

Reports and Papers

- [Final Report of the Task Force, submitted 12 May 2000](#)
[Rapport du Groupe d'étude sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial](#)
- [Report on the Meeting of the Task Force at UNESCO Headquarters, 17 April 2000](#)
- [Comments of ICCROM](#)
- [Comments of the Belgian Delegation](#)
- [Recommended Changes to the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention](#)
Draft Discussion Paper, submitted 31/03/2000
- [Comments of ICCROM](#)
- [Comments of the Belgian Delegation](#)
- [Draft Report](#) 22 February 2000
- [Comments from IUCN to the Task Force](#)
- [Draft Report of Rapporteur](#)
- [Report of the Meeting of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, 21 February 2000](#)

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

RAPPORT DU GROUPE D'ÉTUDE SUR LA MISE EN OUVRE DE LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

FINAL

Executive Summary

Terms of Reference

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

To identify and propose for consideration of the Bureau in June 2000 priority practical measures for more effective operation of the Convention taking account of pressure over the next 10 years. Those measures, some of which would be applicable in preparation of and during the Committee meeting of December 2000, will focus on:

- The organisation and running of the statutory meetings,
- The procedures for decision making,
- The information and documentation management
- The Operational Guidelines

The Task Force will take into account and build upon all discussions in previous General Assembly, Committee and Bureau meetings, the management review and financial audit, and proposals made by State Parties.

Membership

The Task Force was chaired by Canada and included Australia, Belgium, Hungary, Morocco, Mexico, South Africa, Thailand, and the advisory bodies (ICOMOS,

ICCROM and IUCN) and a representative of the World Heritage Centre. Australia acted as rapporteur.

Working Methods

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

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

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

Process

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

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

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

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

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

Explanatory Notes

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

- ‘A’ Priority practical measures that the Bureau can decide upon at its June meeting. These might be implemented for the December 2000 meeting of the Committee in order to ensure visible results of benefit to the Committee
- ‘B’ Measures that the Bureau could submit to the Committee for Decision, either in their present form or with further work by the Task Force before the December 2000 meeting.
- ‘C’ Ideas which need more time for examination. The Bureau may recommend to the Committee the establishment of possible new processes to pursue these issues.

A summary table is presented for convenience.

CONTENTS

MEMBERSHIP

WORKING METHODS

A: Summary table of recommendations

B: Issues and Recommendations

1 STATUTORY MEETINGS *

1.1 General Assembly of States Parties *

1.2 Bureau Meetings [*](#)

1.3 Committee Meetings [*](#)

2. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES [*](#)

2.1 Strategic Planning [*](#)

2.2 Tentative Lists [*](#)

2.3 Nominations [*](#)

2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List [*](#)

2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation [*](#)

2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List [*](#)

2.7 World Heritage Fund [*](#)

3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT [*](#)

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents [*](#)

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites [*](#)

4. OTHER MATTERS 21

4.1 THE ROLES OF THE ADVISORY BODIES AND CENTRE 21

4.1 Contract Development and Management [*](#)

Summary table of recommendations

A: Summary table of recommendations

TOPIC	A: For Consideration by Bureau, July 2000	B: For Committee, November 2000	C: For Further Development

<p>1 STATUTORY MEETINGS</p> <p>1.1 General Assembly of States Parties</p>		<p>1.1.1 The following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● strategic policy issues and report on performance; ● implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions ● report on international assistance <p>1.1.2 The Committee hold its regular meeting immediately <u>before</u> the General Assembly</p> <p>1.1.3 The Committee meet immediately <u>after</u> the General Assembly to elect office bearers.</p> <p>1.1.4 To save time during voting in the General Assembly, Secretariat and scrutineers collect ballots instead of inviting participants to come forward and vote. Rotational/ regional voting could be introduced</p>	
<p>1.2 Bureau Meetings</p>	<p>1.2.1 The Task Force on Implementation to continue work after the Bureau meeting in order to develop concrete proposals for a subcommittee system , to start functioning in 2001 and replace the present system of Bureau/ Committee. The Task Force to report on proposals to the Committee in November 2000.</p> <p>1.2.2 On a trial basis (pending any Committee discussion of a sub-Committee structure):</p> <p>the Bureau meeting in November 2000 should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● not discuss or receive presentations on nominations which have been deferred or referred back, but allow them to proceed to the full Committee. ● Enable a working party, prefiguration of a 	<p>1.2.4 Committee agrees to a system of subcommittees to replace the Bureau, meeting only once a year just before the meeting of the Committee (to commence during 2001).</p>	

	<p>subcommittee for the budget, to prepare the discussion of the budget by the Committee in November 2000</p> <p>1.2.3 The Rules of Procedure (22) defining the order and time-limit of speakers should be firmly applied by the Chair.</p>		
<p>1.3 Committee Meetings</p>	<p>1.3.1 The agenda of the Committee should have as a permanent item general strategic policy matters, including the Strategic Plan and its implementation (see 2.1.1).</p> <p>1.3.2 Working documents for the Committee should be distributed 6 weeks prior to meetings and should not be read aloud during the meetings.</p> <p>1.3.3 The Committee agenda should be structured to ensure adequate time for discussion of strategic policy issues shared by States Parties (eg managing tourism impacts, legislative approaches).</p>	<p>1.3.4 The Committee should change its meeting cycle, with every second meeting in Paris prior to the General Assembly of States Parties.</p> <p>1.3.5 Working groups on implementing the Convention should be made open to all States Parties and those relating to decisions to be made by the Committee should be restricted to Committee members.</p> <p>1.3.6 The Committee should refrain from creating too many working parties and from approving, by giving them the support of the Center and of the Advisory Bodies, too many groups or experts meetings established by the State Parties. Furthermore, the mandates of the groups or meetings created or approved by the Committee should be very clear and exclude any overlapping.</p>	<p>1.3.7, 1.3.8. outline potential relations between the Committee and sub-committees on inscriptions, nominations and periodic reporting</p>
<p>2 DECISION-MAKING</p>			
<p>2.1 Strategic Planning</p>		<p>2.1.1 The Committee should commence a review to formulate a Strategic Plan with clear timelines and milestones for the period 2001-2005, based in part on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolution endorsing the Orientations.</p>	

<p>2.2 Tentative Lists</p>	<p>2.2.1 In order to encourage a Committee process of strategic planning, the Bureau reminds all state parties of the necessity to prepare tentative lists and to specify the order in which they would propose the inscription of the sites.</p>		
<p>2.3 Nominations</p>	<p>2.3.1 The Center should implement and distribute to all State Parties, a checklist for the preparation and assessment of nominations to ensure that nominations are complete before they are sent to Advisory Bodies for evaluation.</p> <p>2.3.2 Advisory Bodies should present their recommendations for inscription in a consistent format: assessing outstanding universal value, relationship to the priorities of the Global Strategy, using a check-list to support recommendations, and identifying potential or existing threats and protective actions.</p> <p>2.3.3 The results of Advisory Bodies' evaluations of nominations should be made available to the nominating State Party, whether or not they are members of the Committee, in a timely manner.</p>	<p>2.3.4 Section B of the Operational Guidelines should clarify that incomplete or late nominations are the responsibility of the States Party and will not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle.</p>	
<p>2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List</p>	<p>2.4.1 The agenda for Bureau and Committee meetings should group the presentation of, and decisions on, similar nominations for efficiency.</p> <p>2.4.2 The assessment documents of the Advisory Bodies and Center should be presented in a single summary table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, and rejection).</p>	<p>2.4.3 The Task Force on Implementation should present proposals for the process of treating referral and deferral of nominations for inscription.</p> <p>2.4.4 The number of nominations for inscription that the Committee and the other bodies of the convention examine each year should not exceed [40].</p>	

<p>2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation</p>	<p>2.5.1 Working documents on monitoring should be distributed early to relevant bodies and States Parties, so Committee has time to discuss issues. They should not be read aloud during meetings.</p> <p>2.5.2 Reactive monitoring reports should be presented in a single document in a consistent format to facilitate discussion and consideration (standardised formats).</p> <p>2.5.3 Presentations on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites should be encouraged to use images and maps to improve comprehension.</p>	<p>2.5.4 In reviewing the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee should examine reports on periodic monitoring, focusing on general trends and developing broad strategies to improve the state of conservation.</p> <p>2.5.5 The Task Force on Implementation should prepare between the Bureau of July 2000 and the Committee of 2000 proposals on the reactive monitoring activities including the role of the Centre, advisory bodies and other UNESCO sectors. The Task Force will also prepare Criteria for a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring.</p>	<p>2.5.6 Proposed approach to state of conservation reporting using sub-committees.</p>
<p>2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List</p>		<p>2.6.1 The Committee should develop clear indicators (based on statements of value agreed at inscription) to report on conservation and management. These indicators should be followed in a consistent way (including preparation of checklist to enable comparative analysis).</p> <p>2.6.2 Funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List. For each site on the In Danger list a precise action plan and a reporting mechanism shall be established.</p> <p>2.6.3 Operational Guidelines to more clearly (paras 86 & 87) stress State Party involvement (and where appropriate responsibility) in the action planning process, and the need to designate responsibility for implementing the actions.</p>	<p>2.6.4 The Committee should carry out systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of inscription on the World Heritage in Danger List and related assistance in the protection of sites.</p>

<p>2.7 World Heritage Fund</p>	<p>2.7.1 The Center should present the budget in a single document with several columns according to category of delegation (Chair, Committee, Bureau, Center). The budget proposals should be in line with the strategic priorities. The budget will indicate, per objective of the strategic plan, the resources requested and the results expected. Every 6 months (or every year if the budget becomes biennial), the Centre will present a document reporting on the expenses actually made and the results achieved.</p> <p>2.7.2 Budget items should be supported by related working documents; each working document with budgetary implications should be cross-referenced to the budget.</p> <p>2.7.3 The Bureau should encourage all parties to respect the Operational Guidelines provisions for international assistance especially on deadlines and follow up to previous projects.</p> <p>2.7.4 The Center should identify opportunities to harmonize funding and conclude cooperation agreements with other organizations involved in world heritage activities.</p>	<p>2.7.5 The Committee should allocate international assistance in line with strategic priorities (eg. World Heritage In Danger, Global Strategy). It should consider establishing principles and procedures for assessing requests for international assistance.</p> <p>2.7.6 The Committee should require periodic (every 6 years) independent evaluations to assess the relevance and effectiveness of international assistance, their impact on sites and the balance between natural and cultural sites.</p>	<p>2.7.7 The Committee should move to a biennial budgeting for the World Heritage Fund to harmonize with the UNESCO budget cycle.</p>
<p>3 INFO & DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT</p>			
<p>3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents</p>	<p>3.1.1 Committee documents should be reduced in volume and improved in format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the use of single documents for each agenda item ● table of contents be prepared for long documents ● the same paragraph numbers for English and French versions ● cross-reference documents with the budget and Operational 	<p>3.1.4 The Committee should encourage wide distribution and promotion of information on best conservation practices, including through web linkages.</p> <p>3.1.5 The decisions and resolutions of the Committee and the General Assembly as well as the text of the Global Strategy should be regrouped in one single document. The countries which have just ratified the Convention as well as the new members of the Committee should be handed documents containing complete</p>	<p>3.1.6 Clear rules should be developed to clarify rights of access to documents. Rules to be consistent with the objective of minimising the production and duplication of documentation, while encouraging and supporting transparent and open decision-making.</p>

	<p>Guidelines where appropriate for clarity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● supplementary information tabled at the meeting should be limited to new information ● revisions should be made clear (e.g. bolding, revision mode) ● use of tables instead of plain text to be encouraged ● use of CD ROMs and other electronic media where practical (note some states do not have) ● Decisions should be drafted in such a way to enable monitoring of implementation. <p>The Task Force on Implementation should after the Bureau in July 2000, work with the Centre to identify practical means to achieve such a reduction.</p> <p>3.1.2 Deadlines established for document production and submission of material should be strictly adhered to by all parties. Items should not be referred to the Committee if materials arrive too late for adequate synthesis.</p> <p>3.1.3 All documents/ Access to certain documents to be decided by the Committee in November 2000 should be available in French and in English, including on the internet web site.</p>	<p>information.</p>	
<p>3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites</p>	<p>3.2.1 The Center should initiate a data capture project to seek out all evidence of early Committee activities and integrate them within a contemporary electronic record, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure the survival of a complete record of all Committee decisions and supporting rationale</p>	<p>3.2.2 A report should be prepared for the Committee on the status of the Information Management System improvements being currently undertaken, especially relating to information on sites, and improved strategies for access by all stakeholders identified. The Committee may wish to establish a working group to guide developments.</p> <p>3.2.3 A list of sites for which international assistance has been granted should be published, and</p>	

		updated regularly. The list will report outcomes and results.	
4 OTHER MATTERS			
4.1.The Roles of Advisory Bodies and the Centre	4.1.1 The Committee should review the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies in relation to the Committee, the Center, and possibly UNESCO, leading to MOUs as appropriate.		
4.2 Contract Development and Management		4.2.1 The Committee, as a high priority, should direct the Center to improve the timeliness of contracts and contract payments.	

B: Issues and Recommendations

1. STATUTORY MEETINGS

1.1 General Assembly of States Parties

Issues

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

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

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

Recommendations

1.1.1 B

The following should become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly

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

1.1.2 B

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

1.1.3 B

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

1.1.4 B

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

1.2 Bureau Meetings**Issues**

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

1.2.1 A

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

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

1.2.2 A

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

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

1.2.3 A

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

1.2.4 B

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

1.3 Committee Meetings**Issues**

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

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

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

flexibility has been raised as a concern.

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

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

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

Recommendations

1.3.1 A

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

1.3.2 A

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

1.3.3 A

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

1.3.4 B

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

1.3.5 B

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

1.3.6 B

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

1.3.7 C

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

1.3.8 C

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

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

2. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES**2.1 Strategic Planning****Issues**

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

Recommendations**2.1.1 B**

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

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

2.2 Tentative Lists

Issues

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.2.1 A

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

2.3 Nominations

Issues

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.3.1 A

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

2.3.2 A

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

2.3.3 A

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

2.3.4 B

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

2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List

Issues

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.4.1 A

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

2.4.2 A

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

2.4.3 B

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

2.4.4 B

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

2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation

Issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.5.1 A

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

2.5.2 A

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

2.5.3 A

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

2.5.4 B

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

2.5.5 B

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

2.5.6 C

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

2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List

Issues

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

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

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

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

Recommendation

2.6.1 B

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

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

2.6.2 B

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

2.6.3 B

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

2.6.4 C

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

2.7 World Heritage Fund

Issues

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

The allocation of international assistance is not related to a clear strategic vision and measurable outcomes. Instead it is proposed on case-by-case basis. Percentage allocations to

different categories of aid may inhibit effective use of available funds as allocations are not linked to strategic priorities.

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.7.1 A

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

2.7.2 A

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

2.7.3 A

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

2.7.4 A

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

2.7.5 B

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

procedures for assessing requests for international assistance.

2.7.6 B

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

2.7.7 C

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

3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents

Issues

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

Information is often duplicated and confusing.

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

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

Recommendations

3.1.1 A

Committee documents should be reduced in volume and improved in format

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

- Decisions should be drafted in such a way to enable monitoring of implementation.

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

3.1.2 A

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

3.1.3 A

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

3.1.4 B

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

3.1.5 B

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

3.1.6 C

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

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites

Issues

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

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

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

Reference materials and files for requests (re: international assistance) made before 1992 are

not available for consultation within the offices of the Center and are not necessarily retrievable from UNESCO archives.

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

3.2.1 A

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

3.2.2 B

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

3.2.3 B

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

4 OTHER MATTERS

4.1. The Roles of the Advisory Bodies and Centre

Issue

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

Recommendation

4.1.1 A

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

4.2 Contract Development and Management

Issue

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

Recommendation

4.2.1 B

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

RAPPORT DU GROUPE D'ETUDE SUR LA MISE EN OEUVRE DE LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Résumé analytique

Mandat

Comme convenu par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à Marrakech, le mandat était le suivant :

Définir et proposer pour examen par le Bureau en juin 2000 des mesures pratiques prioritaires pour un fonctionnement plus efficace de la Convention, tenant compte de la pression escomptée dans les dix années à venir. Ces mesures, dont certaines devraient être applicables lors de la préparation et de la tenue de la réunion du Comité de décembre 2000, seraient centrées sur :

- L'organisation et la conduite des réunions statutaires ;
- Les procédures de prise de décision ;
- La gestion de l'information et de la documentation ;
- Les Orientations.

Le Groupe d'étude appuiera ses travaux sur tous les débats des précédentes réunions de l'Assemblée générale, du Comité et du Bureau, ainsi que des rapports des audits financier et de gestion, et des propositions formulées par les Etats parties.

Composition

Le groupe d'étude était présidé par le Canada et comprenait l'Afrique du Sud, l'Australie, la Belgique, la Hongrie, le Maroc, le Mexique, la Thaïlande et les organismes consultatifs (ICOMOS, ICCROM et UICN), et un représentant du Centre du patrimoine mondial. L'Australie en était le rapporteur.

Méthodes de travail

Il a été convenu par le Comité à Marrakech que le groupe d'étude essaierait de travailler en utilisant autant que possible des moyens électroniques. Un site Web a été créé. On a pu y consulter les projets de documents et recevoir des commentaires qui ont entraîné une nouvelle révision. [Au total, cinq projets ont été affichés sur le site avant finalisation du rapport du groupe d'étude.]

Certains membres du groupe d'étude qui étaient invités à la réunion d'experts de Cantorbéry du 10 au 14 avril se sont réunis de manière informelle sous la présidence du Canada. Le Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial (représentant le Maroc), le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, les organismes consultatifs, l'Australie, la Hongrie, ainsi que des observateurs des Etats-Unis et du Royaume-Uni ont participé à cette réunion.

La première réunion du groupe d'étude s'est tenue à l'UNESCO le 17 avril, sous la présidence de l'Australie, avec l'Afrique du Sud pour rapporteur. La réunion comprenait les participants suivants : Afrique du Sud, Australie, Belgique, Bénin, Canada (par téléphone), Egypte, Finlande, Grèce, Hongrie, Centre du patrimoine mondial, ainsi que l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM.

Processus

Le mandat du groupe d'étude n'a pas été totalement rempli et il reste du travail à faire (par exemple l'élaboration d'une proposition concrète au sujet d'un système de sous-comité, le traitement des propositions d'inscription différées ou renvoyées, les modalités régissant les activités de suivi réactif, les méthodes pour réduire le volume des documents).

Le travail de ce groupe d'étude a été mené parallèlement à trois autres groupes (Représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, Représentativité du Comité du patrimoine mondial et une réunion d'experts tenue à Cantorbéry sur demande du Comité pour débattre de la révision des Orientations). Le groupe d'étude a essayé d'éviter un chevauchement des travaux de ces groupes de travail mais certaines des questions soulevées auraient des incidences sur le travail des autres groupes. Il est clair que les recommandations des groupes de travail ainsi que les recommandations de la réunion d'experts de Cantorbéry pourraient influencer sur la manière dont le Bureau et le Comité traiteront le travail du groupe d'étude.

- **Il a été proposé à la réunion de Paris de tenir une réunion du groupe d'étude et des présidents et rapporteurs des trois groupes de travail et de la réunion d'experts la veille de la réunion du Bureau à Paris ; cela, pour assurer l'intégration et la synergie et remédier aux chevauchements et répétitions inutiles.**

Si les recommandations du groupe d'étude sont acceptées par le Bureau, elles devront être harmonisées avec les recommandations des autres groupes de travail. Après cet exercice, il faudra peut-être faire des amendements conséquents aux Orientations et au Règlement intérieur du Comité.

Une fois que le Bureau aura donné des instructions concernant les recommandations, le Centre devra mettre au point un plan d'action pour effectuer un suivi des décisions. Ce plan d'action devra inclure des indicateurs de performance, un rappel des responsabilités, un emploi du temps et une procédure de suivi de l'avancement.

Notes explicatives

Les recommandations du groupe d'étude ont été classées par priorité et par catégorie :

- **"A"** : Mesures pratiques prioritaires sur lesquelles le Bureau peut prendre des décisions à sa réunion de juin. Ces mesures peuvent être mises en œuvre pour la réunion de décembre 2000 du Comité afin d'assurer des résultats visibles positifs pour le Comité.
- **"B"** : Mesures que le Bureau pourrait soumettre au Comité pour décision, soit sous leur forme actuelle, soit après travail complémentaire du groupe d'étude avant la réunion de décembre 2000.
- **"C"** : Idées exigeant un temps d'examen supplémentaire. Le Bureau pourrait recommander au Comité de créer un ou plusieurs processus possibles pour poursuivre l'étude de ces questions.

Un tableau récapitulatif est présenté pour plus de commodité.

TABLE DES MATIERES

COMPOSITION *

MÉTHODES DE TRAVAIL *

A: TABLEAU RÉCAPITULATIF DES RECOMMANDATIONS *

1. REUNIONS STATUTAIRES *
2. PROCESSUS DECISIONNEL *
3. GESTION DE L'INFORMATION ET DES DOCUMENTS *
4. QUESTIONS DIVERSES *

B: QUESTIONS ET RECOMMANDATIONS *

1. REUNIONS STATUTAIRES *

- 1.1 ASSEMBLÉE GÉNÉRALE DES ETATS PARTIES *
- 1.2 RÉUNIONS DU BUREAU *
- 1.3 RÉUNIONS DU COMITÉ *

2. PROCEDURES DECISIONNELLES *

- 2.1 PLANIFICATION STRATÉGIQUE *
- 2.2 LISTES INDICATIVES *
- 2.3 PROPOSITIONS D'INSCRIPTION *
- 2.4 INSCRIPTION SUR LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL *
- 2.5 SOUMISSION DE RAPPORTS SUR L'ÉTAT DE CONSERVATION *
- 2.6 INSCRIPTION SUR LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL EN PÉRIL *
- 2.7 FONDS DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL *

3. GESTION DE L'INFORMATION ET DES DOCUMENTS *

- 3.1 RÉDACTION, DIFFUSION ET PRÉSENTATION DES DOCUMENTS *

3.2 SYSTÈMES D'INFORMATION RELATIFS AUX SITES DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL *

4. QUESTIONS DIVERSES *

4.1. ROLES DES ORGANISMES CONSULTATIFS ET DU CENTRE *

4.2 ETABLISSEMENT ET GESTION DES CONTRATS *

ANNEXE I : ICCROM *

A: TABLEAU RÉCAPITULATIF DES RECOMMANDATIONS

SUJET	A. Pour examen par le Bureau en juillet 2000	B. Pour le Comité en novembre 2000	C. Pour mise au point ultérieure
<p>1. REUNIONS STATUTAIRES</p> <p>1.1 Assemblée générale des Etats parties</p>		<p>1.1.1 Les points suivants devraient devenir des points permanents à l'ordre du jour de l'Assemblée générale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Questions de politique stratégique et rapport de performance ; ● Mise en œuvre des décisions et résolutions de la précédente Assemblée générale ; ● Rapport sur l'assistance internationale. <p>1.1.2 Le Comité tient sa</p>	

		<p>réunion ordinaire juste <u>avant</u> l'Assemblée générale</p> <p>1.1.3 Le Comité se réunit juste <u>après</u> l'Assemblée générale pour élire ses membres.</p> <p>1.1.4 Pour gagner du temps pendant le vote lors de l'Assemblée générale, le Secrétariat et les scrutateurs rassemblent les bulletins de vote au lieu d'inviter les participants à se présenter pour voter. Possibilité d'introduire un vote par rotation ou régional.</p>	
<p>1.2 Réunions du Bureau</p>	<p>1.2.1 Le groupe d'étude sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention continue à travailler après la réunion du Bureau pour élaborer des propositions concrètes pour un système de sous-comités qui commencerait à fonctionner en 2001 et remplacerait le système actuel du Bureau/Comité. Le groupe d'étude ferait rapport au Comité sur ses propositions en novembre 2000.</p> <p>1.2.2 A titre d'essai (en attendant un débat du Comité sur la structure de sous-comités), la réunion du Bureau en novembre 2000,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ne devrait pas débattre de communications ou accepter d'en recevoir qui traitent de propositions d'inscription différées ou renvoyées, mais devrait les adresser à l'ensemble du Comité. 	<p>1.2.4 Le Comité convient d'un système de sous-comités pour remplacer le Bureau, se réunissant seulement une fois par an juste avant la réunion du Comité (à partir de 2001).</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● devrait permettre à un groupe de travail, préfigurant le sous-comité pour le budget, de préparer le débat du Comité sur le budget en novembre 2000. <p>1.2.3 Le Règlement intérieur (22) définissant l'ordre et le temps imparti aux intervenants doit être fermement appliqué par le Président.</p>		
1.3 Réunions du Comité	<p>1.3.1 L'ordre du jour du Comité devrait comporter en tant que point permanent des questions de politique stratégique générale, y compris le Plan stratégique et sa mise en œuvre (voir 2.1.1).</p> <p>1.3.2 Les documents de travail du Comité devraient être diffusés 6 semaines avant les réunions et ne devraient pas être lus à haute voix aux réunions.</p> <p>1.3.3 L'ordre du jour du Comité devrait être structuré de façon à assurer un temps suffisant pour débattre des questions de mesures stratégiques communes aux Etats parties (par ex. la gestion des impacts du tourisme, les approches juridiques).</p>	<p>1.3.4 Le Comité devrait modifier son cycle de réunions, en tenant une réunion sur deux à Paris avant l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties.</p> <p>1.3.5 Les groupes de travail sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention devraient être ouverts à tous les Etats parties et ceux traitant des décisions à prendre par le Comité devraient être réservés aux membres du Comité.</p> <p>1.3.6 Le Comité devrait s'abstenir de créer trop de groupes de travail et d'approuver, en leur offrant l'appui du Centre et des organismes consultatifs, de trop nombreux groupes ou réunions d'experts organisés par les Etats parties. De plus, les mandats des groupes ou des réunions créés ou approuvés par le Comité devraient être très clairs et éviter le chevauchement.</p>	<p>1.3.7, 1.3.8 Exposer les grandes lignes des relations potentielles entre le Comité et les sous-comités sur les inscriptions, les propositions d'inscription et la soumission périodique de rapports.</p>
2. PROCESSUS DECISIONNEL			

