; ■ **Module 1.2** Assistance to the national authorities for the establishment of a national documentation and information centre on the Convention, and creation of a focal point on its use ■ **Module 1.3** Development of procedures and assistance for the establishment of a regular monitoring system for a property inscribed on the World Heritage List ■ **Project 1.1** Capacity-building for World Heritage information management in the Arab States[14]	• Number of World Heritage sites with updated cartography being used in the daily management of a property; • Number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List whose perimeters and buffer zones have been redefined since listing; • Number of conservators trained in information management techniques (GIS, databases, etc); • Number of monthly contacts on the Arabic WEB site containing information on the World Heritage Convention and the properties inscribed on the List in the Arab Region.

14. This Project, due to take place over a period of 18 months, is currently being implemented, thanks to a contribution from the Flemish authorities. It includes the development of a WEB site in Arabic on World Heritage and databases for better management of the sites and the implementation of the Convention. The training of national specialists in the use of information management software, such as GIS or ACCESS is also foreseen.

2.5. Resources and calendar for the implementation of the Regional Programme

The logic of the Regional Programme is based on the voluntary adhesion of the States Parties which can decide, in accordance with their priorities, if and when they wish to establish the national programme and, consequently, to benefit from the International Assistance Modules and the proposed Projects. Therefore, it is difficult to accurately define the budgetary resources required and the calendar for the implementation of the Regional Programme.

Based on past experience and taking into account the recent figures of the World Heritage Fund, we know that each year approximately US$ 200,000 to 250,000 is allocated to the Arab States through international assistance. Furthermore, the Committee approved a special amount of US$ 200,000 for the execution of Special Programmes[15], a part of which could benefit Arab countries, and US$ 100,000 (for 2004-2005) to assist the Palestinian Authorities in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of Palestine (although this was on an exceptional basis). Additional amounts (US$ 30,000 to 40,000) are allocated each year by the Committee for the follow-up to the Periodic Reports and the Global Strategy.

In addition, extra-budgetary sources were mobilised to support activities in the Arab States. They include more than one million US dollars in the framework of a World Bank project for the rehabilitation of four ancient cities in Mauritania; approximately US$ 280,000 for scientific cooperation for the World Bank cultural project in Lebanon; approximately US$ 100,000 from the Italian funds-in-trust to support expert missions and small-scale projects in Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Sudan; US$ 40,000 from a Dutch funds-in-trust (Yemen and this Regional Programme) and approximately US$ 20,000 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Agreement for expert missions to Mauritania, Syrian Arab Republic, etc.

It is possible that, in the near future, some of the wealthier Arab countries of the Gulf Region might wish to contribute towards the strengthening of the implementation of the Convention in the region. In the event that this tendency is maintained, and that the States Parties are willing to participate in the activities of the Regional Programme by developing their own national programmes, (as explained in paragraph 3.3 above), it is conceivable that at least US$ 500,000 will be available each year to assist the Arab States. However, once the Regional Programme is fully operational and all the assistance modules sufficiently developed and available for immediate implementation, additional resources should be identified, in particular from regional donors and partners, thus increasing the annual budget for the Arab countries to US$ 600,000-700,000, or more.

In accordance with these calculations, Table 6 hereafter illustrates the appropriate timetable for the implementation of the Regional Programme over a six-year period, corresponding to the *Periodic Reporting* cycle.

---

15. To date, the Committee has approved four Programmes: Historic Cities, Earthen Architecture, Forests and Tourism.

Table 6. Provisional timetable for the implementation of the Regional Programme over a six-year period[16]		
2004	**2005**	**2006**
■ Approval of the Regional Programme by the Committee (completed); ■ Integrated and developed assistance modules (nearing completion); ■ Comprehensive projects defined (nearing completion).	■ First regional meeting of the Monitoring Committee for the presentation of the Programme Strategy[17] ■ States Parties develop their national programme for the implementation of the Regional Programme ■ Modules and Projects are refined in accordance with the needs of the different countries ■ Additional resources are identified to support the projects ■ Implementation of the Regional Programme begins	■ States Parties develop their national programme for the implementation of the Regional Programme; ■ Continued implementation of the Regional Programme.

2007	**2008**	**2009**
■ Continued implementation of the Regional Programme.	■ Arab States prepare and submit their second Periodic Reports; ■ The Monitoring Committee (see Chapter 3.4) meets and evaluates the progress of the Regional Programme. Recommendations are made; ■ Continued implementation of the Regional Programme.	■ States Parties develop their national programme for the implementation of the Regional Programme; ■ Continued implementation of the Regional Programme.

16. Years of the Periodic Reporting and meetings of the Monitoring Committee are shaded.
17. As soon as the designing of the modules and projects will have been completed, the World Heritage Centre will organise the first regional meeting at the regional level in order to present the programme to its counterparts for comments and feedback.

Table 7. **National programme**

The National Programmes comprise a selection of assistance modules and projects, adapted according to the specific needs of the State Party. The definition of these Programmes could form a specific international assistance request.

