

Distribution limited

WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7

Paris, 02 December 2004

Original : English/French

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Seventh Extraordinary Session**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II  
6 – 11 December 2004**

**Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: Adjustments to the Budget 2004-2005**

**Information documents**

**SUMMARY**

This document provides information on the two following subjects :

- Analysis by the Advisory Bodies of the funds required for their services
- Retrospective Inventory of inscribed properties and development of an advanced mapping server

## **Analysis by the Advisory Bodies of the funds required for their services**

### **I. Introduction**

1. Over the years, the three Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee, IUCN, ICOMOS, and ICCROM, have tried to supply the highest quality of advice and support for the World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, States Parties, and other actors in the World Heritage system. All three Advisory Bodies have found in recent years that the workload associated with World Heritage has risen dramatically. An increase in the number and length of statutory, scientific and administrative meetings has meant larger amounts of staff time and materials devoted to World Heritage. In addition, the trend to work more strategically, while very positive, has also meant more time in planning, analysis, and strategy development.
2. For IUCN and ICOMOS, the increase in complexity and numbers of nominations has also led to rising costs, and the need to rely more on unpaid contributions of members of their international networks of experts. This is aggravated by the fact that nominations are often of poor quality, demanding additional research from the Advisory Bodies. The high quality of the evaluations is dependent, not only on the mission carried out to the property, but also on consultation with other experts knowledgeable about the property, consultation of documentation, and the final decision by the World Heritage Panels of each Organization.
3. For these reasons, the Advisory Bodies are asking the World Heritage Committee re-examine the funds allocated for the various services they provide. It is hoped that this re-examination will lead to the allocation of funding for the 2006 – 2007 biennium, closer to the real costs that the Advisory Bodies incur in undertaking their work for the implementation of the *Convention*.

### **II. IUCN Budget Considerations**

4. The work carried out by IUCN under the *World Heritage Convention* has increased considerably in recent years, both in complexity and quantity, demanding significant amounts of professional support and expert time.
5. Table 2 below provides an analysis of the funding for IUCN advisory services (not including reactive monitoring or training activities):
  - Column 1 provides details of the current funding provided from the World Heritage Fund for IUCN's advisory services in 2004;
  - Column 2 gives the amount needed for IUCN to maintain its current level of involvement;
  - Column 3 shows the overall increment required;

- Column 4 provides the details of the actual unpaid contribution of IUCN and WCPA experts to the *World Heritage Convention*.

6. **Evaluations:**

IUCN's evaluation process usually involves one expert to carry out the field mission and prepare the draft evaluation report, plus input from independent expert reviewers. At present, the field evaluators receive a small honorarium of between US\$ 500 and US\$ 1 000 for missions lasting between four and eight days (some missions can last up to two weeks, depending on the size and complexity of and access to the property), and up to an additional six days of work in reviewing and researching material, and preparing the report. In addition to this, an average of ten international experts are solicited to carry out desk reviews of each nomination. So far, this is a completely voluntary process; however experts are increasingly noting that they cannot maintain this level of involvement in future on a voluntary basis.

7. The real cost of engaging international experts for this amount of time would be US\$ 8 000 per nomination, as shown in Table 1 below. The voluntary contribution of experts (considering that up to US\$ 1 000 is paid), mainly from the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), is therefore worth at least US\$ 7 000 per nomination. It is no longer possible for IUCN to continuously request voluntary input from top international experts within its networks and expect the highest quality of research and reporting. Although the correct market fee would be US\$ 500 per day, from now on, IUCN is proposing to pay its experts US\$ 200 per day for all missions and meetings attended.

**Table 1: Real cost for international experts evaluating one new nomination**  
(average fee US\$ 500 p/day)

|                                                                                   |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 2 days preparation prior to mission                                               | US\$ 1,000        |
| 6 days on mission (including travel)<br>(missions can range from 4 to 14 days)    | US\$ 3,000        |
| 4 days to prepare final report and communicate with IUCN and World Heritage Panel | US\$ 2,500        |
| 5 independent external expert reviewers<br>(average fee US\$ 300 /review/day)     | US\$ 1,500        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                                                      | <b>US\$ 8,000</b> |

8. As part of the evaluation process for natural Heritage nominations, the UNEP - World Conservation Monitoring Centre prepares detailed datasheets on every site, which are checked by the States Parties and made available on the Internet when sites are inscribed. Every year UNEP-WCMC is subsidizing the World Heritage work by more than US\$ 11,000 (depending the number of nominations) when resources are not available. UNEP-WCMC has made it clear to IUCN that this situation cannot continue.