<p>2.1 Planification stratégique</p>		<p>2.1.1 Le Comité devrait entreprendre une étude pour formuler un Plan stratégique avec un calendrier et des stades précis pour la période 2001-2005, qui serait fondé partiellement sur le document comportant les buts, objectifs et recommandations des Orientations stratégiques de 1992 et sur la Résolution de 1999 approuvant les Orientations.</p>	
<p>2.2 Listes indicatives</p>	<p>2.2.1 Afin d'inciter le Comité à un processus de planification stratégique, le Bureau rappelle à tous les Etats parties la nécessité de préparer des listes indicatives et de préciser l'ordre de proposition d'inscription des sites.</p>		
<p>2.3 Propositions d'inscription</p>	<p>2.3.1 Le Centre devrait élaborer et diffuser auprès de tous les Etats parties une liste de contrôle pour la rédaction et l'évaluation des propositions d'inscription, pour s'assurer qu'elles sont complètes avant l'envoi aux organismes consultatifs pour évaluation.</p> <p>2.3.2 Les organismes consultatifs devraient présenter leurs recommandations pour l'inscription selon un format cohérent : en évaluant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, les relations par rapport aux priorités de la Stratégie globale, en utilisant une liste de contrôle pour appuyer les recommandations et définir clairement les menaces avérées et potentielles et les mesures de protection.</p>	<p>2.3.4 La section B des Orientations devrait préciser que les propositions d'inscription en retard ou incomplètes relèvent de la responsabilité des Etats parties et ne seront pas acceptées pour le prochain cycle d'inscription.</p>	

	<p>2.3.3 Il faudrait communiquer en temps opportun les résultats des évaluations des organismes consultatifs aux Etats parties concernés par les propositions, qu'ils soient ou non membres du Comité.</p>		
<p>2.4 Inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial</p>	<p>2.4.1 L'ordre du jour des réunions du Bureau et du Comité devrait regrouper la présentation de propositions d'inscription similaires et les décisions les concernant, dans un but d'efficacité.</p> <p>2.4.2 Les documents d'évaluation des organismes consultatifs et du Centre devraient être présentés dans un tableau récapitulatif unique (avec les quatre options : inscription, renvoi, étude différée et rejet).</p>	<p>2.4.3 Le groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre devrait présenter des propositions pour le traitement des propositions d'inscription renvoyées ou différées.</p> <p>2.4.4 Le nombre de propositions d'inscription examinés chaque année par le Comité et les autres organes de la Convention ne devrait pas dépasser 40.</p>	
<p>2.5 Soumission de rapports sur l'état de conservation</p>	<p>2.5.1 Les documents de travail sur le suivi devraient être diffusés assez tôt aux organismes concernés et aux Etats parties, pour que le Comité ait le temps de débattre des questions. Ils ne devraient pas être lus à haute voix aux réunions.</p> <p>2.5.2 Les rapports de suivi réactif devraient être présentés en un seul document de format cohérent afin de faciliter le débat et l'examen (formats normalisés).</p> <p>2.5.3 Les communications sur l'état de conservation des sites du patrimoine mondial devraient utiliser davantage les images et les cartes pour faciliter la compréhension.</p>	<p>2.5.4 Lors de la revue de l'état de conservation des sites du patrimoine mondial, le Comité devrait étudier des rapports sur le suivi périodique, en se concentrant sur les grandes tendances et en élaborant des stratégies générales pour améliorer l'état de conservation.</p> <p>2.5.5 Le groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre de la Convention devrait préparer entre la réunion du Bureau de juin 2000 et celle du Comité en 2000 des propositions sur les activités de suivi réactif, y compris le rôle du Centre, des organismes consultatifs et d'autres secteurs de l'UNESCO. Le groupe d'étude établira aussi des critères de sélection plus stratégique des sites pour le suivi réactif.</p>	<p>2.5.6 Approche proposée de la soumission périodique de rapports par le biais de sous-comités.</p>

<p>2.6 Inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril</p>		<p>2.6.1 Le Comité devrait mettre au point des indicateurs clairs (fondés sur la déclaration de valeur approuvée lors de l'inscription) pour faire rapport sur la conservation et la gestion. Ces indicateurs devraient être suivis de façon cohérente (y compris par l'élaboration d'une liste de contrôle permettant une analyse comparative).</p> <p>2.6.2 L'assistance pour le financement devrait être accordée en priorité aux sites figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Pour chaque site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, il faudrait élaborer un plan d'action précis ainsi qu'un mécanisme de soumission de rapports.</p>	<p>2.6.4 Le Comité devrait mener des évaluations systématiques de l'efficacité de l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et sur l'assistance associée pour la protection des sites.</p>
		<p>2.6.3 Les Orientations devraient insister plus clairement (paragr. 86 et 87) sur l'engagement des Etats parties (et responsabilité le cas échéant) dans le processus de planification des mesures, et sur la nécessité de fixer des responsabilités pour la mise en œuvre de ces mesures.</p>	

<p>2.7 Fonds du patrimoine mondial</p>	<p>2.7.1 Le Centre devrait présenter le budget dans un document unique comportant plusieurs colonnes selon la catégorie de la délégation (Président, Comité, Bureau, Centre). Les propositions budgétaires devraient se conformer aux priorités stratégiques. Le budget devra indiquer, par objectif du plan stratégique, les ressources demandées et les résultats escomptés. Tous les 6 mois (ou chaque année si le budget devient biennal), le Centre devra présenter un document décrivant les dépenses réellement effectuées et les résultats atteints.</p> <p>2.7.2 Les postes budgétaires devraient être corroborés par des documents de travail associés ; chaque document de travail avec des implications budgétaires devrait renvoyer au budget.</p> <p>2.7.3 Le Bureau devrait engager toutes les parties à respecter les dispositions des Orientations concernant l'assistance internationale, spécialement en ce qui concerne les dates limites et le suivi apporté aux précédents projets.</p> <p>2.7.4 Le Centre devrait définir les possibilités d'harmoniser les financements et de conclure des accords de coopération avec d'autres organisations concernées par les activités associées au patrimoine mondial.</p>	<p>2.7.5 Le Comité devrait octroyer l'assistance internationale selon les priorités stratégiques (par ex. patrimoine mondial en péril, Stratégie globale). Il devrait envisager de fixer des principes et des procédures pour évaluer les demandes d'assistance internationale.</p> <p>2.7.6 Le Comité devrait demander des évaluations périodiques indépendantes (tous les 6 ans) pour évaluer la pertinence et l'efficacité de l'assistance internationale sur les sites et l'équilibre entre les sites naturels et culturels.</p>	<p>2.7.7 Le Comité devrait passer à une budgétisation biennale pour le Fonds du patrimoine mondial afin de s'harmoniser avec le cycle budgétaire de l'UNESCO.</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>3 GESTION DE L'INFORMATION ET DES DOCUMENTS</p>			
<p>3.1 Rédaction, diffusion et présentation des documents</p>	<p>3.1.1 Il faudrait réduire le volume des documents du Comité et en améliorer le format.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Utilisation d'un seul document pour chaque point de l'ordre du jour ● Table des matières pour les longs documents ● Même numérotation des paragraphes pour les versions anglaise et française ● Documents avec des références au budget et aux Orientations si nécessaire pour plus de clarté ● Les informations complémentaires présentées à la réunion devraient être limitées aux nouvelles informations ● Présentation claire des révisions (par ex. gras ou mode "révision") ● Utilisation de tableaux de préférence au simple texte ● Utilisation de CD-ROM et autres médias électroniques pour des raisons pratiques (noter que certains Etats n'en 	<p>3.1.4 Le Comité devrait inciter à une large diffusion et promotion de l'information sur les meilleures pratiques de conservation, y compris par des liens sur le site Web.</p> <p>3.1.5 Les décisions et résolutions du Comité et de l'Assemblée générale, ainsi que le texte de la Stratégie globale devraient être rassemblés en un seul document. Les pays qui viennent de ratifier la Convention, ainsi que les nouveaux membres du Comité devraient recevoir des informations complètes.</p>	<p>3.1.6 Il faudrait établir des règles précises pour clarifier la question des droits d'accès aux documents. Ces règles doivent être en conformité avec l'objectif de réduction de la production et de la répétition inutile de la documentation, tout en favorisant et en appuyant un processus décisionnel transparent et ouvert.</p>

	<p>disposent pas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● La formulation des décisions devrait être faite de manière à permettre un suivi de leur mise en œuvre. <p>Le groupe d'étude sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention devrait travailler avec le Centre après la réunion du Bureau de juin 2000 pour définir des moyens pratiques de parvenir à une telle simplification.</p> <p>3.1.2 Les dates limites pour la production des documents et la soumission de la documentation devraient être strictement respectées par toutes les parties. Il ne faudrait pas renvoyer les points au Comité si la documentation arrive trop tard pour faire une synthèse pertinente.</p> <p>3.1.3 Certains documents, dont l'accès doit être décidé par le Comité en novembre 2000, devraient être disponibles en français et en anglais, y compris sur le site Internet.</p>		
<p>3.2 Systèmes d'information relatifs aux sites du patrimoine mondial</p>	<p>3.2.1 Le Centre devrait entreprendre un projet de saisie de données pour rechercher toutes les traces des premières activités du Comité et les intégrer dès que possible dans un dossier électronique moderne, afin d'assurer la préservation d'un enregistrement complet de toutes les décisions du Comité, avec justifications à l'appui.</p>	<p>3.2.2 Il faudrait préparer un rapport pour le Comité sur l'avancement des améliorations actuellement apportées au Système de gestion de l'information, s'agissant spécialement de l'information sur les sites et de meilleures stratégies permettant à tous les partenaires concernés d'avoir accès à cette information. Le Comité pourrait souhaiter créer un groupe de travail pour orienter cette évolution.</p>	

		3.2.3 Il faudrait publier et tenir régulièrement à jour une liste des sites qui ont reçu une assistance internationale. Cette liste comporterait des conclusions et des résultats.	
4 QUESTIONS DIVERSES			
4.1. Rôles des organismes consultatifs et du Centre	4.1.1 Le Comité devrait revoir les rôles et les responsabilités des organismes consultatifs par rapport au Comité, au Centre et peut-être à l'UNESCO, ce qui aboutirait éventuellement à des mémorandums d'accord.		
4.2 Etablissement et gestion des contrats		4.2.1 Que le Comité, en tant que haute priorité, charge le Centre d'améliorer la pertinence des contrats et leur paiement.	

B: QUESTIONS ET RECOMMANDATIONS

1. REUNIONS STATUTAIRES

1.1 Assemblée générale des Etats parties

Questions

Le temps passé aux élections et aux questions administratives l'est au détriment des débats de politique générale ou de stratégie.

Il est accordé trop peu d'importance aux résolutions de l'Assemblée générale et à leur suivi.

La date choisie pour l'Assemblée générale (octobre), un mois avant le Comité, occasionne un surcroît de frais de voyages et augmente le volume de travail du Centre.

Recommandations

1.1.1 B

Les points suivants devraient devenir des points permanents à l'ordre du jour de l'Assemblée générale

- Questions de politique stratégique et rapport de performance ;
- Mise en œuvre des décisions et résolutions de la précédente Assemblée générale.
- Rapport sur l'assistance internationale.

1.1.2 B

Le Comité devrait tenir sa réunion ordinaire juste avant l'Assemblée générale tous les deux ans. (Etant donné que l'Assemblée élit des membres de remplacement pour le Comité, cela empêche, sur le plan pratique, une réunion après l'Assemblée générale. En effet, il serait difficile pour les candidats de confirmer leur voyage et autres plans et ils ne pourraient pas se préparer à la réunion comme il convient.)

1.1.3 B

Le Comité devrait se réunir juste après l'Assemblée générale pour élire ses membres. (Noter la préoccupation quant à la capacité des petites délégations de traiter le volume de travail).

1.1.4 B

Pour gagner du temps pendant le vote lors de l'Assemblée générale, le Secrétariat et les scrutateurs devraient rassembler les bulletins de vote au lieu d'inviter les participants à se présenter pour voter. On pourrait introduire un vote par rotation/régional.

1.2 Réunions du Bureau

Questions

Bien que la participation de personnes ayant un statut d'observateur soit utile pour la compréhension des mécanismes de mise en œuvre de la Convention, les réunions du Bureau, du Comité ou des sous-comités pourraient se dérouler plus efficacement si l'on définissait et appliquait des mécanismes permettant de limiter la nécessité de longues interventions des observateurs.

Le Bureau devrait réduire la pression des réunions du Comité en préparant son travail mais les réunions du Comité répètent inutilement le travail du Bureau car il n'y a pas de réelle délégation.

La responsabilité du Bureau (simplifier le travail du Comité en entreprenant un travail préparatoire détaillé) n'est pas toujours assumée car le contenu est souvent recyclé par le Bureau puis par le Comité et longuement débattu.

Le volume, la complexité des documents et le calendrier font peser une grande tension sur les membres du Bureau et du Comité et sur le personnel du Centre.

Le temps précieux des membres du Bureau et du Comité ainsi que des organismes consultatifs n'est pas utilisé efficacement car les présentations sont répétées jusqu'à trois fois par cycle annuel de réunions.

Recommandations

1.2.1 A

Le groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre de la Convention continue à travailler après la réunion du Bureau pour élaborer des propositions concrètes pour un système de sous-comités qui commencerait à fonctionner en 2001 et remplacerait le système actuel du Bureau/Comité. (Noter que certains envisageraient de le faire commencer en 2002). Le groupe d'étude ferait rapport sur ses propositions au Comité en novembre 2000.

Les sous-comités auraient pour objectif de libérer le Comité des détails de l'administration et de consacrer plus de temps à la direction stratégique et à suivre les programmes de travail et responsabilités centrés et pratiques, sur délégation du Comité.

1.2.2 A

A titre d'essai (en attendant le débat du Comité sur une structure de sous-comités), la réunion du Bureau en novembre 2000

- ne devrait pas débattre de communications ou accepter d'en recevoir qui traitent de propositions d'inscription différées ou renvoyées, mais devrait les adresser à l'ensemble du Comité.
- devrait permettre à un groupe de travail, préfigurant un sous-comité pour le budget, de préparer le débat du Comité sur le budget en novembre 2000.

1.2.3 A

Le Règlement intérieur (22) définissant l'ordre et le temps imparti aux intervenants doit être fermement appliqué par le Président, en permettant aux représentants d'organisations, aux personnes privées et aux observateurs de prendre la parole à la réunion avec l'accord préalable du Président. Il faudrait inciter les observateurs à travailler par le biais de leurs représentants régionaux au sein du Comité.

1.2.4 B

Souhaitant d'une part réduire le nombre de réunions statutaires qui constituent un *fardeau inutile* et d'autre part faciliter le travail du Comité en le préparant efficacement, le Bureau recommande au Comité un système de sous-comités/comité. Les sous-comités se réuniraient seulement une fois par an, juste avant la réunion du Comité (cela débiterait en 2001). Noter que certains proposent 2002 et que d'autres proposent que des membres du Bureau, en tant que sous-présidents, puissent présider des sous-comités). Les sous-comités auraient pour objectif de libérer le Comité des détails de l'administration et de suivre les programmes de travail et responsabilités centrés et pratiques, sur délégation du Comité.

1.3 Réunions du Comité

Questions

Le Comité ne donne pas suffisamment d'orientation stratégique, en partie en raison du volume de travail administratif.

Le temps manque pour effectuer le volume de travail lors des sessions plénières.

La proposition consistant à traiter les propositions d'inscription une année et le suivi l'année suivante a des partisans. Cette proposition permettrait d'améliorer l'efficacité en centrant le travail du Centre et du Comité. Toutefois, le fait que ce système pourrait restreindre la flexibilité du suivi a été présenté comme préoccupant.

Les réunions annuelles dans des régions différentes sont coûteuses et prennent du temps. La proposition selon laquelle le Comité pourrait se réunir à Paris une année sur deux, juste avant l'Assemblée générale, a l'avantage de gagner du temps et d'avoir un meilleur rapport coût-efficacité. La Belgique a estimé que "finalement, le système même a plus d'avantages que de désavantages."

On a signalé la répétition inutile d'efforts entre les organismes consultatifs et le Centre.

Les règles présidant à l'adhésion et à l'accès aux documents de travail des divers groupes de travail créés par le Comité et autres organes de la Convention ne sont pas claires.

Recommandations

1.3.1 A

L'ordre du jour du Comité devrait comporter en tant que point permanent des questions de politique stratégique générale, y compris le Plan stratégique et sa mise en œuvre (voir 2.1.1).

1.3.2 A

Les documents de travail du Comité devraient être diffusés 6 semaines avant les réunions et ne devraient pas être lus à haute voix aux réunions.

1.3.3 A

L'ordre du jour du Comité devrait être structuré de façon à assurer un temps suffisant pour débattre des questions de mesures stratégiques communes aux Etats parties (par ex. la gestion des impacts du tourisme, les approches juridiques).

1.3.4 B

Le Comité devrait modifier son cycle de réunions, en tenant une réunion sur deux à Paris avant l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties.

1.3.5 B

Les groupes de travail sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention devraient être ouverts à tous les Etats parties et ceux traitant des décisions à prendre par le Comité devraient être réservés aux membres du Comité.

1.3.6 B

Le Comité devrait s'abstenir de créer trop de groupes de travail et d'approuver, en leur offrant l'appui du Centre et des organismes consultatifs, de trop nombreux groupes ou réunions d'experts organisés par les Etats parties. De plus, les mandats des groupes ou des réunions créés ou approuvés par le Comité devraient être très clairs et éviter le chevauchement.

1.3.7 C

Pour réduire le volume de travail, le Comité devrait étudier les inscriptions et le

suivi périodique après préparation dans les sous-comités. Le Comité ne devrait étudier qu'exceptionnellement les rapports sur le suivi réactif.

1.3.8 C

Suivant d'autres décisions (sur les sous-comités et les Orientations) le Comité pourrait souhaiter réviser le calendrier des propositions d'inscription. Une proposition pourrait être envisagée :

- 1^{er} avril, année 0 : propositions d'inscriptions confiées au Centre du patrimoine mondial. Liste de contrôle des propositions d'inscription complétée et propositions incomplètes renvoyées à l'Etat partie concerné.
- 1^{er} mai, année 0 : propositions d'inscription envoyées aux organismes consultatifs (propositions incomplètes renvoyées au Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui les renvoie à l'Etat partie concerné) ; les organismes consultatifs collaborent avec l'Etat partie/les Etats parties concerné(s) à l'établissement de l'évaluation, y compris en ce qui concerne la logistique pour les missions d'évaluation. Si nécessaire, les organismes consultatifs recherchent, en temps opportun, des informations complémentaires auprès des Etats parties concernés pour permettre l'achèvement du processus d'évaluation.
- 1^{er} juillet, année 0 : évaluations effectuées par les organismes consultatifs adressées au Centre du patrimoine mondial ;
- 1^{er} août, année 0 : évaluations effectuées par les organismes consultatifs envoyées au sous-comité pour les propositions d'inscription, ainsi qu'aux Etats parties concernés ;
- Octobre, année 1 : réunions des sous-comités, suivies par la réunion du Comité.

2. PROCEDURES DECISIONNELLES

2.1 Planification stratégique

Questions

Les orientations stratégiques de 1992 et leur plan d'action étaient pertinents mais n'ont pas atteint leurs buts car aucun mécanisme n'a été mis en place pour assigner les responsabilités de mise en œuvre. Il n'a pas été fixé de calendrier ni de processus pour le suivi et la mise à jour des buts et objectifs.

Recommandations

2.1.1 B

Le Comité devrait entreprendre une étude en vue de la formulation d'un Plan stratégique, fondé sur les buts, objectifs et recommandations des orientations stratégiques de 1992 et sur la Résolution de 1999 approuvant les orientations. Ce Plan stratégique devra comporter au moins :

- une vision
- des buts
- des objectifs
- un plan d'action
- un calendrier
- des mécanismes de soumission de rapports
- des parties responsables
- un cycle de revue.

2.2 Listes indicatives

Questions

Nombre d'Etats parties (40%) n'ont pas de liste indicative ou leur liste indicative existante n'est plus à jour. Les listes indicatives ne sont pas exigées pour les sites naturels (bien que l'UICN appuie la proposition).

Cela gêne le Comité pour établir une planification stratégique et nuit à la flexibilité des organismes consultatifs pour affecter des ressources.

Le Groupe d'étude note que les résultats obtenus par d'autres groupes de travail sur cette question pourraient affecter la mise en œuvre de procédures au sein du Bureau et du Comité. En particulier, la mise en place d'un mécanisme systématique pour limiter l'évaluation des propositions d'inscription et leur accorder une priorité (à envisager par le groupe de travail sur la représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial) pourrait avoir des conséquences pour le travail pratique du Comité.

Recommandations

2.2.1 A

Afin d'inciter le Comité à un processus de planification stratégique, le Bureau rappelle à tous les Etats parties la nécessité de préparer des listes indicatives et de préciser l'ordre de proposition d'inscription des sites.

2.3 Propositions d'inscription

Questions

Alors que d'autres groupes de travail peuvent faire des recommandations sur la question de la préparation de propositions d'inscription, le travail pratique du Bureau et du Comité est directement affecté par la pratique actuelle.

A chaque réunion, un certain nombre de propositions d'inscription sont débattues par le Comité bien que les documents concernant les propositions d'inscription soient incomplets lorsqu'ils sont adressés par le Centre aux organismes consultatifs.

Les membres du Comité qui proposent des sites pour inscription sont avantagés dans le processus de proposition d'inscription car seuls les membres du Comité ont accès aux évaluations réalisées par les organismes consultatifs. Il a été noté que le fait de rendre les évaluations consultables par les Etats parties non-membres du Comité pourrait créer un travail supplémentaire mais permettrait d'informer le processus décisionnel.

Recommandations

2.3.1 A

Le Centre devrait élaborer et diffuser auprès de tous les Etats parties une liste de contrôle pour la rédaction et l'évaluation des propositions d'inscription, pour s'assurer qu'elles sont complètes avant l'envoi aux organismes consultatifs pour évaluation.

2.3.2 A

Les organismes consultatifs devraient présenter leurs recommandations pour chaque inscription pour évaluer clairement si les sites possèdent une valeur universelle exceptionnelle et montrer les relations par rapport aux priorités de la Stratégie globale, en utilisant un format cohérent pour les différentes propositions et en utilisant une liste de contrôle pour appuyer les recommandations et définir clairement les menaces avérées et potentielles et les différentes mesures nécessaires à la protection des valeurs.

2.3.3 A

Les résultats des évaluations des organismes consultatifs devraient être communiqués en temps opportun aux Etats parties qui font les propositions d'inscription, qu'ils soient ou non membres du Comité.

2.3.4 B

La section B des Orientations devrait indiquer clairement que des propositions d'inscription incomplètes ou arrivées tardivement relèvent de la responsabilité des Etats parties et ne seront pas acceptées pour le cycle d'inscription à venir.

2.4 Inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial

Questions

La qualité de l'étude du Comité baisse lorsqu'il y a trop de propositions d'inscription à traiter chaque année et que certaines propositions d'inscription doivent être traitées plusieurs fois en raison des mécanismes de renvoi et d'étude différée.

Un volume de travail excessif et mal réparti incombe aux organismes consultatifs et au Centre en raison du chevauchement des cycles de revue et d'évaluation des propositions d'inscription.

Le Comité reçoit des informations insuffisantes ou tardives, pour des raisons de surcharge de travail, ce qui affecte sa prise de décision.

Recommandations

2.4.1 A

L'ordre du jour des réunions du Bureau et du Comité devrait regrouper la présentation de propositions d'inscription similaires et les décisions les concernant, dans un but d'efficacité.