Table 8. **International Assistance Module (Example)**

National training workshop on procedures for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List

Beneficiaries	10-15 national specialists in the heritage field, involved in the implementation of the Convention in their countries.
Expected results	Upon completion of the workshop, the participants will have acquired a very good understanding of the concepts and procedures relating to the nomination of a property to the World Heritage List, and will be capable of preparing a dossier satisfying the minimal requirements for acceptation by the World Heritage Centre. Thanks to precise examples, the concepts of serial and transborder sites and site extensions will be addressed as well as essential definitions and criteria.
Modalities for execution	The week-long workshop is built around theoretical and practical sessions, including site visits. The participants will be guided through the inscription process of a site thanks to the specific training Kit and following interactive discussions with the Workshop Coordinator and three resource persons. At the end of the workshop, the draft inscription dossiers will be prepared for selected case studies. Earlier nomination dossiers of World Heritage sites will be examined and action plans will be established for their update.
Partnership	ICCROM has been chosen as the partner responsible for the execution of the Assistance Module because of its experience of the Convention (as Advisory Body) and its long tradition in the field of training. Furthermore, at the request of the Secretariat, ICCROM has recently produced a Training Kit specifically conceived for the nomination process.
Budget	An approximate cost of US$ 30,000 is expected for the execution of this Module. This budget includes travel and board and lodging costs, the fees for four experts for the workshop week in addition to a preparatory week, as well as the local logistical costs (meeting room, equipment, transport, board, etc.). Lodging and internal transport costs for the participants should be covered by the local authorities. A more precise budget can be provided in accordance with the context of the country benefiting from the activity.

4

Conclusions

Conclusions

The *Periodic Reporting* exercise was introduced by the World Heritage Committee to "monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties." The first conclusion drawn from *Periodic Reporting* in the Arab States, however, is that it does not, as it is conceived now, conform to the idea that "experts" have of monitoring.

According to professional theory and practice, monitoring should be a continuous process carried out at the site level by local staff, and based on regular control of specific indicators against an established baseline condition. Clearly, this is not the case for *Periodic Reporting*, which takes place every six years and discusses issues such as whether the State Party considers that the site has maintained its original values and integrity, what statement of significance would be more appropriate, which projects are on going or are foreseen, what are the needs of the site in terms of funding and human resources, etc.

Indeed, assessing the state of conservation of World Heritage properties in the Arab States would be very problematic, even for those responsible at the site level, in the absence of a survey of the condition of the property since the time of its inscription on the List. In this respect *Periodic Reporting* sheds light on one of the major weaknesses of the system, at least from its early years until 1993: the inadequacy of almost all the Nomination Files in terms of the description of the properties and the justification for their inscription on the List.

It is important to understand, therefore, that the objective of *Periodic Reporting* is not so much the actual state of conservation of the sites, but rather the way in which States Parties manage them. This latter information was of the utmost importance as it provided the Committee with a general overview of the degree of implementation of the Convention in the Arab Region, which enabled the definition of a strategy of action and a more effective use of resources.

The *Periodic Reporting* exercise, in particular, allowed the identification of the main issues and active factors affecting the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties of the Region. Among the various issues, which were recognised, one of the most important is certainly the lack of an adequate capacity in managing and conserving the heritage resources, and particularly of knowledge of the WH Convention, its main concepts and procedures. This was apparent from the statements of the States Parties in the Periodic reports, as compared with the reality on the ground.

For this reason, the Regional Programme developed in Chapter three, which introduces a very innovative and pro-active approach to the implementation of the Convention, focuses mainly on capacity building, with a view to facilitating as much as possible States Parties in their interaction with the World Heritage Convention.

The lessons learnt from this *Periodic Reporting* will be certainly taken in due account in view of the next cycle. The questionnaires, as an example, will have to be re-drafted and simplified in a language more easily understandable to persons who are not entirely familiar with the jargon of the Convention. More attention will have to be paid to issues such as the definition of boundaries of the WH property and its buffer zone, the values that justified the inscription of the sites on the List and the specific measures taken to ensure their conservation.

In general, this first exercise conducted for the Arab States has provided a number of very interesting and useful indications, which have benefited the implementation of the Periodic Reporting for other regions in the following years. Through the feedback provided for the elaboration of the Regional Programme, moreover, *Periodic Reporting* has initiated a completely new way of working within the Convention and contributed to achieving significant progress in its implementation.

Appendix

Map of World Heritage
properties in
the Arab Region: 2003

Map of World Heritage Properties in the Arab Region (2003)

Syrian Arab
Republic

Ancient City of Aleppo

Quadi Qadisha
Byblos
Tyre
Anjar

Site of Palmyra

Ashur

Baalbek

Ancient City of Damascus

Lebanon

Ancient City of Bosra

Hatra

Old City of Jerusalem

Iraq

Qusair Amra

Petra

Abu Mena

Islamic Cairo

Jordan

Kuwait

Memphis and
Its Necropolis

Saint Catherine Area

Bahrain

Ancient Thebes
with Its Necropolis

Qatar

Egypt

Archaeological Sites of
Bat, Al-Khutm and Al-Ayn

Nubian monuments
from Abu Simbel
to Philae

UAE

Sult. of
Oman

Bahla Fort

Saudi Arabia

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary

Frankicense Trail

Gebel Barkal and the Sites
of the Napatan Region

Old City
of Sana'a

Old Walled City
of Shibam

Yemen

Historic Town
of Zabid

Sudan

Legend:

World Heritage Properties in Danger