9. The number of nominations received by IUCN each year for evaluation and the complexity of nominations have increased over the past five years. This relates in particular to the increasing numbers of Cultural Landscapes and complex serial properties. Unfortunately, the quality of nominations has not improved thus adding sometimes considerable work to the evaluation process. For very large or complex sites, additional time is required and quite often two experts for the field mission. Some examples include the Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas and the Cape Floral Region of South Africa. Additional resources are required to ensure a thorough examination of such dossiers.
10. In addition, IUCN is requested to review new information received for an average of five properties per year that were previously referred or deferred by the Committee, or for minor extensions. No funding is currently provided for this work, which requires technical inputs from a number of independent experts. In terms of Cultural Landscapes, in 2002/2003, IUCN reviewed six Cultural Landscape nominations, and in 2003/2004, nine such nominations. Again no specific funding is provided for this work. This is of concern as IUCN is aware that a number of new Cultural Landscape and serial nominations are under preparation by States Parties.
11. **Meetings:**  
The number of meetings in which IUCN is requested to participate is growing. These include meetings of the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies, meetings on periodic reporting, preparation, review or harmonization of Tentative lists, thematic meetings (e.g. geological heritage, marine heritage), and various other technical meetings. On most occasions, no funds are provided beyond travel and per diem for expert time and the preparation of presentations. In addition, IUCN is requested to participate in some of these meetings at the very last moment, creating pressures on coordination activities. IUCN cannot guarantee its participation and effective involvement in such meetings without adequate resourcing.
12. **Advisory Services:**  
Due to the increased workload and complexity of the work, IUCN staff across the whole of the Union (including Regional and Country Offices and other Global Thematic Programmes) are regularly contributing professional technical support for World Heritage activities. Technical review of International Assistance Requests (55 by October 2004) requires staff time of up to half a day for each request as well as regional expertise. This is currently unpaid but essential in maintaining the credibility of IUCN's advice. The participation in meetings for developing or reviewing Tentative Lists, following the request of the Committee for Advisory Bodies to work more 'upstream', requires considerable technical input that is currently not paid for. In order to maintain the standards expected by the Committee and to actively support States Parties, it is necessary to provide additional funds for this work.

13. **Overheads:**

The IUCN official policy is to charge 17% of the total project budget for overheads. This is in line with other organizations. Up until now IUCN has made an exception for the World Heritage contract, charging only about 10%. However, it is necessary to increase this amount to 12% of the total budget in future.

14. In order to integrate the expenses indicated in Table 2, a total of US\$ 137,109 should be added each year. For the biennium 2004 / 2005, IUCN was allocated US\$ 693,870 for Advisory Services. For the biennium 2006 / 2007, it would be required that the budget be increased to US\$ 693,870 + US\$ 274,218 = US\$ 968,088, representing an increase of 39% compared with the 2004-2005 biennium. If this is not the case, IUCN will need to seek guidance from the Committee on what work to drop and how to select a limited number of nominations that can be handled within the existing budget.