2.4.2 A

Les documents d'évaluation des organismes consultatifs et du Centre devraient être présentés dans un tableau récapitulatif unique (avec les quatre options : inscription, renvoi, étude différée et rejet).

2.4.3 B

Le Groupe d'étude sur la mise en oeuvre devrait présenter des propositions pour le traitement des propositions d'inscriptions renvoyées ou différées.

2.4.4 B

Le nombre de proposition d'inscription examinés chaque année par le Comité et les autres organes de la Convention ne devrait pas dépasser 40.

2.5 Soumission de rapports sur l'état de conservation

Questions

La mise en place de soumission de rapports périodiques sur l'état de conservation est un élément nouveau important qui exige une soigneuse planification. Cela va exiger un temps supplémentaire important de la part du Comité.

Bien que le Comité ait maintenant fixé un calendrier régional pour la soumission de rapports périodiques, il continue cependant à recevoir divers rapports ponctuels (suivi réactif).

Il faut adopter des mécanismes pour traiter du suivi réactif. Il y a une répétition inutile du travail entre le Centre, les organismes consultatifs, d'autres organisations internationales et les secteurs de l'UNESCO pour réaliser un suivi réactif et soumettre des rapports à ce sujet.

L'étude des rapports est gênée par le trop grand nombre de sites concernés et par le fait que les rapports sont lus à haute voix aux réunions du Comité.

L'utilisation stratégique des rapports n'est pas bien mise au point ; il n'y a pas de tentatives d'études comparatives ni de groupements de sites sous des thèmes communs.

Une meilleure et plus large utilisation de moyens visuels pour les présentations aiderait le Comité à étudier les rapports.

Il n'existe pas de règles claires quant à l'accès public aux rapports sur l'état de conservation et aux informations établies lors de leur préparation.

Recommandations

2.5.1 A

Les documents de travail sur le suivi devraient être diffusés assez tôt (au minimum 6 semaines avant les réunions) aux organismes concernés et en particulier aux Etats parties, afin que le Comité ait le temps de débattre des questions à bon escient. Ils ne devraient pas être lus à haute voix pendant les réunions.

2.5.2 A

Les rapports de suivi réactif devraient être présentés en un seul document de format cohérent afin de faciliter le débat et l'étude (formats normalisés).

2.5.3 A

Les communications sur l'état de conservation des sites du patrimoine mondial devraient utiliser davantage les images et les cartes pour faciliter la compréhension.

2.5.4 B

Lors de la revue de l'état de conservation des sites du patrimoine mondial, le Comité devrait étudier des rapports sur le suivi périodique, en se concentrant sur les grandes tendances et en élaborant des stratégies générales pour améliorer l'état de conservation. Le Comité ne devrait uniquement étudier des rapports de suivi réactif qu'en des circonstances exceptionnelles.

2.5.5 B

Le groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre de la Convention devrait préparer entre la réunion du Bureau de juin 2000 et celle du Comité en 2000 des propositions d'inscription sur les activités de suivi réactif, y compris le rôle du Centre, des organismes consultatifs et d'autres secteurs de l'UNESCO. Le groupe d'étude établira aussi des critères de sélection plus stratégique des sites pour le suivi réactif.

2.5.6 C

Chaque année, les Etats parties d'une région soumettent au Centre leur rapport périodique sur l'état de conservation de leurs sites. Le Centre étudie ces rapports entre autres à la lumière des résultats du précédent examen des mêmes sites et rédige un document qui résume les rapports et fournit des commentaires sur l'état de conservation des sites. Ce document du Centre est soumis au sous-comité qui déterminera alors les sites qui n'ont pas de problèmes, des problèmes mineurs ou des problèmes majeurs. Le Comité étudie ensuite le rapport du sous-comité mais limite le débat aux sites confrontés à des problèmes majeurs. Tout membre du Comité a cependant le droit de demander un débat sur un site considéré par le sous-comité comme sans problèmes ou avec des problèmes mineurs. La même procédure s'applique pour le suivi réactif mais le groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre de la Convention doit encore faire des propositions au Comité au sujet de ce suivi réactif.

2.6 Inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril

Questions

La Liste du patrimoine en péril est un instrument permettant d'améliorer la conservation des biens menacés.

L'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril doit s'accompagner d'un plan d'action réaliste et de mesures pratiques et réalisables pour améliorer l'état du bien.

Il y a un manque de clarté des raisons du placement d'un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ou de son retrait, comme de la résistance au placement de sites sur cette Liste.

Les sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril n'ont pas nécessairement priorité pour recevoir une assistance internationale.

Recommandation

2.6.1 B

Le Comité devrait mettre au point des indicateurs clairs (fondés sur la déclaration de valeur approuvée lors de l'inscription) pour faire rapport sur la conservation et la gestion. Ces indicateurs devraient être suivis de façon cohérente (y compris par l'élaboration d'une liste de contrôle permettant une analyse comparative).

- Il faudrait mettre au point un cadre de suivi pour définir les limites tolérables de menaces permettant une inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril (Orientations, paragr. 80-85).
- Il faudrait également un cadre de suivi pour définir un plan d'action et revoir le processus qui détermine quand on peut retirer un bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril (paragr. 92 et 93).

2.6.2 B

L'assistance pour le financement devrait être accordée en priorité aux sites figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Pour chaque site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, il faut élaborer un plan d'action précis ainsi qu'un mécanisme de soumission de rapports.

2.6.3 B

Les Orientations devraient insister plus clairement (paragr. 86 et 87) sur l'engagement des Etats parties (et responsabilité le cas échéant) dans le processus de planification, et sur la nécessité de fixer des responsabilités pour la mise en œuvre de ces mesures.

2.6.4 C

Le Comité devrait mener des évaluations systématiques de l'efficacité de

l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et sur l'assistance associée pour la protection des sites.

2.7 Fonds du patrimoine mondial

Questions

Les débats sur le budget sont trop longs et trop détaillés pour l'ensemble du Comité.

L'octroi de l'assistance internationale n'est pas relié à une vision stratégique précise ni à des résultats mesurables. Cette assistance est plutôt proposée au cas par cas. L'octroi de pourcentages à différentes catégories d'aide pourrait gêner une bonne utilisation des fonds disponibles puisque les affectations de fonds ne sont pas reliées à des priorités stratégiques.

Aucune évaluation indépendante n'est préparée pour évaluer l'impact de l'assistance internationale et l'on constate une absence générale de résultats mesurables.

Les fonds ne peuvent satisfaire aux demandes. (On ne peut convenir qu'il y ait un manque de fonds ; on peut se préoccuper que les fonds soient bien dépensés).

On pourrait parvenir à plus d'efficacité en harmonisant le cycle budgétaire avec celui de l'UNESCO. Les décisions concernant le Fonds sont prises chaque année, bien que l'article 2 du Règlement financier du Fonds du patrimoine mondial indique que l'exercice financier doit être de deux années civiles consécutives coïncidant avec l'exercice financier du Budget ordinaire de l'UNESCO.

L'ICCROM a suggéré de débattre séparément de l'assistance internationale et a fait à ce sujet plusieurs recommandations. L'ICCROM a fourni des informations appréciables sur cette question dans sa communication au groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre de la Convention.

Recommandations

2.7.1 A

Le Centre devrait présenter le budget dans un document unique comportant

plusieurs colonnes selon la catégorie de la délégation (Président, Comité, Bureau, Centre). Les propositions budgétaires devraient se conformer aux priorités stratégiques. Le budget devra indiquer, par objectif du plan stratégique, les ressources demandées et les résultats escomptés. Tous les 6 mois (ou chaque année si le budget devient biennal), le Centre devra présenter un document décrivant les dépenses réellement effectuées et les résultats atteints.

2.7.2 A

Les postes budgétaires devraient être corroborés par des documents de travail associés ; chaque document de travail avec des implications budgétaires devrait renvoyer au budget.

2.7.3 A

Le Bureau devrait engager toutes les parties à respecter toutes les dispositions des Orientations concernant l'assistance internationale, notamment celles qui traitent des dates limites et du suivi apporté aux précédents projets.

2.7.4 A

Le Centre devrait systématiquement définir les possibilités d'harmoniser les financements avec d'autres organisations internationales engagées dans des activités relatives au patrimoine mondial et conclure des accords de coopération avec ces organisations.

2.7.5 B

Le Comité devrait octroyer l'assistance internationale selon les priorités stratégiques (par ex. patrimoine mondial en péril, Stratégie globale). Il devrait envisager de fixer des principes et des procédures pour évaluer les demandes d'assistance internationale.

2.7.6 B

Le Comité devrait demander des évaluations périodiques indépendantes (tous les 6 ans) pour évaluer la pertinence et l'efficacité des différentes catégories d'assistance internationale et leur impact sur les sites, ainsi que l'équilibre entre les sites naturels et culturels.

2.7.6 C

Le Comité devrait passer à une budgétisation biennale pour le Fonds du patrimoine mondial afin de s'harmoniser avec le cycle budgétaire de l'UNESCO.

3. GESTION DE L'INFORMATION ET DES DOCUMENTS

3.1 Rédaction, diffusion et présentation des documents

Questions

Le Comité reçoit trop de documentation, ce qui décourage d'entreprendre des débats de politique générale et de prise de décisions stratégiques.

L'information est souvent répétée inutilement et porte à confusion.

Les apports tardifs et les calendriers chargés empêchent le personnel du Centre de synthétiser les rapports et le Comité de les étudier à fond.

Les informations telles que les documents de travail du Comité et les documents concernant l'assistance ne sont pas facilement consultables par les Etats parties non-membres du Comité, ni par les pays qui n'ont pas ratifié la Convention.

Recommandations

3.1.1 A

Il faudrait réduire le volume des documents du Comité et améliorer leur format.

- Utilisation d'un seul document pour chaque point de l'ordre du jour
- Table des matières pour les longs documents
- Même numérotation des paragraphes pour les versions anglaise et française
- Documents avec des références au budget et aux Orientations le cas échéant pour plus de clarté
- Les informations complémentaires présentées à la réunion devraient être limitées aux nouvelles informations
- Présentation claire des révisions (par ex. gras ou mode "révision")
- Utilisation de tableaux de préférence au simple texte
- Utilisation de CD-ROM et autres médias électroniques pour des raisons pratiques (noter que certains Etats n'en disposent pas).
- La formulation des décisions devrait être faite de manière à permettre un suivi de leur mise en œuvre.

Le groupe d'étude sur la Mise en œuvre de la Convention devrait travailler avec le Centre après la réunion du Bureau de juin 2000 pour définir des moyens pratiques de parvenir à une telle simplification.

3.1.2 A

Les dates limites pour la production des documents devraient être strictement respectées. Il ne faudrait pas renvoyer les points au Comité si la documentation arrive trop tard pour faire une synthèse pertinente.

3.1.3 A

Certains documents, dont l'accès doit être décidé par le Comité en novembre 2000, devraient être disponibles en français et en anglais, y compris sur le site Internet.

3.1.4 B

Le Comité devrait inciter à une large diffusion et promotion de l'information sur les meilleures pratiques de conservation, y compris par des liens sur le site Web.

3.1.5 B

Les décisions et résolutions du Comité et de l'Assemblée générale, ainsi que le texte de la Stratégie globale devraient être rassemblés en un seul document. Les pays qui viennent de ratifier la Convention, ainsi que les nouveaux membres du Comité, devraient recevoir des informations complètes.

3.1.6 C

Des règles claires devraient être définies pour clarifier les droits d'accès aux documents. Ces règles devraient concorder avec l'objectif de minimiser la production de la documentation tout en encourageant et facilitant une prise de décision transparente et ouverte.

3.2 Systèmes d'information relatifs aux sites du patrimoine mondial

Questions

Il a été déterminé qu'il fallait améliorer les systèmes de gestion et le stockage des archives :

- L'information est souvent dépassée
- Le Centre doit maintenir des dossiers de synthèse sur les sites
- Il faut relier les rapports sur l'état de conservation aux demandes et allocations d'assistance internationale.

Il faut établir, maintenir à jour et diffuser une liste des biens qui ont reçu une assistance internationale et faire rapport sur les conclusions et les résultats (responsabilité émanant de la Convention, art. 13.5).

La documentation et les dossiers de référence sur les demandes d'assistance internationale qui sont antérieurs à 1992 ne sont pas consultables au Centre et ne sont pas nécessairement accessibles aux archives de l'UNESCO.

Les questions liées à l'amélioration des systèmes d'information sont expliquées plus en détail ci-dessous :

Il faut clarifier l'information sur les groupes de groupes de travail ou les réunions : création de groupes et organisation de réunions, composition des groupes (mandats précis, critères de participation) et leurs méthodes de travail (diffusion de l'information).

Dans le système actuel, un membre du Comité qui fait des propositions d'inscription est privilégié par rapport à d'autres Etats parties car seuls les membres du Comité ont accès aux évaluations réalisées par les organismes consultatifs. Une solution envisageable serait de fournir les résultats de l'évaluation aux Etats parties concernés dès que possible.

Le Centre du patrimoine mondial devrait suivre une politique générale d'amélioration constante des systèmes d'information relatifs aux sites du patrimoine mondial, en faisant une synthèse des dossiers pour relier électroniquement les dossiers de propositions d'inscription, les rapports de suivi, l'assistance internationale et la correspondance aux dossiers des sites des organismes consultatifs.

Recommandations

3.2.1 A

Le Centre devrait entreprendre un projet de saisie de données pour rechercher toutes les traces des premières activités du Comité et les intégrer dès que possible dans un dossier électronique moderne, afin d'assurer la préservation d'un enregistrement complet de toutes les décisions du Comité avec justifications à l'appui.

3.2.2 B

Il faudrait préparer pour le Comité un rapport de situation sur les améliorations entreprises concernant le Système de gestion de l'information, s'agissant notamment de l'information relative aux sites et de la définition de meilleures stratégies d'accès pour toutes les parties concernées. Le Comité pourrait souhaiter créer un groupe de travail pour orienter l'évolution de la situation.

3.2.3 B

Il faudrait publier et actualiser régulièrement une liste de sites ayant bénéficié d'une assistance internationale. Cette liste comporterait des conclusions et des résultats.

4. QUESTIONS DIVERSES

4.1. Roles des organismes consultatifs et du centre

Question

Il existe des divergences de compréhension des rôles respectifs des organismes consultatifs et du Centre. Ces différences entravent le fonctionnement efficace du Comité.

Recommandation

4.1.1 A

Le Comité devrait revoir les rôles et les responsabilités des organismes consultatifs par rapport au Comité, au Centre et peut-être à l'UNESCO, ce qui aboutirait éventuellement à des mémorandums d'accord.

4.2 Etablissement et gestion des contrats

Question

Le processus actuel consistant à transformer les décisions du Comité portant sur l'allocation de fonds en contrats entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Etats parties ou les organismes consultatifs est lourd et inefficace.

Recommandation

4.2.1 B

Que le Comité, en tant que haute priorité, charge le Centre d'améliorer la pertinence des contrats et leur paiement.

ANNEXE I : ICCROM

L'ICCROM a suggéré de débattre séparément de l'assistance internationale, et a fait plusieurs recommandations à ce sujet. L'ICCROM a fourni des informations utiles sur cette questions dans sa communication au groupe d'étude sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention.

Il n'existe pas de raisons claires qui président à la délégation par le Centre de demandes d'assistance internationale ni à leur soumission rapide aux Etats parties et aux organismes consultatifs pour étude/commentaires.

Il n'existe pas de normes cohérentes pour le traitement de telles demandes par les organismes consultatifs – ce qui rend difficile pour le Centre de synthétiser les réponses.

Les critères utilisés par les organismes consultatifs pour l'évaluation des demandes n'ont pas été étudiés par le Comité.

Les catégories d'assistance internationale sont interprétées différemment par les Etats parties, le Centre et les organismes consultatifs. Une bonne utilisation des dispositions budgétaires établies par le Comité exige que les différents domaines d'activités soient clairement définis et respectés.

Les procédures indiquées par les Orientations pour la gestion des demandes d'assistance technique sont régulièrement négligées par à peu près tous les Etats parties.

Les exigences des Orientations en matière de préparation d'une évaluation de l'efficacité d'une activité sont régulièrement négligées.

Nombre de demandes d'assistance internationale présentées par des Etats parties ont été en grande partie préparées par le personnel du Centre, des consultants et les organismes consultatifs. Les Etats parties et les régions ignorent peut-être certains détails de propositions faites en leur nom. Les systèmes d'évaluation devraient tenter de s'assurer que les Etats parties ont la propriété des idées proposées en leur nom et que celles-ci sont conformes aux objectifs stratégiques régionaux.

Il faut parvenir à une cohérence de traitement des dépenses des organismes consultatifs dans le budget global.

REPORT ON THE MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION - MONDAY 17 APRIL 2000, ROOM XVI, UNESCO HEADQUARTERS

The meeting was attended by representatives of:

Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Korea (Republic of), Morocco, Oman, Portugal, South Africa, the United States of America, the advisory bodies ICCROM and ICOMOS, and the WHC Secretariat.

Due to the "physical" absence of Ms Christina Cameron, Mr Kevin Keefe (Australia) chaired the meeting. Ms Cameron nevertheless participated telephonically. Mr Georges Zouain represented the WHC Secretariat, with Mr Lincoln Marais (South Africa) as rapporteur.

Mr Keefe opened the meeting by welcoming all participants and outlined the aim of the meeting, that is, to discuss and make further amendments to the Draft Discussion Paper ([Draft 4, 11/04/2000](#)) on the Report of the Task Force on Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Previous contributions made by the various delegations and advisory bodies had already been incorporated in the draft and the Belgian delegation was thanked for their detailed input. The Chair went on to explain the process, terms of reference and the Summary Table of "A" and "B" Priority Recommendations. Other recommendations classified as "C" followed in the report itself. Delegations were then called upon to make further comments and suggestions on the draft report and its sections, those being Statutory Meetings, Decision-making Procedures, Information and Document Management, and Other Matters.

As a general remark on format, and to enhance clarity, it was suggested that everything which fell under "C" also be tabulated and that the three sections be named

"A - for Bureau July 2000";

"B - for Committee November 2000";

"C - for further thought/development".

NOTE: The various changes suggested during the meeting and resulting renumbering will appear in full in the revised draft report and table.

1. STATUTORY MEETINGS

The Belgian delegate proposed an important change to paragraph B1.2.3, which would then read "... the Bureau proposes to replace the present system of Bureau/

Committee by a system of Sub-Committees/Committee, the Sub-Committees meeting only once a year, just before the meeting of the Committee. The Task Force on Implementation (hereafter simply Task Force) will set up concrete proposals for such a system which would start functioning in 2001. The Task Force would report on this to the Committee in November 2000."

This proposal meant that all further reference to the Sub-Committee system should be dropped in the rest of the table. Added to B1.2.3 would be "On a trial basis, a working party, prefiguration of a Sub-Committee for the budget, will prepare the discussion of the budget by the Committee in November 2000."

Mr Zouain pointed out that the meetings would imply that the centre would be required to do more. The preparations for the General Assembly before the Bureau and Committee Meetings could give rise to problems with the timely preparation of documents and their content. It was then suggested by the Belgian delegate that a Sub-Committee, as proposed in B1.2.3, take over this burden and thus also reduce the number of meetings. Matters would thereby be simplified and the Bureau would be better prepared by the work of a series of Sub-Committees. Discussion on the Sub-Committee system would take place between July and November 2000 in order to begin its work in the new way by 2001.

The Finnish delegate indicated that the positive proposals made in B1.1.2 and B1.1.3 with regard to the meetings taking place in Paris meant that there would be more participation by developing countries.

With regard to the Committee Meetings, B1.3.4 and B1.3.5 would be dropped as they refer to the Sub-Committee system and B1.3.7 should read instead "... related to the decisions to be taken by the Committee...". Also, an additional point B1.3.8 was suggested that would read "The Committee should refrain from itself creating too many working groups and from approving, by giving them the support of the Centre and of the Advisory Bodies, too many Group or Expert Meetings established by the State Parties. Furthermore, the mandates of the groups or meetings created or approved by the Committee should be very clear and exclude any overlapping."

The Hungarian delegate voiced reservations on the biennial cycle referred to in B1.3.6, saying that sensitivities on the venue may become over-focussed by high level delegations and that this could then harm the process. On A1.3.1, the Strategic Plan should be one of the key issues/proposals by the Task Force. The Bureau should be requested to give the mandate to a group to draft a Strategic Plan containing the elements (1) Permanent Agenda Items, (2) a Work Plan, (3) a Strategic Plan for 3-5 years. The Task Force should ask the Bureau to then

consider the Work and Strategic Plans in November 2000.

To this, Mr Zouain pointed out that a Global Strategy had already been discussed in 1992 and that a Working Group does exist on all issues concerning the Committee and the Convention. The Committee would first have to reflect on the work done since 1992. Furthermore, a Strategic Plan with a two-year budget does exist. Perhaps a Strategic Plan over a period of six year would facilitate the work, but guidance would first have to be sought.

The Hungarian delegate, on being requested by the delegate from Finland, explained that the Strategic Plan would have to be worked out by the State Parties. A Working Group would assist the Bureau/Secretariat for the period July - November 2000. He felt that B1.1.1 should better read (a) Strategic Policy Issues, (b) Implementation of Decisions/Resolutions and (c) International Assistance as a Tool of the Convention. The Finnish delegate felt that, with regard to point (b), one would first need to wait for the results of the consultant's study, as agreed in Kyoto. At this point, the Chair remarked that one could not get locked in the detail here.

The Belgian delegate reminded participants that one could only work within the mandate of Marrakech. He went on to suggest that C1.2.4 and C1.2.5 be set aside.

The Hungarian delegate indicated that a new mandate was needed in order to deal with several issues, these including International Assistance, Representation, the Task Force itself, and how to synthesize the process. Also, B1.2.3, C1.2.4 and C1.2.5 ought to be merged as they could be seen as a "package" on Sub-Committees.

The Chair then summed up the proceedings so far by stating that there appeared to be general agreement on the Sub-Committees/Committee system, but that clarity was still needed on its working procedure. The work on the latter would be undertaken by some Working Group which was still unknown.

The Belgian delegate felt that further progress could have been made had more face-to-face meetings taken place. Electronic communication was simply a tool for assistance, but meetings would have been better.

On B1.1.4, the Finnish delegate enquired as to whether the Task Force had given any further thought to the manner of voting during the General Assembly, describing the old manner as contributing to its ineffectiveness. The Chair explained that voting would take place by normal ballot, with Mr Zouain adding that e-balloting would be too costly. The Hungarian delegate floated the idea of

rotational/regional voting.

2. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

With reference to B2.1.1, the Belgian delegate requested that the 1992 Strategic Orientations document be made available and was reassured that it would be placed on the website.

The Finnish delegate drew attention to the fact the Tentative Lists were also being discussed in a further Working Group and that the proposals should be merged, the US representative adding that the Centre should synthesize the work of the different working groups. This point was later emphasized by the Egyptian delegate too. The Hungarian delegate then shared with participants that he found the Canterbury Meeting to be very useful and that his delegation would reintroduce the resolutions/decisions of that meeting.

The Belgian delegate proposed a change to A2.2.1, to read "... the Bureau reminds all State Parties of the necessity to prepare tentative lists and to specify the order in which they would propose the inscription of the sites", with the Hungarian delegate describing the Tentative Lists as a strategic tool to be used as such.

Mr Zouain pointed out that one should wait for the results of the Working Group on Tentative Lists. To this, the Greek delegate responded that it was the responsibility of the Working Groups to ensure that there was no duplication of work of other groups.

With the Chair requesting that the meeting move ahead to points 2.3 and 2.4. the Belgian delegate proposed that the checklist referred to in A2.3.1 be implemented and distributed to all State Parties. Also, C2.3.4 should become B2.3.4. There was much still missing in 2.4 and it was suggested that additions be made as B2.4.3 reading "The Task Force should present proposals for the treatment of referral and deferral of nominations of inscriptions" and B2.4.4 reading "The number of nominations for inscription that the Committee and the other bodies of the Convention would examine each year should not exceed 40."

The Finnish delegate reminded participants that the other Working Group had discussed the issue of nominations in great length and the delegate from ICOMOS shared with the meeting that a report was to come out. The Chair then pointed out that the Task Force could not take into account the work of other Working Groups at this stage but had to deal with its own work.

On the issue of Reporting on the State of Conservation, the Hungarian delegate felt that the section was too scattered and that it should be summarised at the end, with deadlines and a Strategic Plan. According to the Belgian delegate, A2.5.4, A2.5.5, B2.5.6 and B2.5.8 should be dropped, with B2.5.7 instead becoming "The Task Force should prepare, between the Bureau of July 2000 and the committee of November 2000, proposals on the reactive monitoring activities, including the role of the Centre, the Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors. Furthermore, it was felt that A2.5.5 and B2.5.9 were not clear and should instead read as one new text on regional periodic reporting, the examination of those reports by the Centre identifying the extent and nature of possible problems, the recommendations of a Sub-Committee to the Committee, and the proposals by the Task Force to the Committee on reactive monitoring activities (complete text to be found in new table and report).

The Finnish delegate proposed that A2.7.3 be modified to read "All State Parties should respect the provisions for international assistance in the Operational Guidelines, especially those concerning deadlines and follow-up to previous projects." She also voiced support for B2.7.6 on the allocation of international assistance according to strategic priorities.

Mr Zouain wished then to point out some ambiguities/matters to delegates. According to him, A2.5.2 was already being done, and it was strengthening the work of the Convention on imperilled sites. On B2.5.8, which criteria should be used? It could only relate to the presentation perhaps. Likewise, for B2.6.1 the question arises on how to develop clear assessment indicators concerning the In Danger List. Perhaps this point should be moved to section "C". With regard to A2.7.4 on international organisations involved in world heritage activities, it was suggested that one waits for the Centre's proposals on the issue, as requested in Marrakech.

The Belgian delegate felt that B2.6.2 was a bit unclear and proposed a rewording to read "For each site on the In Danger List, a precise action plan shall be established together with a reporting mechanism on the results." Whereas he suggested that B2.7.5 and C2.7.9 be left out altogether, he wished for the following to be added to A2.7.1 "The budget proposals should be in line with the strategic priorities. The budget will indicate, per objective of the strategic plan, the resources requested and the results expected. Every six months (or every year if the budget becomes biennial) the Centre will present a document describing the expenses really made and the results achieved." Furthermore, A2.7.4 should be replaced to read "The Centre should systematically identify opportunities to harmonise funding allocations with other international organisations involved in world heritage activities and conclude co-operation agreements with these organisations."

3. INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

The Chair indicated that A3.1.1 represented a wish-list, but that concrete proposals were needed for the Cairns Meeting. The Belgian delegate agreed that Committee documents would have to be improved in format and reduced in volume. The Task Force would have to work with the Centre to identify practical means to achieve this reduction. He went on to suggest that B3.1.4 be removed as it seemed an unnecessary initiative. Instead, proposals made were B3.1.3 "The decisions and proposals of the Committee and of the General Assembly, as well as the text of the Global Strategy, should be regrouped in one single document"; B3.1.4 "Countries which have just ratified the Convention as well as the new members of the Committee should be handed documents containing complete information"; and B3.1.5 "All documents should be available in French and in English, including on the Internet website." To this last point, the Finnish delegate proposed to replace "All documents..." with "Access to certain documents..."

The Chair added that A2.5.4 also has relevance here as there is a delicate balance between the rights of the State Parties and access to information. The rules were unclear in the Centre and would need to be clarified.

The representative from ICOMOS explained the concerns around the confidentiality of the Evaluation Committee Reports as they were but one element of the final evaluation and could therefore be contentious and embarrassing. They are technical in nature and not always covering all aspects of the final recommendation. Responding to a question by the US representative, the Chair stated that the Committee would decide in November which documents would be made available.

On B3.2.2 relating to the Information Management System of sites, Mr Zouain pointed out that this was already in place and that the Task Force should stick to the procedure established, while the Hungarian delegate wondered how State Parties would be involved in this exercise in future.

4. OTHER MATTERS

On the question of the roles of the Advisory Bodies and the Centre, the Chair stated that only informal discussions had thus far taken place. He also proposed that this be placed under A4.1.1 and was supported by the representative of ICCROM, who added that no Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) existed. Mr Zouain thought that an MOU had been signed with ICOMOS but that he would check on this. The US representative felt that it was perhaps time for the

agreements and the relationship with the Advisory Bodies to be reviewed but the Greek delegate felt that this was really a task of UNESCO, not the Committee. The Chair pointed out though that this issue did fall under the work of the Committee and its relationship with the Centre.

Mr Zouain proposed that the financial/contractual relationships with the Advisory Bodies be standardised and that, with reference to B4.2.1, the contracts be expressed in figures. Optimally, an auditing system should be set up and, based on that, the contracts could be improved.

To Ms Cameron's remark that the issue of timeliness had to be focussed on, Mr Zouain agreed and added that a Contract Committee did exist, but that progress was slow due to a series of constraints. He also felt that C4.1.1 should be moved to "A".

FURTHER GENERAL REMARKS

Towards the end of the meeting, some general remarks were made by various delegates on the further work of the Task Force. The Chair said that the main task would be to finish the work on the proposals to the Bureau. The Chairs of the Working Groups would get together to synthesize the work, hopefully with the coordination of the Centre.

Mr Zouain indicated that the Centre would need direction from the Task Force. It would do the spadework, but the final synthesis would probably come later. Nevertheless, a preliminary synthesis document will be supplied. The Chair added that a synthesis of the work of the three Working Groups established in Marrakech would have to come from the Bureau. The documents would be circulated by 15 May 2000 though.

What still remained to be worked out was a coherent system of Sub-Committees to replace the Bureau. If a further meeting of the Task Force was required before the Bureau Meeting, it would be arranged. It was recommended that the Task Force produce one final document for the Bureau/Committee well in time. Its huge undertaking and the progress already made were to be applauded.

With the call for texts of the proposed changes to come from delegates to the Chair and/or the Rapporteur, the Chair indicated that the minutes of the Task Force Meeting would be drafted and placed on the website by 26 April 2000.

**Additional comments from ICCROM on WH Task Force document
"Recommended changes to the Implementation of the World Heritage
Convention/
Draft Discussion Paper"
April 6, 2000.**

ICCROM has the following comments on the Task Force document forwarded at the end of last week for review by Task Force members. These comments were prepared by Herb Stovel.

1. The comments of the Belgian delegation concerning follow-up seem very pertinent. I've been looking through the record of the decisions of the Bureau and Committees over the last 5 or 6 years and it is extraordinary how many of the recommendations we seem to be making have already been made before. I think we need to ask ourselves how to move these recommendations into action. The proposal of the Belgians (number 4 in their document of 03.04.2000) to develop an action plan around our recommendations, which would assign responsibility for execution seems very useful.
2. Our primary concern at this stage is less the content of the report (although we believe there are still many points which bear full discussion) but rather, as we have noted a couple of times, how the conclusions of the Task Force due to be finalised on April 30, will be effectively integrated with the conclusions of the other working groups, particularly that set to work in Cambridge next week. Many of the Task Force recommendations touch the Guidelines; these will not be finalised until after the Canterbury group has finished its work. How will all of this all be brought together?
3. A number of the ICCROM comments concerning philosophy of approach (e.g., preparing States Parties for proactive approaches) have fallen by the wayside. This is I assume because our principal job on the Task Force is to come up with pragmatic recommendations for changes on procedures etc., not to philosophize. ICCROM would like however not to lose sight of some of the points made; we believe they are relevant to the effectiveness of the Convention, and we believe that they should be considered

somewhere inside our improvement process. Perhaps our document could contain a summary of those ideas not acted upon but which nevertheless were deemed to have value for examination at a later time.

4. A number of the ICCROM recommendations have been integrated into the document. A large group relating to international assistance have been included but noted as ICCROM comments. I assume there is an intention ultimately to either include or not include these fully within the body of the text. How will it be decided whether these deserve inclusion or not?
5. The Belgian comments of 03.04.2000 suggest a focus on priorities only. ICCROM agrees with the need for a selective focus, but we believe it must be done in the context of a wide and comprehensive overview of all the needs and possibilities (which is what we have been doing fairly effectively so far). What is not clear what the priorities for our recommendations ought to be? Those things that are in most urgent need of reform? Those things that can be done most quickly? With least effort? This is one area where I feel we need serious discussion.
6. More specifically, a number of comments on the text sent for review follow:
 - A proposed section 1.4 to deal with the nature of Advisory Body / Centre meetings was not included. It may have been felt that the document should focus on actions linked to Committee initiatives and that the recommendation was beyond the scope of the Task Force's work. However our proposal for a section 4.2 on the roles of the Advisory Bodies and Centre was included. Perhaps the point made in 4.1 could be included here. We believe that this is a significant item for the Committee since we hope to use these consultation meetings with the Centre for early annual activity and budget planning, which should benefit the Committee's budget discussion in Dec.
 - ICCROM is happy to see training and education given a prominent place on one of the four Committees. Although putting together with promotion might not seem logical to some, promotion, education and training all involve communication, and thus there may be some advantages to bringing them together.

- 1.3. something. (ICCROM recommendation not used). We continue to believe that commitment to keeping the **Bureau and Committee agendas** to a small number of major items instead of the current expanding agenda with its proliferation of overlapping issues is a simple but effective way to streamline.
- Among recommendations for strategic planning (2.1), ICCROM would like to see stated a **commitment to a unified strategic process**. This is not just philosophy; we need to constantly remind ourselves to work in one coherent stream.
- With respect to the meeting cycle for Strategic Planning review, why not link to the 6 year periodic reporting cycle? 4 years is a reasonable period, but would it not be useful to link to other cyclical patterns relevant to the Committee?
- Another ICCROM point that didn't make the cut: ICOMOS and IUCN make presentations of their evaluation work directly to the Committee and in the past did also for monitoring. Now, in the interests of overall coherence, the Centre filters and re-presents all state of conservation and assistance discussions. Substantial time could be saved (the Centre re-writing advisory body reports) if the Advisory bodies could be entrusted with a [part of this within a framework designed by all to maintain overall coherence. I specifically have in mind what seems to be the unnecessary cost in time of having the Centre re-write the ICCROM comments on training assistance.
- The points made by ICCROM about ignoring assistance request deadlines and ignoring post-event evaluation requirements had to do with training. They may apply to other areas of assistance but we have not looked at those areas in any kind of statistical fashion..
- We believe it would be useful to retain the specific references we provided to ICCROM documents developed and used in our work for the Committee, including the training assistance criteria, and the international assistance procedures document.

ICCROM feels at this stage in the Task Force process a strong desire to participate in some kind of face to face review, in support of the point being made by Belgian colleagues. The closer we get to a final document, the more I want to withdraw my earlier statement that 80% if the conclusions are easy to agree with, and discussion could be limited to 20%. In fact, the closer we come to finalising

details, the more issues I realize need to be reviewed or debated, at least at some level.

If, in the need to respect the Bureau information provision schedule (that is, finishing our work by April 30), and the need to respect the existing limiting travel commitments of Task Force members, we are not able to do better than to meet partly in Canterbury, and partly in Paris on the 17th, the more I believe we should begin to think about what we can do between the Bureau and the Committee to try to arrive at the Committee with an overall, coherently integrated package of proposals.

**Recommended changes to the implementation of the World Heritage convention
Comments on the [draft discussion paper](#) (31.03.2000) from the Belgian
Delegation**

1. It has to be made clear to whom this report is addressed: the **final report has to be formatted** in such a way as **to facilitate the decision making process on its recommendations.**
2. According to the terms of reference, the working group **should "identify and propose priority practical measures (...) some of which should be applicable in preparation of and during the Committee meeting of December 2000"**. In Marrakech, Ms Cameron underlined the need to limit the scope of the tasks of the working group. The draft report is much more ambitious.
3. While recognising the importance of some issues raised, we think it is not appropriate to tackle all of them, especially as there will be no plenary meeting of the working group to reach consensus on the pending issues. The report should thus **focus on a limited number of key issues : the "priority practical measures"**. Other important issues and those for which there is no consensus should be transmitted to the Bureau for further examination by a possible new working group (see our terms of reference). They should be grouped in a last section on "future developments".
4. Many similar recommendations have already been issued in the past. They were not implemented because they were not translated into **an action plan defining for each objective clear measures, responsibilities, a timetable and a procedure to monitor progress.** To be of any use, the Cameron report should include these elements, preferable in the format of a table.
5. **Recommendations should be as precise as possible.** E.g. it is not good enough to strongly recommend to set a limit to the number the nomination proposals to be examined per Committee session (2.3.4.), a number has to be proposed, based on past experience.
6. The section on **restructuring the working documents for the statutory**

meetings needs to be developed: a decrease in number and weight would be immediately visible and welcomed by all State Parties. The overwhelming documentation and the late arrival of some of the documents for the last Committee session in Marrakech brought the Committee to set up our working group. Bureau and Committee documents should be examined in order to include in the report proposals which could be already implemented for the next Committee meeting in December. A **real input of the WH-Centre Staff** and the advisory bodies would be necessary. This could best be organised in Paris.

7. Section 3 – "**Information and documentation management**" should also **address the needs of the users and make the link with the strategic priorities**. This is a key issue for a majority of Delegations. We recognise the immense efforts of the WH Centre over the last few years (and months). A review of their activities (what and how) and the needs of the State parties or other countries, leading to updating the strategic information plan (Kyoto) would result in an even more effective communication. Eg. Information for new State Parties, new committee members, all State parties, site managers, pressure groups, ..., rules for access to documents. The questions and proposals made in our last e-mail should be integrated in this section rather than in section 1 or 2.
8. **We expect the face to face meeting to go through the different sections of the report**. Indeed, some new proposals need careful consideration. We regret f.i. that at this stage no arguments were given in support of the proposals concerning the subcommittee system: number of subcommittee members, use of ranking system, decision making process between subcommittee and Committee, number of meetings of the subcommittees, etc. We have **strong reservations on some proposals for implementing the subcommittee system and would prefer simpler solutions**.
9. We noted that some of our **reservations or counter-arguments** were not (or hardly mentioned) in the draft report, e.g.:
 - Meetings in other parts of the world as opposed to meetings in Paris
 - A yearly cycle as opposed to a two year cycle for nominations and conservation reports.

We are of course happy to examine factual information which support those recommendations. If this can not be provided, these issues should be moved to the section "Future developments".

10. Parts of the draft report which need clarification:

- Similar recommendations (e.g. in sections 2.5., 2.7) could be grouped.
- Figures should be quoted in the document, as appropriate (and not only be attached as an annex).
- **4.2. Respective roles of the advisory bodies and the WHC:** this issue is far too important to be in section "Other matters". To be moved to section 1 or 2, as there is no section on decision making bodies & other partners..
- **Some of our proposals were not quoted correctly** e.g.:
 - 2.3.9.: Making available the results of the evaluation bodies to the nominating State Party, whether they are or not Committee members, is only one possible solution to avoid discrimination. It will not only create extra work load but also add pressure on the decision making process. Our recommendation was to examine other solutions as well, e.g. place an embargo, ask Bureau members not to submit nomination proposals and/or give a lower priority for examination of nomination proposals by Committee members unless the proposal corresponds to another high priority category as defined by the Benin group.
 - 2.4.5.: Duplication between the documents of the WH Centre and the advisory bodies should be avoided; the WH centre document could be presented in the form of a table.
 - 2.4.6.: Amend guidelines to restrict participation by observers in meetings to avoid pressure on Committee decision making (instead of time).
- **Some issues raised by our Delegation were not taken up in the draft report:** e.g.
 - "green light feeling" for nomination proposals if no comment is made on tentative lists,
 - many nomination proposals are submitted by already well represented State Parties,
 - links with other working groups and meetings...

11. Examination of the reports of the 3 working groups at next Bureau

meeting:

Special attention should be given to the **coherence of the recommendations** made by the 3 working groups in order to facilitate decision making by the Bureau and the Committee. Having attended the meetings of the 2 other working groups, we think that consensus is growing and that there are no conflicting proposals at this stage.

Of equal importance is the **sequence of the meetings**. The 3 working groups will recommend some revisions of the operational guidelines. The last section on "Future developments" should therefore recommend a global review of the Rules of Procedure and the Operational Guidelines in order to take into account the recommendations of the 3 working groups and the outcomes of the Canterbury meeting.

12. Attached is a list of objectives and measures which belong to the category of priority practical measures and for which there seems to be a consensus.

ANNEX

**Some priority practical measures
Objectives and measures**

Note: For each measure, the report should identify clear responsibilities, a timetable and a procedure to monitor progress

● **Smoother running of statutory meetings:**

- Revising the calendar of the meetings
- Moving towards a subcommittee system
- Limiting the number of nomination proposals (max. 40) and conservation reports (max. ?) to be examined at each yearly session
- Restructuring of the working documents
- Adapting the agenda of Committee meetings in order to have a better

balance between its tasks

- Limiting the number of working groups, developing rules for membership and working methods, assigning them precise terms of reference
- Focussing minutes of meetings on key elements of discussion, decisions and action points

● **Implementing strategic decisions**

- Allowing time for discussions by the Committee and the General Assembly on strategic policy issues
- Developing a Strategic Plan, based on the 1992 Global Strategy, the 1999 Resolutions and the recommendations made by the 3 Working Groups
- Streamlining all activities¹ and bringing them in line with the strategic priorities and the Strategic action plan
- Limiting the number of activities (e.g. by postponing some of them which are less relevant today)
- Adapting the structure of the budget to the strategic priorities, including revising procedures for allocating funds
- Revising the operational guidelines to bring them in line
- Monitoring progress of implementation of strategic decisions
- Presenting the key strategic documents in one single and attractive document
- Encouraging comparative approaches (as opposed to case by case studies) focussing on key sites and issues

● **Implicating the State Parties²**

- Updating and adjusting the information policy of the WHC to the needs of the SP, as perceived by them (e.g. making key documents and information easier accessible)
- Making better use of the General Assembly
- Reinforcing the role of regional representatives
- Making key strategic documents available to non Committee members
- Making publications on evolution of the notion "exceptional universal value", the criteria, typologies... for non Committee members
- Developing best practices and make the information available to site-managers.

¹ Regional action plans, preparatory assistance, international assistance, funding for attending Committee meetings, promotional activities, information & documentation, meetings of experts, informal and formal working groups, evaluations...

² 2/3 of the State Parties have never been a member of the Committee

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION DRAFT DISCUSSION PAPER

Notes: This paper is based on the [Chair's document](#) posted on the Task Force on the Implementation of the WH Convention web site in February 2000 which incorporated comments from IUCN and Australia. Later contributions (Belgium, ICCROM and Australia) have been incorporated. This working document does not yet comprehensively reproduce all issues and recommendations made by contributors.

The implementation of the recommendations will be prioritised, as per the Belgian proposal, when recommendations are finalised.

Recommendations of States Parties are presented on a 'without prejudice' basis for the purpose of discussion.

Contents

1 STATUTORY MEETINGS

- 1.1 [General Assembly of States Parties](#)
- 1.2 [Bureau Meetings](#)
- 1.3 [Committee Meetings](#)

2. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

- 2.1 [Strategic Planning](#)
- 2.2 [Tentative Lists](#)
- 2.3 [Nominations](#)
- 2.4 [Inscription on World Heritage List](#)
- 2.5 [Reporting on State of Conservation](#)
- 2.6 [Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List](#)
- 2.7 [World Heritage Fund](#)

3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

- 3.1 [Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents](#)

3.2 [Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites](#)

4. OTHER MATTERS

4.1 [Contract Development and Management](#)

4.2 [The Roles of the Advisory Bodies and Centre](#)

Attachment A: Indicative table of recommendation sources

Attachment B: Figures indicating numbers of nominated and tentatively listed sites

1 STATUTORY MEETINGS

1.1 General Assembly of States Parties

Issues

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

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

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

Recommendations

1.1.1 That the following become permanent agenda items for the General Assembly

- strategic policy issues;
- report of performance on strategic direction and the implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions.

1.1.2 That the Committee hold a regular meeting immediately before the General Assembly (as the Assembly elects replacement members of the Committee, there are practical impediments to it meeting after the General Assembly - candidates would have difficulties in

confirming travel and other plans, and candidates would not be able to adequately prepare for the meeting).

1.1.3 The Committee meet immediately after the General Assembly to elect office bearers.

1.1.4 To save time during voting in the General Assembly, Secretariat and scrutineers collect ballots instead of inviting participants to come and vote.

1.2 Bureau Meetings

Issues

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

Although the participation of those with observer status is helpful to the understanding of the mechanisms of implementing the convention, Bureau/ Committee /Subcommittee meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers.

Recommendations

Subcommittees

1.2.1 That a subcommittee system be introduced to replace the Bureau that:

- frees the Committee from administration
- constitute subcommittees with clearly defined work programs and responsibilities delegated by the Committee.

1.2.2 That four subcommittees be constituted to assume the following functions:

- Nominations to the List including the Global Strategy.
- State of conservation of properties inscribed on the list.
- Promotion, education and training.
- Finance and administration.

1.2.3 That the subcommittees have the following structure:

- Each subcommittee be made up of 7 Committee members.
- States Parties may be represented on up to two of the subcommittees.
- The members, chairs and rapporteurs for each subcommittee to be elected by the

Committee for the period of two years and to the extent possible be representative of different regions (elections held in the Committee meeting held immediately after the General Assembly).

- Decisions of Subcommittees are to be by at least two-thirds majority.
- Subcommittees to meet once a year, immediately before Committee meetings, coordinated by the four Subcommittee chairs.
- Other meetings and communication of Subcommittees to be at discretion of Subcommittees and to have regard to the circumstances of the States Parties represented on the subcommittee. Subcommittees would be expected to conduct their work by making use of dedicated internet sites (assistance to be provided to enable states representatives to participate). Subcommittee decisions can be made out of session.
- That the Rules of Procedure of the Committee (document WHC/1) be amended to constitute the Subcommittee system.

1.2.4 That the Subcommittees, based on strategic parameters provided by the Committee, develop a focussed and practical work program with identifiable outcomes.

Other

1.2.5 Speaking rights in Bureau/ Committee/ Subcommittee meetings should be reviewed, clearly documented and rigorously applied. Observers should not intervene during meetings except in exceptional circumstances. Observers should instead work through their regional representatives (see also 2.4.6).

1.2.6 The General Assembly should endorse the principle that State Parties with Bureau/ Committee/ Subcommittee membership have a responsibility to represent their region.

1.3 Committee Meetings

Issues

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

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

The proposal to increase efficiency by dealing with inscriptions one year, and monitoring the next has support. However, the potential for this to decrease monitoring flexibility has been raised as a concern.

Annual meetings in different regions are costly and time-consuming. A proposal that the Committee meet in Paris every second year, immediately before the General Assembly, is time and cost effective.

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

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

(Section 1.2, Bureau Meetings, deals with the duplication of Bureau and Committee work and reform of speaking rights).

Recommendations

1.3.1 The Committee amend the nomination cycle and procedures to decrease the Committee workload (Operational Guidelines paras 65, 112, 129-34).

1.3.2 That the following revised calendar for nominations be introduced, which abolishes the current June/July Bureau meeting:

- 1 April Year 0: nominations to be lodged with the WH Centre (nomination check list completed and incomplete nominations sent back to the nominating state);
- 1 May Year 0: nominations sent to the Advisory bodies (incomplete nomination proposals are sent back to the WH Centre, who refer back to the nominating state);
- 1 July Year 1: Advisory Bodies assessments sent to WH Centre;
- 1 August Year 1: Advisory Bodies assessments sent to nominations Subcommittee;
- October Year 1: meetings of subcommittees, followed by Committee meeting.

1.3.3 In years when monitoring will be the focus of the Committee (if that proposal is accepted), nominations received the previous year will not be considered until the following year. The nominations Subcommittee, using an agreed ranking system, will provide to the Advisory bodies a schedule of nominations for assessment, listing order of priority and limiting the number per year.

1.3.4 The Committee meet in Paris every second year, immediately before the General Assembly of States Parties in regular session, and very briefly after, to elect new office bearers.

1.3.5 The Committee develop streamlined processes for consideration of Subcommittee recommendations. The Committee, based on strategic parameters provided by the General Assembly, develop a focussed and practical work program with identifiable outcomes.

1.3.6 Where responsibility for tasks has been delegated by the Committee / Subcommittee to Advisory Bodies, the Advisory Bodies report directly (via the World Heritage Centre) to the Subcommittee to minimise duplication with the Centre.

1.3.7 That the Rules of Procedure of the Committee (document WHC/1), be amended to reflect these recommendations.

1.3.8 That the rules of membership and access to the documents of the various working groups that are set up by the Committee and other bodies of the Convention are made clear.

1.3.9 That working groups on implementing the Convention be made open to all States Parties and that those related to the decision making process of the Committee to be restricted to Committee members.

2. DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

2.1 Strategic Planning

Issues

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

Recommendations

2.1.1 Committee to commence a review to formulate a Strategic Plan, based on the goals objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolution endorsing the Orientations. The review to fully integrate other strategic initiatives under the Convention.

2.1.2 The Strategic Plan to contain at a minimum:

- a vision
- goals
- objectives
- action plan
- timelines
- reporting mechanisms
- accountable parties
- a four year cycle of review monitoring and definition of new objectives (to be

reviewed by every second General Assembly).

2.1.3 The implementation of the Strategic Plan to be a permanent Committee agenda item and to require a presentation of a progress report to each General Assembly with a proposal for action if required.

2.2 Tentative Lists

Issues

Many States Parties have no tentative list, or their existing list is out-of-date.