**Table 2: Analysis of annual Funding for IUCN World Heritage Advisory Services**

|          | All figures in US\$                                                              | 1                  | 2                            | 3         | 4                                   |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|
|          |                                                                                  | UNESCO<br>CONTRACT | PROPOSED<br>AMOUNT<br>NEEDED | INCREMENT | ESTIMATED<br>UNPAID<br>CONTRIBUTION |
| <b>1</b> | <b>Evaluations of Nominations</b>                                                |                    |                              |           |                                     |
| 1A       | Evaluation missions: Travel and Per diem (15 missions in 2004)                   | 34,800             | 45,000                       | 10,200    | -                                   |
| 1B       | Fees/Honorarium for evaluators, WCPA network input                               | 24,000             | 40,000                       | 16,000    | 105,000                             |
| 1C       | UNEP-WCMC Services - datasheets for natural sites, global comparative analyses   | 30,000             | 41,562                       | 11,562    | 11,562                              |
| 1D       | Meetings of the IUCN World Heritage Panel (2 meetings)                           | 12,350             | 15,000                       | 2,650     | 10,500                              |
| 1E       | Review of deferred / referred nominations, minor extensions (average 5 per year) | -                  | 1,500                        | 1,500     | 1,500                               |
| 1F       | Review of Cultural Landscapes (average 5 per year)                               | -                  | 1,500                        | 1,500     | 1,500                               |
| 1G       | Documentation, Printing and Translation                                          | 22,135             | 25,500                       | 2,865     | 5,000                               |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Statutory and other meetings</b>                                              |                    |                              |           |                                     |
| 2A       | Meeting of the World Heritage Committee (2 meetings)                             | 13,400             | 20,000                       | 6,600     | 7,000                               |
| 2B       | Meetings of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies (4 meetings)           | 5,000              | 5,000                        | -         | 2,000                               |
| 2C       | Other World Heritage meetings: Travel and Per diem                               | 2,100              | 6,000                        | 3,900     | 8,000                               |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Global Strategy</b>                                                           |                    |                              |           |                                     |
| 3A       | Analysis of the List and Tentative Lists                                         | 10,500             | 10,500                       | -         | -                                   |

|    |                                                                                                       |                |                |                |                |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 3B | Global Thematic Studies                                                                               | 16,350         | 16,350         | -              | -              |
| 4  | <b>Advisory Services</b>                                                                              |                |                |                |                |
| 4A | Professional Support - coordination of evaluation and Global Strategy process                         | 142,700        | 192,700        | 50,000         | 12,000         |
| 4B | Examination of International Assistance Requests @ US\$13 (55 reviewed by Oct.04)                     | -              | 7,800          | 7,800          | 7,800          |
| 4C | Professional input of Regional / Country Offices + other Global Programmes                            | -              | 10,000         | 10,000         | 8,000          |
| 4D | IUCN working upstream to support States Parties in implementation of <i>World Heritage Convention</i> | -              | 5,000          | 5,000          | 8,000          |
| 5  | <b>Overheads</b>                                                                                      |                |                |                |                |
| 5A | Overheads / communications                                                                            | 34,850         | 42,382         | 7,532          | 25,191         |
| 5B | Contingency (fluctuation of US\$, additional missions, unforeseen expenses)                           | 5,000          | 5,000          | -              | -              |
|    | <b>Total Advisory Services</b>                                                                        | <b>353,185</b> | <b>490,294</b> | <b>137,109</b> | <b>213,053</b> |

### III. ICOMOS Budget Considerations

15. The work carried out by ICOMOS, in its capacity as Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee, continues to grow and demands more human resources and expert time.
16. The examination of the nominations to the World Heritage List has evolved and each stage requires a greater investment in terms of time and often input by a greater variety of specialists. Nominations are more complex, and the request for improving the quality of evaluations in terms of both level of information and analysis of the properties, requires increased time and resources.
17. Missions to larger properties, serial nominations, transboundary nominations, and less accessible properties have a particular impact on the workload and costs of field missions. For 2005 alone, the additional cost for the missions thus generated represents US\$ 30,000 while the number of nominations has remained practically the same as in 2004. The ICOMOS experts who carry out these missions thoroughly prepare and submit reports, which are increasingly comprehensive, and require the study of more complicated nomination dossiers, complementary research, contact with other experts, etc. Until now, these experts have always carried out the missions on a purely voluntary basis. ICOMOS can not continuously call upon unpaid experts, and must from now on pay them up to a maximum of US\$ 200 per day spent on mission. It should be noted that the examination of each nomination calls for documentation research and consultation of external specialists in very specific fields. This procedure has to be applied

systematically and the World Heritage Committee must be able to rely on the contribution of the best specialists.