Tentative Lists should be a tool for the Committee to plan its work in advance and to take decisions on nomination proposals to achieve a more representative List. The Committee should invite the Advisory Bodies to examine the existing tentative lists by geo-cultural area and that Operational Guidelines be amended to require all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both natural and cultural heritage, and consult with regional partners before any site can be considered for inscription.

Systematic and comprehensive tentative lists are necessary to provide an effective tool in analysing and helping to regulate nominations. It is possible that the resource requirements for the development and ongoing maintenance of comprehensive tentative lists will continue not to be an issue for a significant number of States Parties.

The development of a systematic mechanism to limit and prioritise the assessment of nominations (to be considered by the Working Group on the Representativeness of the World Heritage List) has potential to develop a more representative list.

Recommendations

2.2.1 That the Operational Guidelines require all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both natural and cultural heritage, and resulting from regional consultations, before any site can be considered for inscription, and that the lists be systematically updated. (inconsistent with rec 2.2.3)

2.2.2 The Committee use tentative lists as a planning tool to take decisions on nominations to achieve better representativity of the List. The Committee should invite the Advisory Bodies to examine the existing tentative lists by geo-cultural area. Their recommendations to be presented to the Committee and States Parties (will require adequate resources). (inconsistent with rec 2.2.3)

2.2.3 That the development of tentative lists be made a clearly voluntary option for States

Parties (Operational Guidelines paras 7-8). (inconsistent with recs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2)

2.3 Nominations

Issues

The World Heritage List is not fully representative of places with World Heritage Value. Nominations are not necessarily related to the priorities of the Global Strategy. As well, nominations do not necessarily satisfy requirements for assessment.

Reformed tentative lists (previous section) have been identified as a potential mechanism to contribute to a process to achieve greater representativity.

Nomination quality, and timely submission, require improvement. ICCROM has noted that nominations do not always fully reflect an understanding of the Convention and do not always convincingly advocate the 'outstanding universal value' of sites.

Committee members nominating sites are advantaged in the nomination process because only Committee members have access to the evaluation by the Advisory Body.

Recommendations

2.3.1 Develop and implement a checklist for the preparation and assessment of nominations. Only in exceptional circumstances should it not be applied.

2.3.2 The Centre check nominations for completeness (checklist), according to Operational Guidelines requirements. Section B of the Operational Guidelines should clarify that incomplete or late nominations are the responsibility of the States Party and will not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle (obviates need for consideration by the November session of Bureau and late nominations have resource ramifications).

2.3.3 Agendas for each meeting of the General Assembly and Committee to include an item reporting on nominations and listed sites by States Parties/region.

2.3.4 The Implementation Task Force strongly supports processes (to be considered by the Working Group on the Representativeness of the List) which limit the number of nominations to be assessed each year and which implements criteria based on representativeness to prioritise the nominations to be assessed.

2.3.5 That States Parties be strongly encouraged to follow the direction of the 12th General Assembly.

2.3.6 Advisory Bodies to present their recommendations on inscriptions in a way that clearly shows their relation to the priorities of the Global Strategy, and in a consistent format from one nomination to the next, using a check list to support recommendations, and clearly identifying potential or existing threats and any actions to protect the values.

2.3.7 States Parties to consult at all levels in developing nominations, consistent with the Operational Guidelines encourage, including the public, site managers, responsible officials and political decision-makers.

2.3.8 That the concept of ‘outstanding universal value’ be (more) precisely defined and applied between Advisory Bodies, and by the Committee.

2.3.9 That the results of Advisory Bodies’ evaluations of nominations be made available to the nominating State Party whether or not they are members of the Committee.

2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List

Issue

There is a lack of balance with the List. The Global Strategy is designed to help overcome gaps and imbalances in the representativeness of the List but its implementation has been inconsistent. (The balance and equity of the List is being examined by the Working Group on the Representativeness of the World Heritage List).

Too many nominations are handled each year, and nominations are handled several times due to referral and deferral mechanisms.

A two-year cycle for meetings, one year inscriptions, next year monitoring has been proposed.

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

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

Recommendations

Recommendation **2.3.4** supports processes (to be considered by the Working Group on the Representativeness of the List) which limit the number of nominations to be assessed each

year and which implements criteria based on representativeness to prioritise the nominations to be assessed.

Recommendation **2.3.2** seeks the Centre to be directed to check the contents of each nomination for completeness and to not accept late or incomplete nominations for the upcoming inscription cycle.

2.4.1 Introduce a two year cycle of meetings, one year inscriptions, next year monitoring.

2.4.2 Amend the Operational Guidelines to streamline the referral and deferral process (no specific mechanisms identified).

2.4.3 Prepare an analysis of the sources of imbalances in the World Heritage List and the list of sites being nominated, with a view to redress imbalances in the nomination and inscription process. The analysis should include the impact of UNESCO and Centre interactions with regions and States Parties, and identify the benefits of preparatory assistance and funding for preparation of tentative lists. (refer to Report of Task Force on Representativity of WH List).

2.4.4 Group the presentation of, and decisions on, similar nominations for efficiency.

2.4.5 The work documents of the Advisory Bodies and WHC to be presented in a table (with the four options: inscription, referral, deferral, negative advice) and that information not be duplicated in these documents.

2.4.6 Amend guidelines to restrict participation by observers in meetings to avoid pressure on Committee time.

2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation

Issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.5.1 Reactive and periodic reporting to be now handled by the proposed new subcommittee, along with the World Heritage Committee.

2.5.2 A formal mechanism is required to coordinate reactive monitoring activities with all parties who carry out monitoring, including the Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors. (Requires reforms to Operational Guidelines paras 68-79 in particular, and should link also to In Danger process in paras 80-93, and Deletion process in paras 46-56.)

2.5.3 Distribute documentation on monitoring early to relevant bodies, particularly the relevant state party, so Committee has time to discuss issues in an informed manner.

2.5.4 Present a single reactive monitoring report to the Subcommittee and Committee. Reports to be in a consistent format to facilitate discussion and consideration (standardised formats).

2.5.5 Timing and early triggers should be specified for a reactive monitoring report in Monitoring framework (Operational Guidelines para 68). Views of relevant State Party to be sought and appropriate weight given to them.

2.5.6 Operational Guidelines (para 79) and explanatory notes to be amended to encourage use of images and maps to improve comprehension.

2.5.7 Meeting procedures to be changed so that state of conservation discussions are separate from inscription of sites on In Danger List.

2.5.8 Criteria to be established to guide a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring (para 68 Operational Guidelines).

2.5.9 Include a new clause in Operational Guidelines Section II Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting to recognise and encourage best practice in management and monitoring.

2.5.10 Distribute examples of best practice to site managers/authorities.

2.5.11 Change Committee meeting procedures to ensure:

- Individual reports are to be made available to the Subcommittee and Committee, but are not to be read aloud (on condition that documents are distributed on schedule - 6 weeks prior to meeting).
- The focus on individual reports to be in Subcommittee. The focus on strategic trends (overview summary of monitoring activity) in Committee to encourage general discussion on ways and means to improve state of conservation.

2.5.12 Introduce a tabular summary of sites with lesser conservation problems and actions being taken to address them to be tabled for information, with opportunity to comment in writing to Centre and tabling of updates at subsequent meetings (standardised formats would facilitate this proposal).

2.5.13 A World Heritage List document be produced (internal use only) to indicate whether and when a site has been discussed by Committee

2.5.14 Centre to prepare an overview of the sites discussed in the Committee, their number, the effect of this discussion, and the state of conservation of sites that have and have not been discussed.

2.5.15 Introduce a mechanism to identify conservation themes that recur. On the basis of Committee discussions and experience, develop some guidelines for site managers and/or authorities so that they can benefit from the experience.

2.5.16 Reduce the number of sites reported on and give an associated increased level of attention to sites with significant rather than peripheral problems. (See also 2.5.12)

2.5.17 That clear rules be developed that make clear the level of public access to state of conservation reports and to information developed in their preparation.

2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List

Issues

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

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

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

Inscription on In Danger list should be aligned to allocation of international assistance.

Recommendation

2.6.1 The purpose of the In Danger Listing to be clarified and be accompanied by an analysis of evolution of the notion.

2.6.2 That clear indicators be developed to assess whether sites are to be inscribed on, or removed from, the In Danger List and that they are adhered to (including preparation of checklist to enable comparative analysis).

- A monitoring framework to be developed to identify the threshold levels of threat that trigger nomination to the In-Danger List (Operational Guideline paras 80-85)
- A monitoring framework to also specify a review process (paras 92 and 93).

2.6.3 Committee should set strategic priorities for action for sites on In Danger List.

2.6.4 Operational Guideline Para 91 to be amended to ensure that funding assistance is allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List and that strategic priorities should be set for action using strategic plan, and mechanisms in place for reporting outcomes.

2.6.5 Operational Guidelines to more clearly (paras 86 & 87) stress State Party involvement (and where appropriate responsibility) in the action planning process, and the need to designate responsibility for who will carry out the actions. Within the monitoring framework (again a checklist), the action plan will be linked to a review process that determines when a property should no longer be on the In-Danger List.

2.6.6 That a checklist for inscription on World Heritage in Danger List be established and adhered to (in support of recommendation 2.6.2)

2.6.7 That the effectiveness of inscription on the World Heritage in Danger List and related assistance in the protection of sites be systematically evaluated, against agreed objectives and measurable outcomes.

2.7 World Heritage Fund

Issues

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

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

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

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

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

International Assistance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

2.7.1 Establish a finance and administration subcommittee to prepare budget for Committee (see recs 1.2.1, 1.2.2) and also allow for substantive discussion of budget issues, including the World Heritage Fund. (para 122 of Operational Guidelines).

2.7.2 (a) Revise Operational Guidelines to require the Centre to provide clear work plans, to be updated every 6 months, which specify resource requirements linked to strategic plan and documented expected outcomes; and which require a detailed accounting, every 6 months, on actual expenditures and results.

(The requirement for workplans is not specified in the Operational Guidelines. A new paragraph to be inserted in Section V: World Heritage Fund. This paragraph should promote the transparency of funding procedures and outline a review and accountability process.)

(b) Revise Operational Guidelines to give greater flexibility to the Centre under authority of the Chair (in consultation with the Chair of the Subcommittee) to allocate international assistance, while requiring the Centre to provide proper reports on accountability and performance.

2.7.3 Allocate World Heritage Funds on a more strategic basis (e.g. World Heritage in Danger). Needs to be linked with Global Action Plan. (Paras 113 and 114 of the Operational Guidelines outline the order of priority for funding allocation and may need to be changed to be more 'strategic'.)

2.7.4 Achieve efficiencies by taking into account the existence of other international funding (including other UNESCO programs) and use the Fund to attract major sponsors. Present budgets in a way that identifies external funding and funding needed to complete the project.

2.7.5 Harmonise the World Heritage budget cycle with that of UNESCO.

2.7.6 Require periodic independent evaluations to assess relevance and effectiveness of different categories of international assistance and their impact on sites. (This could be incorporated into a funding review process, to be specified in a new paragraph of the Operational Guidelines and/or in the financial regulation document WHC/7.)

2.7.7 The Centre to prepare a plan that systematically identifies international organisations that are involved in world heritage activities, and the opportunities and strategies to harmonise funding allocation.

2.7.8 Reinstate biennial budgeting for WHF. (see Operational Guidelines para 112 and rec 2.7.5).

2.7.9 Revise Budget presentation: one single document with several columns according to category of decision making (Centre, Chairman, Bureau/Subcommittees, Committee).

2.7.10 Each 'article' of the Budget to be accompanied by the relevant information and the number of the related working document.

2.7.11 Each working document with budgetary implications to mention the article of the budget.

2.7.12 The Operational Guidelines procedures on the management of requests for technical assistance be rigorously adhered to.

International Assistance (ICCROM recs)

2.7.13 Clarify within the Operational Guidelines (or a related procedures document) considerations related to the process of managing requests for international assistance, including establishing clearly distinct definitions of categories of international assistance, expectations of roles of Advisory bodies and WH Centre in managing the process of response to such requests, expectations re nature and format of Advisory Body reviews, verification of criteria to be used in carrying out reviews.

2.7.14 Ensure that the provisions contained within the Guidelines, including those concerning deadlines and follow up to previous projects, are respected and followed by all partners in the system.

2.7.15 Examine budget treatment of Advisory Body services support costs for responding to requests for international assistance, with a view to improving consistency of treatment of the advisory bodies funds within the budget, and with a view to maximising the use of budgeted funds for operational projects.

2.7.16 Ensure that international assistance requests are considered in relation to strategic priorities established by the Committee

2.7.17 That training be separated out from consideration of other forms of international assistance in discussion, and for training to appear as a regular agenda sub-item in all meetings, in order to bring greater consistency and attention to the treatment of training. ICCROM believes that the very significant funds being allocated to training at the moment, and the high effectiveness of training investments in improving conditions for conservation, warrant the Committee giving this increased prominence to consideration of training issues, strategies and requests.

2.7.18 That the ‘Draft procedures for reviewing requests for international assistance (cultural heritage)’ and the ‘Principles guiding the assessment of training requests’ (Annexes 1 and 2 of the ICCROM submission to the Task Force on the Implementation of the Convention)’ be considered for adoption.

3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents

Issues

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

Information is often duplicated and confusing.

Late input from advisory bodies and Centre and compressed schedules prevents Centre staff from synthesising reports, and Committee (and Subcommittees) from considering the information.

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

Recommendations

3.1.1 Reduce volume of documentation presented to Committee

- the use of single documents for the agenda

- having the same paragraph numbers for English and French versions
- table of contents be prepared for long documents
- cross-reference documents with the budget where appropriate for clarity
- complementary information should be limited to new information
- revisions should be made clear (e.g. bolding, revision mode)
- use of tables instead of plain text to be encouraged
- use of CD roms and other electronic media where practical
- lists of decisions to be drafted in such a way to help monitoring implementation.

3.1.2 That there be strict adherence to the deadlines established for document production. Items should not be referred to the Committee if materials arrive too late for adequate synthesis.

3.1.3 That the Operational Guidelines (para 111) be amended to specify that WH Funding may be sought to enable States Parties to acquire the information technology needed to access the relevant information if it can be demonstrated that this is cost effective in terms of the distribution of documentation.

3.1.4 That clear rules be developed that clarify rights of access to documents, including by States Parties that are not members of the Committee. (Rules to be consistent with the objective of minimising the production and duplication of documentation.)

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites

Issues

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

- information out-of-date
- need for Centre to have consolidated site files
- need to link state of conservation reports with international assistance requests/ allocations, and triggers.

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

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

Recommendations

3.2.1 Centre to consolidate record keeping to link nomination files, monitoring reports, international assistance and correspondence. These records should be linked electronically to site files of Advisory bodies.

3.2.2 Centre to establish a management information system that will enable analysis of trends and patterns in international assistance projects.

3.2.3 Establish and publish a list of sites for which international assistance has been granted, and update regularly. The list to report outcomes and results.

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

3.2.5 Anticipate future record keeping needs and ensure use of a data management system which can ensure appropriate capture and future accessibility of the record of current activities and decision making.

4. OTHER MATTERS

4.1 Contract Development and Management

Issue

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

Recommendation

4.1.1 That the Committee, as a high priority, improve the contract development and management system within the Centre, including the development of standards for contract development.

4.2 The Roles of the Advisory Bodies and Centre

Issue

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

Recommendation

4.2.1 That the Committee clarify the respective roles of the Advisory Bodies and Centre by developing MOUs that address the interests of all parties in the system.

Attachment A

Table of sources of recommendations on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

Note: This table is indicative only.

1. Statutory Meeting Recommendations

1.1.1	IUCN, Chair, Belgium
1.1.2	Belgium
1.1.3	Belgium
1.2.1	Raised as option by chair, IUCN, Belgium & ICCROM support
1.2.2	Specific subcommittee suggestions by ICCROM, Australia variously
1.2.3	Specific subcommittee suggestions by ICCROM, Australia variously
1.2.4	Belgium, Australia
1.2.5	Australia
1.2.6	Chair
1.3.1	Belgium
1.3.2	Belgium
1.3.3	Chair, Australia, not supported by Belgium

1.3.4	Chair, Australia
1.3.5	Australia
1.3.6	ICCROM
1.3.7	Australia
1.3.8	Belgium
1.3.9	Belgium

2. Decision-Making Procedures

2.1.1	Chair, ICCROM, Belgium
2.1.2	Chair, ICCROM, Belgium
2.1.3	Chair, ICCROM, Belgium
2.2.1	Option of Chair, Belgium
2.2.2	Belgium
2.2.3	Option of Chair, Australia. IUCN disagrees
2.3.1	ICCROM, Australia
2.3.2	Chair, Belgium
2.3.3	Chair
2.3.4	Belgium, Australia
2.3.5	Chair, IUCN
2.3.6	Belgium
2.3.7	ICCROM
2.3.8	IUCN
2.3.9	Belgium
2.4.1	Option of Chair, not supported by Australia
2.4.2	Chair

2.4.3	Chair
2.4.4	Belgium
2.4.5	Belgium
2.4.6	Belgium
2.5.1	Australia
2.5.2	Chair, Australia
2.5.3	Chair, Belgium
2.5.4	Chair
2.5.5	Chair
2.5.6	Chair
2.5.7	Chair
2.5.8	Chair, Australia
2.5.9	Chair, Australia
2.5.10	Belgium
2.5.11	Chair, Belgium
2.5.12	Belgium
2.5.13	Belgium
2.5.14	Belgium
2.5.15	Belgium
2.5.16	IUCN
2.5.17	Belgium
2.6.1	Belgium, ICCROM
2.6.2	Chair, with additions from Australia
2.6.3	Chair, Belgium
2.6.4	Chair, IUCN
2.6.5	Australia
2.6.6	Australia
2.6.7	Australia

2.7.1	Chair, Belgium. Australia seeks discussion of Budget issues too.
2.7.2	Chair, Belgium
2.7.3	Chair, Belgium
2.7.4	Chair, IUCN, Belgium
2.7.5	Chair, Belgium
2.7.6	Chair, IUCN, Belgium
2.7.7	Chair
2.7.8	Chair, Belgium
2.7.9	Belgium
2.7.10	Belgium
2.7.11	Belgium

3. Information and Document Management

3.1.1	Chair, IUCN, Belgium
3.1.2	ICCROM
3.1.3	Australia
3.1.4	Belgium
3.2.1	Chair
3.2.2	Chair
3.2.3	Chair. Australia seeks report on outcomes on list
3.2.4	ICCROM
3.2.5	ICCROM

4. Other Matters

4.1.1	ICCROM
4.2.1	ICCROM

Attachment B**Attachment B: Figures indicating numbers of nominated and tentatively listed sites.**

- **Number of nomination proposals per year:**

1978-1998: 965 nomination proposals

≈ 45 nomination proposals a year

- **Number of inscriptions on the WHList per year:**

1978-1998: 582 inscriptions

≈28 inscriptions a year

(see WHC-99/CONF.204/12 Rev)

- **Table of sites on the Tentative Lists:**

Notes:

- As at November 1999 (based on WHC-99/CONF.209/10).
- Totals to be checked with WHC.
- WHSites are included in the number of Tentative List Sites.

Regions	Tentative List Sites	WHSites in 1998	Countries without Tentative Lists
Africa	92	46	13
Arab States	76	51	8
Asia/pacific	231	123	11
Europe/North America	731	288	6
Latin America/Carribbean	131	74	10
Total	1260	582	48

- **Table of evolution of the WHList over the coming years with 30,45 or 60 inscriptions a year:**

	30/year	45/year	60/year
1999	630	630	630
2000	660	675	690
2001	690	720	750
2002	720	765	810
2003	750	810	870
2004	780	855	930
2005	810	900	990
2006	840	945	1050
2007	870	990	1110
2008	900	1035	1170
2009	930	1080	1230
2010	960	1125	1290
2011	990	1170	1350
2012	1020	1215	1410

Comments from ICCROM:

ICCROM felt it important to contribute to the work of the task force in the simplest fashion possible. Given the completeness of the summary offered by Christina Cameron, and the comprehensive IUCN overview prepared earlier (whose major points appear to be picked up in Christina's summary), it seemed most useful to interpolate comments and perspectives where relevant within Christina's outline. Hence, our comments are limited to areas where we feel some modification or extension of views would be useful, and also where we have felt the need to offer some additional points. *These comments are shown in italics.* Where nothing has been added, we are generally in agreement with the issues and recommendations identified in Christina's document.

Some of the comments may be of greater relevance to the Canterbury meeting on the Operational Guidelines; nevertheless these are included here to ensure their place within an overall perspective.

One of the difficulties we experienced in coming up with recommendations for the Task Force is the recognition that while short term measures and improvements for Committee operations are actively desired, the measures most likely to improve functioning require commitment to fairly radical alterations to the Committee's working framework and could only be implemented in the mid to long term. Too much emphasis on short term measures might even be counter-productive, without considering these within a long term perspective. *Nevertheless we have placed in bold italics measures we feel are both urgent and which, if addressed quickly, could have substantial short term positive impacts.*

ICCROM's comments were put together by Herb Stovel (with very limited opportunity for input from Marc Laenen and Joe King).

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

April 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Context:

- grows out of Financial and Management Audit of 1996-98
- increasing workload (number of States Parties, number of nominations and sites, length of statutory meetings, size of paperwork)
- labour intensive administration involved in coordinating and administering inscription, monitoring and international assistance processes
- 60% of Centre staff time dedicated to servicing statutory meetings
- duplication of effort-presentation of same material to Bureau, Extraordinary Bureau and Committee
- time constraints for States Parties, Advisory Bodies and Centre
- multiplicity of actors involved in the implementation of the Convention
- urgency to lighten burden
- replication with minor changes of same documents two or three times
- cumbersome processes mean that urgent matters are not dealt with in timely fashion
- lack of time to deal with policy and strategic direction-setting
- last-minute distribution of papers means Committee members not have sufficient time to consider important issues

Comment(ICCROM):

-in our view, another important contextual consideration requiring emphasis is the need for all partners in the system to recognize that adoption of the "strategic" approaches which all seem to favour, requires moving from the reactive mechanisms encouraged by the Convention (where initiative is generally left with States Parties to request inscription or assistance of one kind or another) , to proactive, anticipatory approaches, and the implications of this shift.

While it is easy to support recommendations to adopt strategic approaches, these may be more difficult to fully implement since strategic approaches reduce individual initiatives available to States Parties. While proactive approaches may increase the effectiveness of utilization of available funds, they reduce opportunities for States Parties to seek financial support for programmes of direct interest to their sites. In the end , if we continue to move in this direction, most of the WH Fund budget will be allocated in advance, in accordance with perceived regional priorities. This will reduce possibilities for States Parties to seek direct support for activities and initiatives of perceived national importance. This transition and its implications need to be discussed and carefully managed

Objective:

- to identify and propose practical measures for more effective operation of the Convention
- blueprint for future direction in implementation of Convention
- to look at working methods, procedures, documentation

Comment(ICCROM):

*-in relation to the above objectives, it would be useful from ICCROM's perspective to ensure that the various measures, methods, procedures, blueprints etc. advocated are proposed within a strategic planning process which **integrates existing Committee strategic initiatives within one overall strategic framework.***

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

CHAPTER 1 STATUTORY MEETINGS

1.1 General Assembly of States Parties

Issues:

- time spent on election and administrative issues at expense of policy discussions
- timing of General Assembly one month before Committee (more costly for travel and overburden on Centre)

Recommendations:

- focus on strategic policy issues
- report on performance on strategic direction

1.2 Bureau Meetings

Issues:

- Bureau is meant to take pressure off Committee meetings by preparing its work, but in fact everything is duplicated at Committee meetings because there is no real delegation
- the conduct of Bureau meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers.

Recommendations:

- eliminate duplication with Committee by clearly identifying work program for each either with significant delegation to Bureau or else eliminate Bureau and move to sub-committee system

Comment(ICCROM):

-ICCROM believes firmly that a sub-committee system would strengthen Committee effectiveness. The sub-committees could be based on the principal chapters used within the WH Fund budget, (establishing the List, technical implementation, state of conservation, promotion and education) as well as on questions of budget planning. This approach while increasing effectiveness of Committee debate, in theory should also offer more opportunities for States Parties to participate in the work of the Committee and perhaps reduce the desire of observers to intervene directly in Bureau/ Committee debate. ICCROM believes that as long as the Bureau is perceived as a body which prepares work for the Committee, the repetition and overlap problems will inevitably continue.

-the clearly redefined work program should be designed to free the Committee from administration to focus on strategic policy issues

-speaking rights in Bureau meetings be reviewed and rigorously applied – regional representatives on the Bureau may be an effective vehicle to represent States Parties without Bureau membership.

1.3 Committee Meetings

Issues:

-not enough time to handle workload in plenary sessions

-material duplicates Bureau work

-too much time spent on specific items but little on strategic direction-setting

-yearly meetings in different regions are costly and time-consuming (hospitality/ touring)

-exhaustion factor for all parties

- The conduct of Committee, like Bureau, meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers and maintaining control over the number of participants.

Recommendations:

-eliminate duplication with Bureau by clearly identifying work program for each or else move to a sub-committee system to improve efficiency (finance and administration, cultural sites, natural sites)

-propose changes to meeting cycle (meetings every two years or inscriptions one year, monitoring the next)

-arrange and follow a balanced and coherent agenda, allowing time for substantive policy debate

Comment and recommendation(ICCROM):

- simplification of the Bureau and Committee agendas might be one of the most

effective ways to reduce workload and to increase coherence in Bureau and Committee discussions; if the agenda could follow the main chapters in the Fund budget for example, and all discussion items could be seen as sub-units within this overall framework, and if this framework could relate to an integrated strategic plan, then it should become easier to allocate Committee time to priorities within the Committee's interests. Would it not be possible to work within a consistently formatted agenda corresponding to the principal chapters of the WHFund budget?

- meet in Paris every second year, coordinated with General Assembly of States Parties
- Speaking rights in Committee meetings be reviewed and rigorously applied – regional representatives on the Committee may be an effective vehicle to represent States Parties without Committee membership.

Comment and recommendation (ICCROM):

-one specific mechanism by which duplication of effort could be reduced would be to allow the Advisory bodies to assume responsibility for presentation directly to the Committee of some of the tasks they are assigned to carry out. For example, why should not ICCROM present directly to the Committee the results of the analysis of the requests for training assistance for cultural heritage it carries out? At present, in relation to training, WH Centre staff synthesize the results of advisory body analyses, and present slightly modified versions of the advisory body's texts, to the Committee. If ICCROM for example were entrusted with the responsibility to present the results of its analysis of requests for training assistance directly to the Committee, considerable savings of staff time within ICCROM and the Centre could be made.

Any move in this direction would have to be carried out with due regard for maintaining overall coherence of materials presented to the Committee, but we believe if a clear common working framework and format for presentations were developed, coherence could be maintained and the burden on Centre staff reduced.

Proposed new section (ICCROM):

1.4 Advisory bodies/ WH Centre meetings

(Forgive our proposing a new section, but Committee members are not always fully aware of the existence of such meetings. If carefully planned and used, these meetings can help address many of the operational issues identified as significant by the Task Force members.)

Issue:

- after the WH Centre was created in 1992, at the instigation of ICOMOS, the

advisory bodies began to meet with the WH Centre staff several times a year in order to better co-ordinate their activities, and to discuss common scientific problems in the context of the Convention. In recent years, propelled by the ever-constant pressure of preparing for the next meeting, the Centre has taken over organisation of the meetings and focussed their agenda on the preparation of Bureau or Committee working documents by the Centre and discussion of related agenda issues. At present, generally, these meetings are held twice a year, in early September and in early February.

Recommendation(ICCROM):

- ICCROM and ICOMOS have both strongly expressed their wish to return to using these forums to plan together their programmes and activities within long term strategic frameworks. We believe for example that these meetings offer an excellent opportunity to examine and prepare budgets together well in advance of Committee meetings, in a collegial and constructive climate. This point is being made here because we believe it would be useful for the Task Force to recognize and reinforce the potential of these meetings, if properly organised, to improve Committee effectiveness.

CHAPTER 2 DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

2.1 Strategic Planning

Issues:

- 1992 Strategic Orientations with its action plan was relevant but direction not sustained because no mechanism for assigning responsibilities for implementation, no timelines identified and no process for monitoring and updating
- goals and objectives of Strategic Orientations were not achieved

Recommendations:

- undertake a Strategic Review exercise using as a starting point a follow-up on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document.
- ensure that an updated Strategic Plan, containing at a minimum a vision, goals, objectives and action plan be produced and systematically followed up on (regular review)
- ensure that the action plan specifies accountable parties, timelines and reporting mechanisms
- adopt the review of the Strategic Plan as a permanent agenda item

Comment and recommendations(ICCROM):

-ICCROM strongly supports a return to the 1992 Strategic Orientations document (as

CC has suggested) and commitment to the processes underlying creation of that document. Perhaps the difficulties confronting the Committee at the time were of a lesser scale, but nevertheless, this was a period, in our view, when the Committee's challenges appeared manageable, and the clarity of the 1992 plan played no small role in building that confidence. Unfortunately, without follow-up, the intensive efforts made to clarify future directions at the time appear to remain largely wasted.

We believe that it would be important to:

- 1. -return to the five strategic orientations defined in 1992, and the 20 accompanying objectives , and monitor the extent of their current integration within the World Heritage system. While time has moved on since 1992, these strategic orientations have the advantage of addressing all of the Committee's concerns within one integrated document, an advantage not presently enjoyed within the Committee's work.*

- 2 - commit to a regular cycle of review and updating of these "strategic orientations"; for example, following a 5 year cycle of review, monitoring and definition of new objectives, to ensure that the inevitable celebration of 5 year Convention anniversaries (20, 25, 30, 35 years of the Convention and so on) is accompanied with parallel initiatives of practical utility. Perhaps given the adoption of the periodic reporting system and its 6 year reporting cycle, it would be advantageous to work within a 6 year review cycle. At present however, since we are still many months away from the first regional report, rather than wait for the periodic reporting system results to kick in, we should actively seek an opportunity to review the 1992 work. One method would be for the Task Force to take this responsibility, and to report its recommendations to the upcoming Bureau.*

- 3. –ensure that the strategic planning process that everyone appears to agree should be adopted fully integrates the various strategic initiatives now in place within the Committee's work, to reduce the overlap among these initiatives. At present, there are several parallel strategic initiatives which remain unconnected. Efforts to fulfil the Global Strategy result in a series of regional activities whose nature sometimes extends beyond efforts to increase the representativity of the List. As well, the development of regional training strategies results in proposals to "build capacity" for regional site managers which often go well beyond conventional definitions of training; and shortly, the periodic reporting process will begin to give the Committee recommendations which will to some extent cut to across all of the above.*

- 4. – ensure that this single strategic framework can easily integrate treatment of "new" issues by the Committee within it, to maintain overall coherence of strategic efforts, and to avoid proliferation of unconnected single issue initiatives.*

2.2 Tentative Lists

Issues:

- many States Parties have no list or an out-of-date list
- is anyone using them?

Recommendations:

- amend Operational Guidelines to require all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both cultural and natural heritage, before any site can be considered for inscription
- require systematic updating of tentative lists or else eliminate requirement for tentative lists

2.3 Nominations

Issues:

- quality control and timeliness of nomination submissions
- not necessarily related to strategic priorities of Global Strategy
- too many nominations from States Parties with many sites on World Heritage List

Recommendations:

- Centre should check the contents of each nomination for completeness, according to Operational Guidelines requirements. Nominations that are incomplete or late should not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle
- strongly encourage States Parties to follow direction from 12th General Assembly
- peer pressure to encourage limitation of nominations from over-represented Parties/regions should be maintained by frequent and prominent reporting on nominations (and listed sites) by State Party/region
- mechanisms such as twinning/compulsory sponsoring of nominations from under-represented States Parties/regions to be introduced

Issue(ICCROM):

- ICCROM staff are often called upon by ICOMOS to carry out evaluation missions to proposed nominations and find that in many cases, those entrusted at national level with explaining and promoting the nomination do not fully understand the Convention, and are unable to convincingly advocate the "outstanding universal value" of the site. As a result, the evaluation visit often becomes then a kind of training seminar on World Heritage for those involved. While this will not usually adversely affect the outcome of the mission, or the recommendations of the expert, this lack of consciousness of the World Heritage concept at local and national level does not bode well for the long term

integration of concern for the World Heritage values of the site in its management.

Recommendation(ICCROM):

- The "best" nominations in our opinion are those that result from an intensive process of consultations at all levels, involving the public, site managers, responsible officials and political decision-makers in a serious debate about a site's WH values. It would be useful if the Committee within the advice offered to States Parties within the Operational Guidelines or related procedural documents could encourage States parties to prepare nominations within the context of such an ongoing consultative process. This would also have the effect of slowing the rate of arrival of new nominations without in any way directly limiting States Parties access to the List.

2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List

Issue:

- lack of balance and representativity of sites on List
- Global Strategy which is designed to overcome gaps and imbalances is not consistently followed

Recommendation:

-prepare an analysis of the sources of imbalances in the World Heritage List and the list of sites being nominated, with a view to present options to redress the imbalances in the nomination and inscription process. The analysis should include the effect of UNESCO and Centre interactions with regions and States Parties, allocation of preparatory assistance and funding for preparation of tentative lists.

Issue:

- excessive and poorly distributed workload for Advisory Bodies and Centre due to overlapping cycles of review and evaluation of nominations
- limitations of climate in certain regions impair quality and timeliness of site evaluations by Advisory Bodies
- Committee receives inappropriate or delayed information, due to heavy workloads, affecting its decision-making
- too many nominations being handled each year
- nominations handled several times due to referral and deferral mechanisms

Recommendation:

- two-year cycle for meetings, one year inscriptions, next year monitoring
- limitations on nominations as per recent General Assembly agreement
- streamline referral and deferral process
- may result in backlogs of nominations but it could be tolerated to ensure the quality of assessment and Committee consideration of nominations

2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation

Issues:

- introduction of periodic reporting is an important new element that must be planned for
- while the Committee has now set a regional schedule for periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee continues (and will continue) to receive individual, ad hoc reports (reactive monitoring)
- duplication among Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors in carrying out and reporting on reactive monitoring
- too many sites being reported on
- reading reports aloud during Committee meetings
- lack of visual information makes it hard for Committee to have a substantive discussion
- duplication of work of Bureau and Committee
- periodic reporting will require a substantial increase in Committee time

Recommendations:

- develop formal mechanism(s) for coordinate reactive monitoring activities with all parties who carry out monitoring, including the Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors
- distribute documentation early so Committee has time to discuss issues
- present a single reactive monitoring report to the Committee
- include images and maps to improve comprehension
- table summary for sites with lesser conservation problems and actions being taken for information with opportunity to comment in writing to Centre and tabling of updates at subsequent meetings
- separate state of conservation discussions from inscription of sites on In Danger List
- establish criteria to guide a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring
- on condition that documents are distributed on schedule (6 weeks prior to meeting), individual reports do not have to be read aloud to Committee
- focus on individual reports in Bureau
- focus on strategic trends (overview summary of monitoring activity) in Committee to encourage general discussion on ways and means to improve state of conservation
- Introduce reporting which recognises, rewards and encourages good practice in management and monitoring.

2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List

Issues:

- In Danger List is a tool for improving conservation of threatened properties
- inscription on In Danger List needs to be accompanied by action plan to improve condition
- inscription on In Danger List is not necessarily aligned to allocation of international assistance
- lack of clarity about why a site is put on or taken off In Danger List

Recommendation:

- Committee should set strategic priorities for action for sites on In Danger List
- funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List
- set strategic priorities for action using strategic plan
- describe indicators to inscribe sites on or remove sites from In Danger List

Issue(ICCROM):

- the recent Kakadu debates revealed that States Parties interpret the purpose of the World Heritage List in Danger in different ways; for some, it is understood as a mechanism to bring significant international attention and assistance to threatened sites; for others it appears to imply criticism of national efforts to look after sites. Without developing agreement on the intended purpose of the World Heritage List in Danger, it will be difficult to use its provisions with the full effectiveness intended by the framers of the Convention.

Recommendation(ICCROM):

-encourage the Committee to explicitly clarify the intended purpose of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger

2.7 World Heritage Fund

Issues:

- budget discussions are interminable and overly detailed for full Committee
- processes need streamlining; current system is unnecessarily cumbersome
- no strategic vision for allocation of international assistance; proposed on case-by-case basis
- percentage allocations to different categories of aid may inhibit effective use of available funds as allocations are not linked to strategic priorities
- no independent evaluations are prepared to assess impact of international assistance on sites

Comment (ICCROM):

- one of the best ways to improve our ability to measure impact of international assistance offered is not just to carry out continuing independent reviews, but to ensure that international assistance spending is linked to the results of the other strategic processes in place within the Committee, for example the regional training strategies prepared by ICCROM, and in the years to come, the results within regions of the periodic reporting reviews

-low level of funds means that WHF should be used strategically, to attract major funders

-efficiencies could be achieved by harmonizing budget cycle with UNESCO; decisions on WHF are made on annual basis although art 2 of Financial Regulations for WHF states that financial period should be two consecutive calendar years coinciding with financial period of regular budget of UNESCO

Recommendations:

-establish a finance and administration subcommittee to prepare budget for Committee

-develop strategic priorities among and within categories of international assistance, considering the niche of the World Heritage Fund, the role of regular UNESCO funds, the actions of other UNESCO sectors and other donors (eg. priority to world heritage in danger, allocate funds where they can make the biggest difference)

-revise Operational Guidelines to require the Centre to provide clear work plans, updated every 6 months, which specify resource requirements linked to strategic plan; and which require a detailed accounting, every 6 months, on actual expenditures and results [revise Operational Guidelines to give greater flexibility to the Centre to allocate international assistance, while requiring the Centre to provide proper accountability and performance reports]

-require periodic evaluations to assess relevance and effectiveness of different categories of international assistance and their impact on sites

-prepare a plan that systematically identifies international organizations that are involved in world heritage activities, and the opportunities and strategies to cooperate

-reinstate biennial budgeting for WHF

-administrative elements of fund should be clearly identified as a Bureau/sub-committee function

Issue (ICCROM):

-ICCROM feels that international assistance may deserve a section of its own in this discussion (perhaps independently of review of the Fund) since at least in our experience, there seem quite a number of points worth making about improved co-ordination. While the current review of international assistance mandated by the Committee may deal with some of these issues , all appear worth the attention of the Task Force and are described below:

- no clear rationale for assignment by the Centre of requests for

international assistance to the advisory bodies for review; many requests for technical assistance (outside training) come to both ICCROM and ICOMOS, some to only one or the other,

- no consistent standards for treatment of such requests by the advisory bodies, hence it is difficult for the Centre to synthesize responses, or for the advisory bodies where required to produce a co-ordinated response; ICCROM developed a document to guide treatment of requests for international assistance for cultural heritage and presented it during a recent meeting of the Advisory bodies/ WH Centre – however, this document (attached as ANNEX 1) has yet to be received or discussed by the Committee.

criteria used by the advisory bodies for assessment of such requests have not been reviewed by the Committee; (criteria for review of training assistance requests developed by ICCROM in a WH expert meeting of Nov. 1998 in Rome, and presented to the Committee in an information document in Dec. 1999, are attached as ANNEX 2).

-the categories of international assistance are interpreted in different ways by States Parties, by the Centre and by the Advisory bodies. In some instances where budgets are being quickly consumed, this can have a material effect on whether or not a proposed activity is funded. The current ICCROM review of training assistance funded by the Committee has noted that frequently seminars funded under "technical cooperation" are virtually indistinguishable in character from requests for training workshops proposed under "training assistance". Those who know the system well can sometimes move a proposal from category A to category B when funds appear exhausted in category A. Proper use of the budget provisions established by the Committee requires that the demarcations of activity be clearly defined and respected, in order to avoid any potential manipulation of the priorities set by the Committee by its budgeting process.

- as with tentative lists and nominations, it would be useful to live by the procedures established within the Operational Guidelines to manage requests for technical assistance. These are ignored routinely by virtually all States Parties. In 1999, for example, all requests for training assistance but one came after the deadline established by the Guidelines for submission of such requests, and most came many months late, just before the Committee meeting; 5 were submitted during the meeting itself. The issue here is not just a question of enforcing rules: in the case of training assistance requests, ICCROM is much happier to have the

chance to consult with States parties well before the Committee meeting to clarify and strengthen proposals made. Last minute requests can only be "judged" – yes, or no – and this is usually unfair to the State Party and those for whom the training has been designed.

- another requirement of the Operational Guidelines for review of training requests routinely ignored is the preparation of an evaluation of the effectiveness of the activity. Preparation of such an evaluation is understood to be a prerequisite for consideration of subsequent submissions. Again, if the constraint is worth placing in the Guidelines, then it is worth living by.

- it is clear to ICCROM that many requests for international assistance forwarded by States parties have been substantially prepared by staff of the Centre, private consultants, and/or members of the Advisory bodies (including ICCROM). Obviously, it is important to optimize support offered States Parties by all partners, but on a number of occasions it has seemed to ICCROM that the State Party was unaware of the nature or details of the proposal being made on their behalf. Our evaluation systems should attempt to ensure that States Parties feel "ownership" of the ideas being proposed in their name.

- more attention should be given to the location of Advisory body service support costs in the overall budget. For example, the principal funds support for ICOMOS and IUCN services appear to be placed within Chapter 2 of the budget concerned with the Establishment of the World Heritage List, including those proportions of IUCN support concerned with training. ICCROM's support for training is placed within Chapter 3 concerned with Technical Implementation of World Heritage Convention. By allocating funds in this way, the total amount available for training for cultural heritage is reduced by the amount paid (in 1999) to ICCROM for its services, while it appears that IUCN's training support costs do not reduce available training funds for natural heritage in the same way. Our point here is the desire for consistency in treatment of advisory body costs.

Recommendations(ICCROM):

- ICCROM believes that considerable improvements in the treatment of international assistance could be achieved by:

1. clarifying within the Operational Guidelines (or a related procedures document) considerations related to the process of managing requests for international assistance, including establishing clearly distinct definitions of categories of international assistance, expectations of roles of Advisory bodies and WH Centre in managing the process of response to such requests, expectations re nature and format of Advisory body reviews, verification of criteria to be used in carrying out reviews;

2. ensuring that the provisions contained within the Guidelines, including those concerning deadlines and follow up to previous projects, are respected and followed by all partners in the system.

3. examining budget treatment of advisory body services support costs for responding to requests for international assistance, with a view to improving consistency of treatment of the advisory bodies funds within the budget, and with a view to maximizing the use of budgeted funds for operational projects.

4. ensuring that international assistance requests are considered in relation to strategic priorities established by the Committee

- ICCROM also believes that it would be useful for training to be separated out from consideration of other forms of international assistance in discussion, and for training to appear as a regular agenda sub-item in all meetings, in order to bring greater consistency and attention to the treatment of training. ICCROM believes that the very significant funds being allocated to training at the moment, and the high effectiveness of training investments in improving conditions for conservation, warrant the Committee giving this increased prominence to consideration of training issues, strategies and requests.

CHAPTER 3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents

Issues:

- too much documentation given to Committee
- voluminous and often duplicate information is time-consuming and confusing
- lack of clarity in documentation
- need to increase efficiency of decision-making processes and raise the level of debate to policy issues

Recommendations:

- reduce volume of documentation presented to Committee
- information presented to Committee and Bureau should be streamlined to encourage discussion of policy issues and stimulate strategic decision-making
- redefined work program for the Bureau and Committee should be used as a basis to reduce the duplication and distribution of documentation
- reduce paper volume by using CD roms and other electronic media where practical

Issue(ICCROM):

- one of the sources of the paper explosion is lack of adherence to document production schedules. When inputs from advisory bodies come late or when the schedule is too compressed, Centre staff do not have time to synthesize reports received, and forward all documents received verbatim to the Committee. In these circumstances, the Committee do not receive the expected decision document, but rather all raw materials received by staff, without evaluation – here the Committee is being called upon to play the role of Centre staff, without the time to review or absorb materials.

Recommendation(ICCROM):

- adhere strictly to the deadlines established for document production; if materials arrive too late for adequate synthesis, then rather than burden the Committee with undigested data, the items should not be forwarded to the Committee for the upcoming meeting.

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites

Issues:

- need for management system and archival storage
- information out-of-date
- need for Centre to have consolidated site files
- need to link state of conservation reports with international assistance requests/ allocations
- need to draw up, keep up to date and publicize a list of property for which international assistance has been granted (responsibility from Convention, art. 13.5)
- recognize some progress made

Recommendations:

- institute consolidated record keeping, linking nomination files, monitoring reports, international assistance and correspondence; these files should be linked electronically to site files of Advisory bodies
- establish a management information system that will enable analysis of trends and patterns in international assistance projects
- establish and publish a list of sites for which international assistance has been granted,

and update regularly

Issue(ICCROM):

- one of the difficulties that has become apparent during ICCROM's current assessment of training assistance requests is that reference materials and files for requests made before 1992 are not available for consultation within the offices of the Centre, and are not necessarily retrievable at all within UNESCO archives. For example, with reference to international assistance, although lists of funds allocated to States Parties can be generated, it seems not possible to identify the particular object of all expenditures made. It may no longer be possible to construct the full history of the Committee's activities with a full degree of accuracy or completeness.

Recommendation(ICCROM):

- initiate a high priority data capture project which would seek out all evidence of early Committee activities and integrate them within a contemporary electronic record, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure the survival of a complete record of all Committee decisions and supporting rationale;*
- anticipate future record-keeping needs and ensure use of a data management system which can ensure appropriate capture and future accessibility of the record of current activities and decision-making*

CHAPTER 4 OTHER MATTERS

1. Contract development and management:

Issue(ICCROM):

- one of the areas which seems important to address in the work of the Task Force is difficulties in implementation and follow-up to the Committee's decisions when made. One of the bottlenecks impeding timely implementation of the Committee's work is the length of the process now necessary to turn Committee decisions re allocation of funds into WH Centre contracts with States Parties and/ or advisory bodies. In some cases, the length of the process is resulting in projects approved by the Committee being delayed or cancelled, always with severe consequences for local partners. Contracts prepared for ICCROM usually follow the implementation of the activity, in some cases by as much as 6 or 7 months, and cause enormous problems within ICCROM re project administration. Thus far in 2000, WH Centre contracts for all ICCROM activities undertaken in 2000 have arrived after the activities were completed. In spite of WH Centre attempts to address these delays, the problem seems to worsen. Difficulties appear to include the degree of internal financial control imposed on the process of

contract development, unclear assignment to staff of responsibility for contract development and follow-up, and the escalating levels of workload within the Centre

Recommendation(ICCROM):

- ICCROM strongly feels that the Committee should give high priority to the improvement of the contract development and management system within the Centre. It would be useful for the Committee to establish a mechanism to examine these delays and the reasons for them and to define both standards for contract development reflecting the Committee's expectations, and to explore possible means to improve the effectiveness of the processes now being employed.

2. Advisory body/ Centre roles in implementing the Convention:

Issue(ICCROM):

- whatever improvements are made in operating systems and mechanisms, a continuing impediment to effectiveness of Committee operations will be the differing visions of their respective roles held by the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre. There often result in differences of interpretation of the degree of initiative and the degree of direct involvement in operations appropriate to support the Committee's activities. These differences result in loss of much time on the part of all concerned in continuing to sort out roles project by project, and often adversely affect the climate of good will and co-operation necessary to provide effective support for the Committee's work. The MOUs proposed by the Centre a number of years ago were intended to address these differences; however only one advisory body (IUCN) signed the MOU proposed. The others disagreed with the Center's interpretation of their roles and have not signed. ICCROM for its part has prepared a MOU which it believes best addresses its responsibilities and capacities; this has not yet been reviewed by the Centre.

Recommendation(ICCROM):

-it would be useful for the Committee to associate itself with efforts to clarify the respective roles of the Advisory bodies and the WH Centre in serving the Committee through the signing of MOUs which address the interests of all partners in the system, and to give these efforts high priority.

ANNEX 1:

DRAFT PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE (Cultural Heritage)

Over the years, requests for international assistance for cultural heritage sites have been carried out in a largely *ad-hoc* manner. Recently both ICOMOS and ICCROM have expressed a wish to provide a stronger framework of procedures which would allow for a more systematic review of requests, allowing the advisory bodies to better carry out this important function.

Suggested Procedures for Cultural Heritage International Assistance Requests

It will be the responsibility of the World Heritage Centre to:

- Ensure that all requests for assistance for cultural heritage sites be sent to both ICOMOS and ICCROM for their review and comment. One organization should normally be designated as the lead organization charged with making the official response. The other organization should receive the document for information purposes, allowing it a chance to comment if it has specific information of consequence to the request. (Usually, for training assistance requests, ICCROM would be the lead organization. For other terms of international assistance (preparatory assistance, emergency assistance, technical co-operation, assistance for educational, information and promotional activities), ICOMOS would normally take the lead.) In cases involving cultural landscapes, IUCN would also be consulted. In some cases, the Centre may wish to request two or more of the Advisory bodies to prepare a consolidated response.

Rationale: It will be important to send all requests for assistance for cultural heritage sites to both organizations for cultural heritage, and in the case of cultural landscapes, to IUCN. This will allow each advisory body to share their information as widely as possible. Often, both organizations will have specific knowledge of a site or will have projects taking place in a specific country. This will also allow each to build up complete dossiers of projects for use both in the current year and in future years

- Ensure that the advisory bodies are given adequate time to provide requested reviews.

Rationale: It is recognized that requests often come in from States Parties at the last minute. At the same time, in order to ensure high quality of information required, it is important to allow advisory bodies enough time to consult the proper experts in the field, and the opportunity to consult with States Parties in order to clarify or strengthen proposals.

- Ensure that adequate information is provided to the advisory bodies in order to make a complete response.