18. The ICOMOS evaluation Panel comprises a large group of experts who travel to Paris and spend several days discussing the new nominations, all on their own time and cost. This often means that there is poor geographic representation on this panel and that we can not ensure the participation of the most appropriate experts.
19. The review of the International Assistance requests submitted by States Parties to the World Heritage Fund is an activity, which has been developing over the last years. It requires skills, which deserve to be compensated at a rate of US\$ 130 for each request examined. At present this activity is undertaken by ICOMOS on an unpaid basis.
20. Finally, since 1997, a given percentage of the ICOMOS contract is attributed to the Advisory Body under the chapter "Indirect Costs". This percentage represents the totality of costs incurred by the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. It has dropped from 20% in 1997 to 10% in 2003 whilst simultaneously the global expenses incurred by ICOMOS have continuously risen. It is necessary to restore the balance of this trend and to bring this percentage back to a minimum of 12%, which represents an increase of about US\$ 10 000 on the global annual budget.

**Table 3: Analysis of annual Funding for ICOMOS World Heritage Advisory Services**

All figures US \$

| <u><b>WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION 2004</b></u>           | <b>PAID<br/>UNESCO<br/>Contract 2004</b> | <b>UNPAID</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>1. Evaluation Nominations</b>                       |                                          |               |              |
| a- Coordination (Advisers)                             | 59,000                                   | 0             | 59,000       |
| b- Missions (Experts at US\$ 200/day)                  | 62,000                                   | 22,000        | 84,000       |
| c- Staff                                               | 131,000                                  | 0             | 131,000      |
| d- Preparation and reproduction documents              | 56,500                                   | 0             | 56,500       |
| e- Additional costs linked to complexity of properties |                                          | 30,000        | 30,000       |
| f- External assistance to finalize evaluations         |                                          | 7,500         | 7,500        |
| Sub-total Evaluation Nominations                       | 308,500                                  | 59,500        | 368,000      |
| <b>2. Statutory and other Meetings</b>                 |                                          |               |              |
| World Heritage Committee meeting / Advisory            | 20,500                                   | 0             | 20,500       |
| Panel meeting                                          | 15,000                                   | 42,000        | 57,000       |

|                                                                              |                |                |                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>3. Global Strategy</b>                                                    |                |                |                |
| Global Strategy                                                              | 30,000         | 0              | 30,000         |
| Analysis of the World Heritage List                                          | 15,000         | 0              | 15,000         |
| <b>4. Advisory services</b>                                                  |                |                |                |
| Examination of International Assistance requests (65 in 2004): US\$ 130 each | 0              | 8,500          | 8,500          |
| <b>5. Overheads</b>                                                          |                |                |                |
| Indirect Costs (Office & Miscellaneous)                                      | 51,000         | 10,000         | 61,000         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                                                 | <b>440,000</b> | <b>120,000</b> | <b>560,000</b> |

21. For the 2006-2007 biennium, we have established a budget of US\$ 965,000 which does not take into account the additional costs incurred by the more complex missions (US\$30,000) and the expenses mentioned above. In order to integrate the expenses indicated in the table above, a sum of US\$ 120,000 should be added for each year, that is US\$ 240,000 for the biennium 2006-2007.
22. For the biennium 2004-2005, ICOMOS was allocated US\$ 876,500. For the biennium 2006-2007, it would be desirable if the budget was to be increased to  $965,000 + 240,000 = \text{US\$}1\,205,000$ , representing an increase of 37, 50% compared with the 2004-2005 biennium.
23. With reference to the conclusions of the analysis of the World Heritage List and the Tentative Lists carried out by ICOMOS and to the decisions of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS is preparing a programme of activities which will be submitted to the next session of the Committee in 2005, and the costs of which are not included in the proposed 2006-2007 budget.

#### IV. ICCROM Budget Considerations

24. ICCROM as an Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee has contributed in many ways to the *World Heritage Convention*. Over the past years, the demands of working in this capacity of Advisory Body have increased as there have been more statutory meetings, more scientific development of the *Convention*, and more work related to the better administration and implementation of the *Convention* (revision of the *Operational Guidelines*, Periodic Reporting, Global Strategy, Global Training Strategy, etc.).