Rationale: When forwarding requests to the advisory bodies, it will be useful for the Centre to pass along as much information as possible. This would include plans and reports, draft curriculum, etc. In addition, where possible, the Centre should forward final reports or evaluations from other recently completed projects in the requesting country. This information will be used to demonstrate that the States Party has effectively used World Heritage Funds in the past. Overall, the information requested, in this point, will allow the advisory bodies to give informed advice on the requests.

- Ensure that the response of the advisory bodies is provided verbatim to the Chair, the Bureau, or the Committee. Summaries or additional comments by staff of the Centre should accompany rather than replace the responses of the advisory bodies

Rationale: Reviews provided by the advisory bodies are often carefully worded documents which contain important information for the use of the decision making organ. While it is recognized that summaries might be useful, it is also important for decision makers to have access to the full text of the review in order to be able to make a more informed decision.

- Ensure that the Centre's own comments on a request are shared in writing with the Advisory bodies, even in the event that the Centre challenges or feels obligated not to support the response from the advisory bodies.

Rationale: This action will allow the advisory bodies to keep a complete record of the requests made. This will be useful for the evaluation of future requests, and will also promote a more open and complete communication between the Advisory Bodies and Centre staff.

- Ensure that comments are treated as internal documents.

Rationale: In order to make as open and honest evaluation as possible, it is important for comments to be considered internal documents. If there is a need by the Centre to pass comments along to the State Party making the request, the appropriate advisory body should be informed first.

- Ensure that decisions by the Chair, Committee, Bureau are communicated in writing to the advisory bodies.

Rationale: Again, this action will allow the advisory bodies to keep a complete record of the requests made. This will be useful for the evaluation of future requests. It will also promote a more open and complete communication between the Advisory Bodies and Centre staff. In practice, since decisions by the Committee/Bureau are contained in meeting reports, particular care should be taken to communicate decisions by the Chair.

It will be the responsibility of ICOMOS/ICCROM to:

- Ensure that reviews are carried out and transmitted in a timely manner taking into account the need to ensure that the appropriate experts have the chance to make the reviews. The advisory bodies will try to be as flexible as possible in this respect.

Rationale: In order for the Centre to effectively carry out its duties, it will be important for it to receive accurate advice in a timely manner. It will be important for the advisory bodies to ensure that they consult qualified experts and respond as quickly as possible.

- Ensure that reviews are as succinct, yet complete as possible.

Rationale: As the entire review will be passed on to the appropriate decision maker, it will be important for the Advisory Bodies to be as succinct as possible in their responses. At the same time, however, it will be important for them to transfer whatever information is necessary for the decision maker to make an informed decision.

- Coordinate their responses to requests to ensure that there are no contradictions in the advice given to the centre.

Rationale: It would not be useful for the Centre staff and decision making bodies to receive contradictory viewpoints from the two advisory

bodies. Therefore, ICOMOS and ICCROM will, as much as possible, try to coordinate their reviews ahead of time to ensure consistent advice is given to the relevant decision makers.

- Ensure that comments/reviews are made within the frame of established criteria (for example, the checklist for training requests developed by ICCROM as part of the training strategy meeting in 1998. A complementary checklist for other forms of international assistance should be developed by the two advisory bodies for cultural heritage, and in conjunction with IUCN for cultural landscapes. Both these checklists should eventually be integrated into one set of guidelines for review of international assistance requests.)

Rationale: The creation of written criteria will allow for a more open and transparent system of evaluation of requests. The advisory bodies are committed to the creation and use of such criteria in carrying out their reviews.

ANNEX 2:

Principles Guiding the Assessment of Training Requests:

The following considerations should be taken into account in assessing requests made for training assistance under the World Heritage Convention. These criteria should be considered together in making balanced judgements concerning the appropriateness of allocating the limited financial support available through the World Heritage Fund.

1. Requests for training assistance should be ‘related to implementation of the World Heritage Convention’ (*Operational Guidelines*, paragraph 94):
 - It is desirable but not essential for such training to take place on a World Heritage site;
 - There should be clear benefits derived from the training activity for specific World Heritage sites or the management system of which they

are a part.

2. The request should clarify how the proposed training activity responds to a well-defined need. Where appropriate the request should be seen in the context of the regional World Heritage training strategy.
3. The request should demonstrate the extent to which the proposed activity will benefit those responsible for cultural heritage in general.
4. The request should give attention to the extent to which the training activities can offer benefits throughout the region in which it will take place.
5. Requests should offer opportunities for increasing collaboration with local, regional and international partners.
6. Requests should demonstrate how training activities will strengthen local and regional training institutions.
7. Requests should show how proposed activities are linked to practical applications in the field.
8. Requests should demonstrate how proposed training activities will promote innovative teaching procedures and models.
9. Requests should show how provision will be made for disseminating results of the training activity and related materials to other agencies and institutions in the field.
10. Requests should show how training activities will ensure processes for continuing evaluation and improvement (ref. Paragraph 96, e).
11. Requests should show what training methods will be used to ensure that learning objectives are met.
12. Requests should be described following the indications provided in the attached Check List.

Check List for Requests for Training Support

The purpose of this Check List is to permit comparative evaluation of requests, and to assist proponents as a guide in designing their training programmes. The information supplied is also used to help build a World Heritage training database.

1. **Field** (Operational Guidelines, art. 94):
 - 1.1 Identification of World Heritage sites
 - 1.2 Protection of World Heritage sites
 - 1.3 Conservation of World Heritage sites
 - 1.4 Presentation of World Heritage sites
 - 1.5 Rehabilitation of World Heritage sites
 - 1.6 Related to implementation of WH Convention

2. **Type** (Operational Guidelines, art. 95):
 - 2.1 Group training
 - 2.2 Individual training
 - 2.3 Training at local (national) level
 - 2.4 Training at regional level
 - 2.5 Training activity takes place at local centre
 - 2.6 Training activity takes place at regional centre

3. **General information** (*Operational Guidelines*, art. 96):
 - 3.1 Details of training activity (provide a list of subjects and a brief description of training contents)
 - 3.2 Level and type of instruction (e.g., mid-career, class/field work)
 - 3.3 Teaching staff (name, qualification)
 - 3.4 Number of participants (students)
 - 3.5 Country(ies) of origin of participants
 - 3.6 Dates of training activity (from – to -)
 - 3.7 Place of training activity
 - 3.8 Principal training materials (facilities) available
 - 3.9 Functional responsibility of participants in relation to WH site

4. **Type of assistance requested from WH Fund**
 - 4.1 Financial contribution (total in US\$)
 - 4.2 Specialized teaching staff (specify: field, qualification, name)
 - 4.3 Equipment (specify)
 - 4.4 Books and educational materials

5. **Total Cost** (include detailed budget)

6. **Approximate cost of items for which support is requested** (indicate cost in US \$, and % of total budget)
 - 6.1 Tuition fees
 - 6.2 Daily subsistence allowances
 - 6.3 Purchase of educational materials
 - 6.4 Travel costs
 - 6.5 Total:

7. **Other contributions** (in US\$)
 - 7.1 National financing
 - 7.2 Multilateral contributions
 - 7.3 Bilateral contributions.

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

April 2000

General Comments by the Belgian Delegation:

1. The report should **concentrate on priority practical** measures for more effective operation of the convention, some of which should be already applicable during the December 2000 meeting.
2. We should distinguish **3 categories for our recommendations** :
 - A. **Priority practical measures that the Bureau can decide upon at its June meeting**
These can be implemented at the December meeting of the Committee. (note: we think that "visible" results" are absolute essential).
 - B. **Measures that the Bureau has to submit to the Committee for decision.**
 - C. **Ideas which need more time for examination** : the Bureau can recommend to the Committee to set up the possible new working group. We made a first attempt to classify the recommendations of the draft report.
3. The recommendations need to be **specific and pragmatic**: how to implement the ideas.
4. Policy documents include the 1992 Strategic orientations (with its action plan) **and the 1999 resolutions** on the representativity of the List and of the Committee.
5. It is essential to **establish links** with the other working groups and the Canterbury meeting: some themes are indeed raised in the other groups as well. Consensus is growing on some proposals, e.g. limiting the number of nomination submissions to be examined by the Committee each year.
6. Concerning the structure of the report, we suggest to start with the Decision making procedures as chapter 1 and to continue with the Statutory meetings (chapter 2). Recommendations made concerning the Decision making procedures have implications on the (calendar and frequency of the) Statutory meetings

Key principles:

1. Take time pressure off the work of the Committee
2. Balance between the different tasks of the Committee
3. Attack problems at the root
4. Use a thematic, comparative approach (instead of the traditional "case by case" approach)
5. Need to highlight positive results (instead of focussion only on problems)
6. Budget should reflect strategic priorities
7. Need to establish links between different WHC activities

Key ideas in brief:

1. Revising the format of the workingdocuments: simplification, less paper
2. Using the tentative lists as a planning tool.
3. Limiting the maximum number of nomination proposals that the committee can examine each year.
4. Focussing the 2002 meeting of the Committee on the results of the comparative study of the tentative lists by the advisory bodies.
5. Replacing the Bureau system by a subcommittee system
6. Revising the calendar and periodicity of the meetings: one Committee meeting a year, preceeded by the meeting of the subcommittees
7. Revising planning, presentation and monitoring of the budget

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Context:

- grows out of Financial and Management Audit of 1996-98
- increasing workload (number of States Parties, number of nominations and sites, length of statutory meetings, size of paperwork, **new task periodic reporting**)
- labour intensive administration involved in coordinating and administering inscription, monitoring and international assistance processes
- 60% of Centre staff time dedicated to servicing statutory meetings
- duplication of effort-presentation of same material to Bureau, Extraordinary Bureau and Committee
- time constraints for States Parties, Advisory Bodies and Centre
- multiplicity of actors involved in the implementation of the Convention
- urgency to lighten burden
- replication with minor changes of same documents two or three times

- cumbersome processes mean that urgent matters are not dealt with in timely fashion
- lack of time to deal with policy and strategic direction-setting
- last-minute distribution of papers means Committee members not have sufficient time to consider important issues

Objective:

- to identify and propose **priority** practical measures for more effective operation of the Convention
- blueprint for future direction in implementation of Convention

Note: this is really ambitious. We think is a task for the new group succeeding to our group.

- to look at working methods, procedures, documentation **some of which can be implemented at the next December meeting**

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. Priority practical measures that the Bureau can decide upon at its June meeting**
- B. Measures that the Bureau has to submit to the Committee for decision.**
- C. Ideas which need more time for examination**

CHAPTER 1 DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

1.1 Strategic Planning

Issues:

- 1992 Strategic Orientations with its action plan was relevant but direction not sustained because no mechanism for assigning responsibilities for implementation, no timelines identified and no process for monitoring and updating, **no time of General Assembly of State Parties or Committee meeting devoted to it**
- goals and objectives of Strategic Orientations were not achieved

- **1999 resolutions endorse the 1992 Strategic Orientations**
- **policy documents have to be taken into account in decision making processes (criteria = is this decision bringing us closer to the achievement of the objectives as set out in the policy document?)**

Recommendations:

(C)-undertake a Strategic Review exercise using as a starting point a follow-up on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document and the 1999 Resolutions

(C)-ensure that an updated Strategic Plan, containing at a minimum a vision, goals, objectives and action plan be produced and systematically followed up on (regular review)

(C)-ensure that the action plan specifies accountable parties, timelines and reporting mechanisms

(A)-adopt the review of the Strategic Plan as a permanent agenda item of the Committee meetings

(A)-Committee should present progress report to each general Assembly with proposal for action if required

1.2 Tentative Lists

Note: this has been discussed at length by the group on the representativity of the List (Benin Group)

Issues:

-many States Parties have no list or an out-of-date list

- without any comment on the tentative list, State Parties assume that they can go ahead with all nomination proposals on the list

- how many nominations if you add all the proposals on the tentative list?

- are there any gaps? Is there overlapping (too many sites of the same typology, period?)

-is anyone using them? Not today: it is an administrative formality instead of being a planning tool

Recommendations:

(B)- Tentative lists should be a planning tool for the Committee:

to plan its work in advance, to take decisions on nomination proposals (comparison with other sites in tentative lists of other countries), to achieve a better representativity of the List

(B)- The Committee should invite the advisory bodies to examine the existing tentative lists by geo-cultural area (region by region, including countries with historic links).

Their recommendations should be presented to the Committee and the State Parties.

Adequate resources have to be voted for this.

(note: this will also be a conclusion of the Benin Group)

(B/C) – The 2002 meeting of the Committee (30th anniversary of the convention!)

could be devoted to examine the advisory bodies recommendations on the tentative lists (no inscriptions)

(B)-amend Operational Guidelines to require all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both cultural and natural heritage, and resulting from regional consultations, before any site can be considered for inscription

(B)-require systematic updating of tentative lists or else eliminate requirement for tentative lists

1.3 Nominations

Issues:

-quality control and timeliness of nomination submissions

- incomplete nomination proposals
- unclear guidelines when additional information is required
- nominations not necessarily related to strategic priorities of Global Strategy

-too many nominations from States Parties with many sites on World Heritage List

Recommendations:

(B)- limit the number of nomination proposals per year (eg. 30, 40?)

(B) – Committee should adopt criteria to define which nominations have priority: eg. Underrepresented State Party, underrepresented typology, urgency,...

(note: we expect the Benin Group to come up with proposals for criteria)

(A)-Centre should check the contents of each nomination for completeness, according to Operational Guidelines requirements. Nominations that are incomplete or late should not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle. This means that there is no need for an extraordinary Bureau in November, at least for the nomination proposals. (note: experience has shown that most of the countries can not submit this extra information in due time and that the advisory bodies have not enough time to study them with care)

-strongly encourage States Parties to follow direction from 12th General Assembly (see report of the Benin Group)

(B)-peer pressure to encourage limitation of nominations from over-represented Parties/regions should be maintained by frequent and prominent reporting on nominations (and listed sites) by State Party/region: can be achieved through the use of the tentative lists as a management tool: the recommendations of the advisory bodies have to be drafted in such a way that State Parties will submit nomination proposals of under-represented rather than of over-represented heritage

(A) Advisory bodies should present their recommendations on inscriptions in relation to strategic priorities of Global Strategy (decision in Kyoto)

-mechanisms such as twinning/compulsory sponsoring of nominations from under-represented States Parties/regions to be introduced (see report of the Benin Group)

1.4 Inscription on World Heritage List

Issue:

- lack of balance and representativity of sites on List
- Global Strategy which is designed to overcome gaps and imbalances is not consistently followed

note: the two last issues are dealt with by the Benin Group

Recommendation:

- prepare an analysis of the sources of imbalances in the World Heritage List and the list of sites being nominated, with a view to present options to redress the imbalances in the nomination and inscription process. The analysis should include the effect of UNESCO and Centre interactions with regions and States Parties, allocation of preparatory assistance and funding for preparation of tentative lists. **(see report of the Benin Group)**

Issue:

- excessive and poorly distributed workload for Advisory Bodies and Centre due to overlapping cycles of review and evaluation of nominations
- limitations of climate in certain regions impair quality and timeliness of site evaluations by Advisory Bodies
- Committee receives inappropriate or delayed information, due to heavy workloads, affecting its decision-making
- **similar nomination proposals are not always grouped**
- too many nominations being handled each year : **impossible to handle them with care, dangerous for decision making**
- nominations handled several times due to referral and deferral mechanisms
- **unnecessary duplication of workdocuments**

- **unclear rules in the operational guidelines concerning additional information asked for by the Bureau and/or the Committee. Note: the possibility to provide additional information by 1st October (referral), creates extra work for the Centre and the advisory bodies. Experience of last year shows that most countries were not in a position to deliver the required information in time; that the advisory bodies did not have enough time to study the information; that this information sometimes was given during the Committee meeting itself. This has a very negative effect and leads to disorderly conduct and lousy decisions at the extraordinary Bureau and the Committee.**

- **considering that there is no comment on the tentative lists and that preparing a nomination submission requires an "investment", many State Parties consider that it is**

"too late" for the Committee to refuse the nomination

- the Committee and the advisory bodies are put under pressure, resulting from the participation of representatives of towns

Recommendation:

(A) Group presentation and decision on similar nomination proposals

(B) Redistribute the workload per calendar year and reduce the number of Statutory meetings (see below)

-limitations on nominations as per recent General Assembly agreement (is only on voluntary basis; see also report of Benin Group)

(B)- limit the total number of nomination proposals per year (eg. 30, 40?) to be examined

(C)-two-year cycle for meetings, one year inscriptions, next year monitoring may result in backlogs of nominations but it could be tolerated to ensure the quality of assessment and Committee consideration of nominations

This is an option, the other being limiting the number of proposals being examined each year. This last option allows quick reaction on state of conservation – if required – and a better balance between different tasks of the Committee. We have to avoid a system which would encourage over-represented countries to quickly submit long lists of proposals.

(A)-streamline referral and deferral process

(A) New presentation of the workdocuments in order to avoid unnecessary duplication (rephrasing): the workdocuments of the 2 advisory bodies and one document by the WHC in the form of a table (with the 4 options: inscription, referral, deferral, negative advice). Note: only extra or new information in new documents, no duplication of existing information.

(A) Revise operational guidelines on additional information requirements: an incomplete nomination should not be examined in the upcoming year

- (A) Define guidelines on participation of observers at meetings

1.5 Reporting on State of Conservation

Issues:

-introduction of periodic reporting is an important new element that must be planned for

-while the Committee has now set a regional schedule for periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee continues (and will continue) to receive individual, ad hoc reports (reactive monitoring)

-duplication among Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors, and other international organisations in carrying out and reporting on reactive monitoring

- too many sites being reported on
- only case by case approach
- no attempt to make comparative studies, to group sites with common themes, to bundle the past experience on some themes
- reading reports aloud during Committee meetings
- lack of visual information makes it hard for Committee to have a substantive discussion
- duplication of work of Bureau and Committee
- periodic reporting will require a substantial increase in Committee time

Recommendations:

(B)– Planning of the reports: how many reports can the Committee deal with in one meeting?

(A)– On WHList document – for internal use only – indicate whether site has been discussed by Committee and when.

(A/B) - Centre to prepare overview: how many sites have been discussed in the Committee? What was the effect? How many sites have never been discussed? What is their state of conservation?

(B)-develop formal mechanism(s) for coordinate reactive monitoring activities with all parties who carry out monitoring, including the Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors

(A)-distribute documentation early so Committee has time to discuss issues

(A)-present a single reactive monitoring report to the Committee

(A)-include images and maps to improve comprehension

(A)-table summary for sites with lesser conservation problems and actions being taken for information with opportunity to comment in writing to Centre and tabling of updates at subsequent meetings

(A)-separate state of conservation discussions from inscription of sites on In Danger List

(A)-establish criteria to guide a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring

(A)-on condition that documents are distributed on schedule (6 weeks prior to meeting), individual reports do not have to be read aloud to Committee ; an individual report should never be read aloud

(B)-focus on individual reports in Bureau/Subcommittee

(A)-focus on strategic trends (overview summary of monitoring activity) in Committee to encourage general discussion on ways and means to improve state of conservation

(A)-Introduce reporting which recognises, rewards and encourages good practice in management and monitoring.

(B)– Identify themes which come up often. On basis of Committee discussions and experience in the sites, develop some guidelines for site managers and/or authorities so that they can benefit from this experience

(C)– Distribute examples of good practise to site managers/authorities.

1.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List

Issues:

- In Danger List is a tool for improving conservation of threatened properties
- **More and more countries resist to putting a site on the In Danger List**
- inscription on In Danger List needs to be accompanied by action plan to improve condition
- inscription on In Danger List is not necessarily aligned to allocation of international assistance
- lack of clarity about why a site is put on or taken off In Danger List
- **use of In Danger List has been changed since the beginning of the convention**

Recommendation:

- (C) – Committee should look at evolution of notion "WH In Danger" and use that has been made in order to:**
- (C)**-Committee should set strategic priorities for action for sites on In Danger List
- (C)**-funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List
- (C)**-set strategic priorities for action using strategic plan
- (C)**-describe indicators to inscribe sites on or remove sites from In Danger List

1.7 World Heritage Fund

Issues:

- budget discussions are interminable and overly detailed for full Committee
- processes need streamlining; current system is unnecessarily cumbersome
- no strategic vision for allocation of international assistance; proposed on case-by-case basis **and not linked with Global Strategy and representativity of the List**
- percentage allocations to different categories of aid may inhibit effective use of available funds as allocations are not linked to strategic priorities
- no independent evaluations are prepared to assess impact of international assistance on sites
- low level of funds means that WHF should be used strategically, to attract major funders
- note: not all State Parties are convinced that there is a lack of funding; their first concern is that the money available is well spent**

-efficiencies could be achieved by harmonizing budget cycle with UNESCO; decisions on WHF are made on annual basis although art 2 of Financial Regulations for WHF states that financial period should be two consecutive calendar years coinciding with financial period of regular budget of UNESCO (note: when we proposed that in June last year, there was no consensus about that)

Recommendations:

(B) – Bring the priorities in line with the strategic objectives (1992 document and 1999 resolutions) and revise the Operational Guidelines accordingly (eg priorities for technical assistance)

(A/B)-establish a finance and administration subcommittee to prepare budget for Committee . Next December meeting could be a testcase for the system of subcommittees

(A)– even with the subcommittee system, the discussion on the budget needs an appropriate moment and enough time

(C)-develop strategic priorities among and within categories of international assistance, considering the niche of the World Heritage Fund, the role of regular UNESCO funds, the actions of other UNESCO sectors and other donors (eg. priority to world heritage in danger, allocate funds where they can make the biggest difference) Needs to be linked with the Global Action Plan (no fragmented approach)

(B)-revise Operational Guidelines to require the Centre to provide clear work plans, updated every 6 months, which specify resource requirements linked to strategic plan; and which require a detailed accounting, every 6 months, on actual expenditures and results [revise Operational Guidelines to give greater flexibility to the Centre to allocate international assistance, while requiring the Centre to provide proper accountability and performance reports]

(A)– revise meanwhile presentation of budget: one single document with several columns according to the categories of decision making (Centre, Chairman, Bureau, Committee)

(A)– Each "article" of the budget should be accompanied with the relevant information and the number of the related workingdocument

(A) – Each working document with budgetary implications should mention the "article" of the budget

(B)-require periodic evaluations to assess how the activities contributed to achieve the strategic goals and to examine the relevance and effectiveness of different categories of international assistance and their impact on sites

(B)-prepare a plan that systematically identifies international organizations that are involved in world heritage activities, and the opportunities and strategies to cooperate & present the budget in such a way that sources of external resources and needs are identified (needs = funding necessary to complete the project; easy to identify possibilities for bilateral or other funding)

(B/C)-reinstate biennial budgeting for WHF (note: if there is no consensus about this, the planning could be for 2 years, decision could be annual and based on the detailed

accounting to be provided every 6 months)

(B/C)-administrative elements of fund should be clearly identified as a Bureau/sub-committee function **subcommittee!**

CHAPTER 2 STATUTORY MEETINGS

2.1 General Assembly of States Parties

Issues:

- time spent on election and administrative issues at expense of policy discussions
- **Decisions and resolutions of the GA are not or insufficiently implemented**
- timing of General Assembly one month before Committee (more costly for travel and overburden on Centre)

We think that the Committee meeting should precede the General Assembly of States Parties. We are convinced that it is important to maintain the General Assembly within the framework of the General Conference of UNESCO: for many State Parties, the General Conference is an unique opportunity to take participate in the General Assembly.

Recommendations:

- (B)-focus on strategic policy issues by having a specific agenda item on those issues**
- (B)-report on performance on strategic direction and on the implementation of previous General Assembly decisions and resolutions**
- (B) – Revising election procedures: eg. The secretariat and "scrutateurs" could collect the ballots instead of inviting the participants to come and vote (quicker and smoother procedure)**

2.2. Committee Meetings

Issues:

- not enough time to handle workload in plenary sessions
- **no balance between the important tasks of the Committee (strategic orientations, inscriptions, state of conservation, periodic reporting, administer the Fund, organisational issues): too much time spent on specific items but little on strategic direction-setting**
- material duplicates Bureau work
- yearly meetings in different regions are costly and time-consuming (hospitality/ touring)

They have the advantage however of establishing contacts and discussions on implementation of the convention: without those, the Committee would not have been able to develop its "doctrine" - reflexion on so many issues !

- exhaustion factor for all parties

- The conduct of Committee, like Bureau, meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers and maintaining control over the number of participants.

Recommendations:

(A) Agenda of the meetings to draft in such a way that there is a balance between the tasks of the Committee

(B)-eliminate duplication with Bureau by clearly identifying work program for each or else move to a sub-committee system to improve efficiency (finance and administration, cultural sites, natural sites) **We are in favour of the subcommittee system.**

(C)-propose changes to meeting cycle (meetings very two years or inscriptions one year, monitoring the next) **We are not in favour for alternation of inscriptions and monitoring: this system does not allow enough flexibility for the monitoring aspect and might create an increase of nomination proposals from the well-represented countries.**

(C)-meet in Paris every second year, coordinated with General Assembly of States Parties. **We are aware of the organisational difficulties. We are convinced however that in the end the actual system has more advantages than disadvantages.**

We propose the following alternative:

Annual meetings, in host countries, but with a revised calendar and no Bureau meeting in July.