25. The following list summarizes the areas of contributed time of ICCROM staff for providing advisory services to the World Heritage Committee:
- participation in statutory meetings,
  - participation in planning and scientific meetings;
  - review of requests for technical assistance;
  - development of the Global Training Strategy;
  - involvement with and review of scientific issues;
  - general coordination and preparation of documentation for the Committee.
26. For the 2004 – 2005 biennium, ICCROM will receive a total of US\$ 94,600 from the World Heritage Committee for its participation as an Advisory Body. This funding is used for costs associated with travel to statutory, planning, and some scientific meetings, professional services for outside consultants who are part of our network to represent ICCROM at some scientific meetings, and costs for part-time support for organizing ICCROM's World Heritage work.
27. In addition, ICCROM contributes a great deal of its own staff time to World Heritage work. In 2003, the last year for which a complete accounting can be made, the following ICCROM staff took part in various aspects of implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*:
- Nicholas Stanley-Price, Director General
  - Herb Stovel, World Heritage Coordinator/Unit Director, Heritage Settlements
  - Joseph King, Senior Project Manager
  - Kumiko Shimotsuma, Project Manager
  - Sonia Widmer, Administrative Assistant
28. The total estimated staff time contributed by ICCROM staff during 2003 follows as Table 4.

**Table 4: Estimated staff time contributed by ICCROM staff during 2003**

| <b>Activity</b>                                                                                                                                                           | <b>Total Number of Person/Days</b> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Participation in Bureau and Committee meetings, Advisory Bodies meetings, and other related preparatory meetings and activities, and preparation of supporting documents. | 68 person/days                     |
| Involvement in review of requests for international assistance                                                                                                            | 27 person/days                     |
| Involvement in development and implementation of global training strategy                                                                                                 | 20 person/days                     |
| Involvement in the review of scientific issues and themes pertinent to the World Heritage Committee                                                                       | 24 person/days                     |

|                                                 |                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Overall coordination and preparation of reports | 44 person/days                       |
| <b>Total Number of Person/Days</b>              | <b>183 person days = US\$ 31,550</b> |

29. Taking into account the involvement of the various levels of staff, ICCROM has estimated that in 2003, its unpaid contribution was US\$ 31,550 towards the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.
30. In addition ICCROM has worked in partnership with the World Heritage Centre in the implementation of many training activities and programmes aimed at the better conservation of World Heritage properties. To take one example, in 2003, the World Heritage Fund contributed US\$ 100,000 and ICCROM, US\$ 122,796, towards the implementation of the AFRICA 2009 programme which benefits the conservation of immovable heritage properties (including World Heritage properties) in Africa. ICCROM was also able to leverage an additional US\$ 995,000 for the implementation of that programme from other sources.
31. Unlike the IUCN and ICOMOS, ICCROM does not deal with nominations and has a lesser role related to State of Conservation reporting. Nevertheless, the increase in activities of the *Convention*, while welcome, has also had an impact on ICCROM staff time and administrative and communication costs.
32. In looking at the 2006 – 2007 biennium, ICCROM will continue to make its staff time available as necessary to fulfill its obligation as an Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee. It also must take into account that as demands grow for scientific and planning meetings associated with World Heritage, ICCROM will most likely need to rely more on its outside network of experts. This use of its network will have cost implications. ICCROM also recognizes that the continued decline in the value of the US Dollar against the Euro has caused problems because most costs are incurred in Euro.
33. For this reason, ICCROM is requesting a 5% increase for the 2006 – 2007 biennium (from US\$ 94,600 to US\$ 99,330). ICCROM does, however, recognize the existing pressures on the World Heritage Fund and would be ready to further discuss the issue.

# **Project Proposal: Better Heritage Management through Better Data: Retrospective Inventory of Inscribed Properties and Development of an Advanced Mapping Server**

## **I. Background**

Since the first properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978, the information requested in the nomination format about each site has changed significantly. Nomination files accepted in earlier years, often without maps or boundaries of the property being protected, do not reflect the current needs of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre, or the property itself to monitor change. Nominations can be incomplete due to:

- absence of baseline data necessary to identify, protect, and monitor properties -- especially maps that should have identifying boundaries and buffer zones, statements of significance justifying the use of specific criteria, and other standard elements of modern World Heritage nominations;
- absence of identifying information for properties now considered "serial" properties (two or more properties thematically linked but geographically separated);
- changes to the nomination dossier made after the first submission, whether at the request of the State Party itself, or on the suggestion of the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies, or the World Heritage Committee;
- certain materials, especially large-format maps and other graphic material, were not duplicated from the archive established at the UNESCO-ICOMOS Documentation Centre for the World Heritage Centre, when the latter was established in 1992.

These lacunae limit the Centre's ability to assist World Heritage properties and compromise the results of the periodic reporting process requested by the 29th General Conference of UNESCO (1997) and approved by the World Heritage Committee in 1998. As a result, the World Heritage Centre staff often must make decisions based on incomplete information about the true nature of inscribed World Heritage properties. Too often, missions are undertaken to properties without an accurate understanding of their nature or their geographical extent. As a result, the timely opportunity of flagging these lacunae with the State Party is lost.

## **II. Retrospective Inventory**

This Programme proposes a retrospective inventory of nomination dossiers of World Heritage properties inscribed between 1978 and 1998, when the World Heritage Centre Documentation Unit began to compile inventories of all nominations received. In so doing, it will identify critical omissions in, or losses from, the dossiers of inscribed properties. In particular, it will identify the presence or absence of maps, their quality,

boundary definitions, the area in hectares of each property, the nature (single area, serial, linear, etc) of the property inscribed and its component parts. Furthermore, it will identify World Heritage Committee or Advisory Bodies statements that may be considered elements of a "Statement of Significance."

This information will become part of the baseline data used in the periodic reporting process and other monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee.

### **III. GIS and Public Mapping Component**

Understanding the size and dimensions of heritage properties is critical to the protection as well as the effective management of World Heritage properties at international, national and local levels. In connection with the retrospective inventory, the World Heritage Centre will digitize its existing maps, where necessary requesting new maps, to allow the assembly of a digital inventory of the boundaries of all World Heritage properties. The new World Heritage web site will be expanded to include a map server capable of displaying the boundaries of all World Heritage properties. The ability to display and share boundary data will allow other agencies to incorporate World Heritage properties boundaries in their planning efforts and in disaster-preparedness.

As the most effective means of repairing the omissions or losses is to request this information from States Parties as part of the cycle of Periodic Reporting, the work will be undertaken by region. As a pilot project; the region currently being examined in the First cycle of Periodic Reporting (2001-2006), Europe/North America, is already being studied: In the second cycle of Periodic Reporting (dates to be determined), the Retrospective Inventory will build on data submitted in the first cycle.

Based on the inventory report, separate requests will be made to States Parties outlining in detail the requested information. Where maps are requested, national mapping agency and appropriate map scales will be specified.

It is estimated that a small percentage of States Parties may need technical assistance to complete the mapping requests. The project envisions that 10-20 percent of States Parties may not be able to respond without assistance. Funds for technical missions will be made available; wherever possible combining this assistance with missions already scheduled.

The project will build on data already received from the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, incorporating the data into the existing database of inscribed properties.

### **IV. Internet Map Server**

It is anticipated that an Internet map server will be added to the existing World Heritage web site in the second half of 2005, with the assistance of ESRI, a global leader in Geographical Information System (GIS) and Internet mapping. In-kind software and support is being sought from the company at this time.

## V. Time Frame

The project's pilot phase, covering Europe and North America, commenced in November 2004 and will be completed in April 2005. Succeeding phases will be conducted in tandem with the first four-phases of the second cycle of periodic reporting cycle, as noted below:

|                 |                                      |                            |   |   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| Phase I (pilot) | Europe/North America, cycle 1        | November 2004 - April 2005 |   |   |
| Phase II        | Arab States, cycle 2                 | Dates being discussed      |   |   |
| Phase III       | Africa, cycle 2                      | "                          | " | " |
| Phase IV        | Asia / Pacific, cycle 2              | "                          | " | " |
| Phase V         | Latin America and Caribbean, cycle 2 | "                          | " | " |