Tentative timetable:

- 1st April Year 0: deadline for nomination proposals
- 1st June Year 0: complete nomination proposals sent to advisory bodies (other nomination proposals are sent back to the countries concerned)
- 1st July Year 1: workdocuments of the advisorybodies sent to WHC
- 1st August Year 1: Documents are sent to Committeemembers
- October Year 1: Meetings of Subcommittees, followed by Meeting of the Committee
- November Year 1 (= every other year): general Conference of Unesco and General Assembly of State Parties

Advantages:

- No July meeting anymore: It is this last meeting, in the middle of the year, which makes it difficult for the Centre and the advisory bodies to handle the work.
- Concentration of the work in one single session (Committee and subcommittees) = same time as the November and December meetings today.
- General Assembly can take account of work prepared by previous Committee

meetings

- More time for advisory bodies to examine nomination proposals (12 months instead of 6)

(A)-arrange and follow a balanced and coherent agenda, allowing time for substantive policy debate

(A)-Speaking rights in Committee meetings be reviewed and rigorously applied – regional representatives on the Committee may be an effective vehicle to represent States Parties without Committee membership.

2.3 Bureau Meetings

Issues:

- Bureau is meant to take pressure off Committee meetings by preparing its work, but in fact everything is duplicated at Committee meetings because there is no real delegation
- Participation with observer status in the Bureau meetings is helpful to understand the mechanisms of implementing the convention
- the conduct of Bureau meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers.

Recommendations:

- (B)-eliminate duplication with Committee by clearly identifying work program for each either with significant delegation to Bureau or else eliminate Bureau and move to sub-committee system. We strongly recommend the subcommittee system
- (B)-the clearly redefined work program should be designed to free the Committee from administration to focus on strategic policy issues
- (B)– The Committee could adopt items for decision for which there was consensus in the subcommittees and if no Committee member raises a question about them ("points A")
- (B) – The Committee has to elect the chairs and rapporteurs for the subcommittees
- (B)-speaking rights in Bureau/subcommittee meetings be reviewed and rigorously applied – regional representatives on the Bureau/in the subcommittees may be an effective vehicle to represent States Parties without Bureau/Committee membership.

CHAPTER 3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents

Issues:

- too much documentation given to Committee, too late and only one set per Delegation

- voluminous and often duplicate information is time-consuming and confusing
- lack of clarity in documentation
- need to increase efficiency of decision-making processes and raise the level of debate to policy issues

Recommendations:

(B)-information presented to Committee and Bureau/**subcommittees** should be streamlined to encourage discussion of policy issues and stimulate strategic decision-making

(B)-redefined work program for the Bureau/**subcommittees** and Committee should be used as a basis to reduce the duplication and distribution of documentation

(A)-reduce volume of documentation presented to Committee: **how? One single document for related matters, eg. one single document for the agenda (instead of 3), idem for the budget**

(A)- **easier presentation of the documents:**

- **eg. either having the same numbering of the pages for the english and french versions of the documents, either numbering the paragraphs of the documents**
- **long documents need a table of content (beginning)**
- **cross references are needed with the budget**
- **complementary information should be limited to the new information (no need to copy the whole document)**
- **differences/revisions should be made clear (bold, ...)**
- **more use of tables (instead of plain text)**

(A) – **Draft decision can be more straight**

-reduce paper volume by using CD roms and other electronic media where practical

(A)- **List of decisions to be drafted in such a way to help monitoring implementation**

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites

Issues:

-need for management system and archival storage

-information out-of-date

-need for Centre to have consolidated site files

-need to link state of conservation reports with international assistance requests/allocations

-need to draw up, keep up to date and publicize a list of property for which international assistance has been granted (responsibility from Convention, art. 13.5)

-recognize some progress made

Recommendations:

- institute consolidated record keeping, linking nomination files, monitoring reports, international assistance and correspondence; these files should be linked electronically to site files of Advisory bodies
- establish a management information system that will enable analysis of trends and patterns in international assistance projects
- establish and publish a list of sites for which international assistance has been granted, and update regularly

CHAPTER 4 OTHER MATTERS

CHAPTER ? OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Whitout duplicating the work of the Canterbury meeting, it would be helpful to summarize the issues dealt with in this report and which would require a revision of the operational guidelines

CHAPTER ? FUTURE WORK

If appropriate, some indications for the possible new working group

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

April 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Context:

- grows out of Financial and Management Audit of 1996-98
- increasing workload (number of States Parties, number of nominations and sites, length of statutory meetings, size of paperwork)
- labour intensive administration involved in coordinating and administering inscription, monitoring and international assistance processes
- 60% of Centre staff time dedicated to servicing statutory meetings
- duplication of effort-presentation of same material to Bureau, Extraordinary Bureau and Committee
- time constraints for States Parties, Advisory Bodies and Centre
- multiplicity of actors involved in the implementation of the Convention
- urgency to lighten burden
- replication with minor changes of same documents two or three times
- cumbersome processes mean that urgent matters are not dealt with in timely fashion
- lack of time to deal with policy and strategic direction-setting
- last-minute distribution of papers means Committee members not have sufficient time to consider important issues

Objective:

- to identify and propose practical measures for more effective operation of the Convention
- blueprint for future direction in implementation of Convention
- to look at working methods, procedures, documentation

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

CHAPTER 1 STATUTORY MEETINGS

1.1 General Assembly of States Parties

Issues:

- time spent on election and administrative issues at expense of policy discussions
- timing of General Assembly one month before Committee (more costly for travel and overburden on Centre)

Recommendations:

- focus on strategic policy issues
- report on performance on strategic direction

1.2 Bureau Meetings

Issues:

- Bureau is meant to take pressure off Committee meetings by preparing its work, but in fact everything is duplicated at Committee meetings because there is no real delegation
- the conduct of Bureau meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers.

Recommendations:

- eliminate duplication with Committee by clearly identifying work program for each either with significant delegation to Bureau or else eliminate Bureau and move to sub-committee system
- the clearly redefined work program should be designed to free the Committee from administration to focus on strategic policy issues
- speaking rights in Bureau meetings be reviewed and rigorously applied – regional representatives on the Bureau may be an effective vehicle to represent States Parties without Bureau membership.

1.3 Committee Meetings

Issues:

- not enough time to handle workload in plenary sessions
- material duplicates Bureau work

- too much time spent on specific items but little on strategic direction-setting
- yearly meetings in different regions are costly and time-consuming (hospitality/touring)
- exhaustion factor for all parties
- The conduct of Committee, like Bureau, meetings could be streamlined by better controlling the level of direct participation by observers and maintaining control over the number of participants.

Recommendations:

- eliminate duplication with Bureau by clearly identifying work program for each or else move to a sub-committee system to improve efficiency (finance and administration, cultural sites, natural sites)
- propose changes to meeting cycle (meetings every two years or inscriptions one year, monitoring the next)
- arrange and follow a balanced and coherent agenda, allowing time for substantive policy debate
- meet in Paris every second year, coordinated with General Assembly of States Parties
- Speaking rights in Committee meetings be reviewed and rigorously applied – regional representatives on the Committee may be an effective vehicle to represent States Parties without Committee membership.

CHAPTER 2 DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

2.1 Strategic Planning

Issues:

- 1992 Strategic Orientations with its action plan was relevant but direction not sustained because no mechanism for assigning responsibilities for implementation, no timelines identified and no process for monitoring and updating
- goals and objectives of Strategic Orientations were not achieved

Recommendations:

- undertake a Strategic Review exercise using as a starting point a follow-up on the goals, objectives and recommendations of the 1992 Strategic Orientations document.
- ensure that an updated Strategic Plan, containing at a minimum a vision,

goals, objectives and action plan be produced and systematically followed up on (regular review)

- ensure that the action plan specifies accountable parties, timelines and reporting mechanisms
- adopt the review of the Strategic Plan as a permanent agenda item

2.2 Tentative Lists

Issues:

- many States Parties have no list or an out-of-date list
- is anyone using them?

Recommendations:

- amend Operational Guidelines to require all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both cultural and natural heritage, before any site can be considered for inscription
- require systematic updating of tentative lists or else eliminate requirement for tentative lists

2.3 Nominations

Issues:

- quality control and timeliness of nomination submissions
- not necessarily related to strategic priorities of Global Strategy
- too many nominations from States Parties with many sites on World Heritage List

Recommendations:

- Centre should check the contents of each nomination for completeness, according to Operational Guidelines requirements. Nominations that are incomplete or late should not be accepted for the upcoming inscription cycle
- strongly encourage States Parties to follow direction from 12th General Assembly
- peer pressure to encourage limitation of nominations from over-represented Parties/regions should be maintained by frequent and prominent reporting

on nominations (and listed sites) by State Party/region

- mechanisms such as twinning/compulsory sponsoring of nominations from under-represented States Parties/regions to be introduced

2.4 Inscription on World Heritage List

Issue:

- lack of balance and representativity of sites on List
- Global Strategy which is designed to overcome gaps and imbalances is not consistently followed

Recommendation:

- prepare an analysis of the sources of imbalances in the World Heritage List and the list of sites being nominated, with a view to present options to redress the imbalances in the nomination and inscription process. The analysis should include the effect of UNESCO and Centre interactions with regions and States Parties, allocation of preparatory assistance and funding for preparation of tentative lists.

Issue:

- excessive and poorly distributed workload for Advisory Bodies and Centre due to overlapping cycles of review and evaluation of nominations
- limitations of climate in certain regions impair quality and timeliness of site evaluations by Advisory Bodies
- Committee receives inappropriate or delayed information, due to heavy workloads, affecting its decision-making
- too many nominations being handled each year
- nominations handled several times due to referral and deferral mechanisms

Recommendation:

- two-year cycle for meetings, one year inscriptions, next year monitoring
- limitations on nominations as per recent General Assembly agreement
- streamline referral and deferral process
- may result in backlogs of nominations but it could be tolerated to ensure the quality of assessment and Committee consideration of nominations

2.5 Reporting on State of Conservation

Issues:

- introduction of periodic reporting is an important new element that must be planned for
- while the Committee has now set a regional schedule for periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites, the Committee continues (and will continue) to receive individual, ad hoc reports (reactive monitoring)
- duplication among Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors in carrying out and reporting on reactive monitoring
- too many sites being reported on
- reading reports aloud during Committee meetings
- lack of visual information makes it hard for Committee to have a substantive discussion
- duplication of work of Bureau and Committee
- periodic reporting will require a substantial increase in Committee time

Recommendations:

- develop formal mechanism(s) for coordinate reactive monitoring activities with all parties who carry out monitoring, including the Centre, Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO sectors
- distribute documentation early so Committee has time to discuss issues
- present a single reactive monitoring report to the Committee
- include images and maps to improve comprehension
- table summary for sites with lesser conservation problems and actions being taken for information with opportunity to comment in writing to Centre and tabling of updates at subsequent meetings
- separate state of conservation discussions from inscription of sites on In Danger List
- establish criteria to guide a more strategic selection of sites for reactive monitoring
- on condition that documents are distributed on schedule (6 weeks prior to meeting), individual reports do not have to be read aloud to Committee
- focus on individual reports in Bureau
- focus on strategic trends (overview summary of monitoring activity) in Committee to encourage general discussion on ways and means to improve state of conservation
- Introduce reporting which recognises, rewards and encourages good practice in management and monitoring.

2.6 Inscription on World Heritage In Danger List

Issues:

- In Danger List is a tool for improving conservation of threatened properties
- inscription on In Danger List needs to be accompanied by action plan to improve condition
- inscription on In Danger List is not necessarily aligned to allocation of international assistance
- lack of clarity about why a site is put on or taken off In Danger List

Recommendation:

- Committee should set strategic priorities for action for sites on In Danger List
- funding assistance should be allocated on a priority basis to sites on the In Danger List
- set strategic priorities for action using strategic plan
- describe indicators to inscribe sites on or remove sites from In Danger List

2.7 World Heritage Fund

Issues:

- budget discussions are interminable and overly detailed for full Committee
- processes need streamlining; current system is unnecessarily cumbersome
- no strategic vision for allocation of international assistance; proposed on case-by-case basis
- percentage allocations to different categories of aid may inhibit effective use of available funds as allocations are not linked to strategic priorities
- no independent evaluations are prepared to assess impact of international assistance on sites
- low level of funds means that WHF should be used strategically, to attract major funders
- efficiencies could be achieved by harmonizing budget cycle with UNESCO; decisions on WHF are made on annual basis although art 2 of Financial Regulations for WHF states that financial period should be two consecutive calendar years coinciding with financial period of regular budget of UNESCO

Recommendations:

- establish a finance and administration subcommittee to prepare budget for Committee
- develop strategic priorities among and within categories of international assistance, considering the niche of the World Heritage Fund, the role of regular UNESCO funds, the actions of other UNESCO sectors and other donors (eg. priority to world heritage in danger, allocate funds where they can make the biggest difference)
- revise Operational Guidelines to require the Centre to provide clear work plans, updated every 6 months, which specify resource requirements linked to strategic plan; and which require a detailed accounting, every 6 months, on actual expenditures and results [revise Operational Guidelines to give greater flexibility to the Centre to allocate international assistance, while requiring the Centre to provide proper accountability and performance reports]
- require periodic evaluations to assess relevance and effectiveness of different categories of international assistance and their impact on sites
- prepare a plan that systematically identifies international organizations that are involved in world heritage activities, and the opportunities and strategies to cooperate
- reinstate biennial budgeting for WHF
- administrative elements of fund should be clearly identified as a Bureau/ sub-committee function

CHAPTER 3 INFORMATION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 Preparation, distribution and presentation of documents

Issues:

- too much documentation given to Committee
- voluminous and often duplicate information is time-consuming and confusing
- lack of clarity in documentation
- need to increase efficiency of decision-making processes and raise the level of debate to policy issues

Recommendations:

- reduce volume of documentation presented to Committee
- information presented to Committee and Bureau should be streamlined to encourage discussion of policy issues and stimulate strategic decision-making
- redefined work program for the Bureau and Committee should be used as a basis to reduce the duplication and distribution of documentation
- reduce paper volume by using CD roms and other electronic media where practical

3.2 Information systems relating to World Heritage Sites

Issues:

- need for management system and archival storage
- information out-of-date
- need for Centre to have consolidated site files
- need to link state of conservation reports with international assistance requests/allocations
- need to draw up, keep up to date and publicize a list of property for which international assistance has been granted (responsibility from Convention, art. 13.5)
- recognize some progress made

Recommendations:

- institute consolidated record keeping, linking nomination files, monitoring reports, international assistance and correspondence; these files should be linked electronically to site files of Advisory bodies
- establish a management information system that will enable analysis of trends and patterns in international assistance projects
- establish and publish a list of sites for which international assistance has been granted, and update regularly

CHAPTER 4 OTHER MATTERS

COMMENTS FROM IUCN, TO THE TASK FORCE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

GENERAL COMMENT

1. The comments below focus on priority practical actions for the more effective operation of the Convention. For the sake of brevity, these actions are listed as short bullet points. More elaboration can be provided if necessary.
2. Actions are listed under the headings used in the terms of reference of the task force on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Under each heading and sub-heading, IUCN has included a concise (one to two sentence) statement of the issue and then lists actions suggested to address these issues.
3. It is noted, at a general level, that there are a number of pre-conditions for these actions to be effectively implemented. These include:
 - A supportive World Heritage Committee;
 - A restructured and refocused World Heritage Centre;
 - A clear and effective Strategic Plan for the World Heritage Convention.

THE ORGANISATION AND RUNNING OF THE STATUTORY MEETINGS

Statutory meetings, specifically the World Heritage Bureau and Committee meetings, are the key mechanism by which the World Heritage Convention is implemented and decisions made. Planning and implementation of these meetings are fundamental to the effective operation of the Convention. However, the implementation of the meetings should not be

considered in isolation from a range of other factors and issues outlined in the first draft of the terms of reference as discussed on 1 December 1999 at a meeting of the Task Force Group at Marrakesh. Accordingly, actions are outlined in relation to each of these points below.

The General Assembly of States Parties

The General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention is held every two years and this is the paramount body in the governance of the Convention electing the Committee as well as reviewing and guiding implementation. Accordingly, it should have the key role in setting overall policy and direction. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Ensuring that discussion and associated background papers are focused at a strategic level and concentrate on fundamental policy issues and direction, rather than on issues associated with administration;
- Ensuring that policy directions arising from the General Assembly of States Parties are clearly expressed and are associated with Action Plans, with realistic tasks and time lines, and regular feedback.

The Committee and the Bureau

A considerable amount of the time of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, is currently taken up with planning and implementation of the Committee and Bureau meetings. These meetings are often also focused more on administrative matters rather than the application of policy. Another factor is that there is currently much repetition between the meetings of the Bureau and those of the Committee and there is scope for streamlining procedures between the two meetings. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Develop a Strategic Plan for World Heritage, which sets out clear directions, tasks and timelines over both the short term and long term. It is noted that there is currently a global strategy document (World Heritage [Conf. 209/8](#) for the 1999 World Heritage Committee Meeting). However, IUCN does not see this as a strategy document but rather as an aggregation of regional strategies which lack a clear picture of where the World Heritage Convention is heading in the short and long term. In the view of IUCN, this document needs

much more work, and would, specifically, benefit from inclusion of a global synthesis section which should precede the individual regional sections. Such a global synthesis section should identify the key global thematic and geographic priorities for World Heritage. For example, at a geographic level this could include a focus on the underrepresented regions such as the Pacific. In relation to Natural World Heritage, it could include a focus on better coverage of underrepresented biomes, such as grassland/steppe.

- In the short term, the operation of the Bureau and Committee meetings should be examined to avoid repetition and to streamline functions. For example, this could involve the establishment of an effective sub committee system to give clear policy direction and advice in relation to areas such as: (a) finance and administration; (b) cultural conservation; (c) natural conservation. An effective sub-committee system such as this could reduce the need for the Committee itself to be involved in the minute debate of budget details as was witnessed at the Morocco World Heritage session.
- The background papers prepared for the Bureau and Committee meetings could also be greatly streamlined and also, where possible, reproduced electronically. The option of including some background papers in the CD Rom format should be considered.
- The Committee meetings themselves should be restructured to allow for more substantive discussion on policy issues. Examples of such debate were provided at the Morocco meeting in relation to issues such as World Heritage and Mining and the cultural landscapes debate in the context of the Loire valley nomination.
- In the longer term, consideration could be given to whether the committee meetings could shift to a two- year instead of an annual cycle. There are advantages and disadvantages of such an approach; these need further elaboration and discussion. Also the possibility of combining Committee and Bureau meeting could also be considered if an effective sub-committee system was established and was found to function effectively.
- The effective functioning of the Bureau and Committee meetings reflects the number of site nominations. With the annual number of nominations increasing rapidly, nominations take up a high percentage of the total time of both meetings. Accordingly,

consideration could be given to practical ways of applying the direction by the General Assembly of State Party that States, already well represented on the list, should hold back on their nominations. The recording of the minutes of the Bureau and Committee meetings could also be streamlined to focus on key elements of discussion and action points arising, rather than providing voluminous background information, as currently is the case, particularly in relation to State of Conservation Reports. Consideration could be given to including the background material in annexes rather than in the record of the meeting.

The Advisory Bodies

The role of the Advisory Bodies is critical to the effective functioning of the World Heritage Convention. All Advisory Bodies are currently suffering from the overload associated with an ever increasing number of nominations, and also the increasing profile of sites and issues associated with sites that are currently on the List. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Ensuring that the resolutions of the General Assembly of State Parties relating to reducing the number of new nominations are applied.
- Working to improve the cooperation between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre such that there is a clear team approach progressing towards the achievement of mutually agreed objectives and targets. It is noted that this is currently a constraint in relation to some areas. It is also noted that the MOU developed between the World Heritage Centre and IUCN has contributed to effective partnership.
- Ensuring that the Advisory Bodies continue to draw on, to the fullest extent, their relevant networks to ensure that expertise is harnessed most effectively to deliver results.
- Increase the level of focus in relation to State of Conservation reporting such that it is giving priority to key sites and issues and also ensuring, at all times, that State of Conservation reporting is bringing forward practical and achievable recommendations to address issues outlined. More resources will be required to ensure more effective State of Conservation reporting and linkage to action.

The Secretariat (WHC)

The Secretariat is currently comprised of motivated, talented people. However, it could function more effectively as a team and there is a need to examine ways in which this could be achieved. Actions to improve the current structure could include the following:

- Development of a Strategic Plan for the Centre which focuses on objectives and targets for the Centre as a whole. This would be an integral element of the previously mentioned strategy.
- Ensuring that the staff of the Centre are working as a team with the relevant Advisory Bodies rather than, as has been said, being seen as in competition. It is essential that there be the greatest possible synergy between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre as a key to effective performance.
- Reviewing the current focus of the Centre on meetings, either on servicing statutory Bureau and Committee meetings, or in assisting with the implementation of natural and cultural strategy meetings around the world. It is important that there be a more selective and focused approach that ensures that all meetings result in clear outputs, build on previous work and contribute to the development of an integrated Global Strategy.
- It is considered that prioritisation is essential and that there should be an increased emphasis within the Centre on fundraising, communication and information management. Accordingly, it is considered there should be lesser emphasis on meetings as currently exists and on individual projects managed by staff within the secretariat.
- The more effective operation of the Secretariat would be enhanced if the Committee agreed to proceed with a more integrated approach to the operation of the Convention, particularly through adoption of a single set of World Heritage Criteria.
- There also needs to be an examination of ways in which the Centre could operate in a smarter manner, such as through the use of information technology to minimise unnecessary work in functions such as, for example, handling nominations and transmitting them to Advisory Bodies.

Regional Focal Points

World Heritage Focal Points currently exist in the Nordic World Heritage Office; the World Heritage Office in Japan, the proposed Asia/Pacific Focal Point for World Heritage and the World Heritage post in the UNESCO office in Samoa. Action to enhance the current situation could include the following:

- Ensuring there is effective coordination between the regional focal points and the World Heritage Centre.
- Ensuring there is effective coordination and liaison between the respective focal points.
- Ensuring that regional focal points are working towards the same strategic plan and individual workplans, as other arms of the World Heritage Convention.
- Encouraging increased development of regional focal points, where appropriate, particularly in relation to under represented regions and their use to develop support for existing World Heritage sites needing assistance, as well as promoting the Convention.
- Attempting to link the activities of regional World Heritage focal points Offices with those of the Advisory Bodies, where this is possible and appropriate. For example, IUCN regional offices in Africa can be a potential linkage point for any World Heritage regional focal points established.

THE PROCESSES OF DECISION MAKING UNDER THE CONVENTION

There are a number of processes under the Convention, which are critical. These processes and suggested actions to improve the current situation are set out below.

Tentative Lists

Tentative lists are required under the Operational Guidelines and many have been prepared. IUCN agrees strongly with the concept of tentative

lists but they must be effectively developed and applied if they are to be of any use. IUCN considers: "you either use them or you should lose them". Action to improve the current situation could include the following:

- State Parties should be encouraged to continually revise and update their tentative lists. Many tentative lists include sites of doubtful merit but they have been on the list for many years without challenge. In such a situation, the relevant State Party may assume that in due time they may make a nomination of the site on the tentative list and have it inscribed automatically. Some tentative lists are long out of date and are not updated. Some States may use their tentative list simply as access to clear the way for a specific nomination. For example a State Party could include a site on a tentative list solely to satisfy the requirements on the operational guidelines without serious consideration of potential sites and without consultation with stakeholders.
- The tentative list process needs to be linked with the strategy work of the Advisory Bodies. For example, the Forest Strategy work, coordinated by IUCN should be used to provide State Parties as to whether or not forest sites are included on their tentative World Heritage lists. Similarly, Global Strategy regional sessions could be used to review tentative lists and guide State Parties in revising tentative lists.

Nomination and Inscription Process

The problems of balance inherent in the World Heritage List are continuing and are expanding. These have been exacerbated by the growing number of nominations each year and by different approaches to the interpretation of "universal value by the Advisory Bodies. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Ensuring that the General Assembly of States Parties resolution relating to number of sites nominated by State Parties and voluntarily holding back on nominations are applied.
- Ensuring that only viable nominations are put forward by State Parties in the first instance. This implies the application of support to State Parties in preparation of nominations and reviewing the tentative list process as a management mechanism.

- Working towards a more consistent application of "outstanding universal value" between the Advisory Bodies.
- Working to ensure that the existing strategy processes, meetings, strategy documents, etc, are more effectively applied to new nominations.
- Ensuring that the expectations of State Parties in relation to the inscription of new sites is pragmatic and realistic.
- Working to ensure that the process of referral and deferral of sites is streamlined.

Conservation, Reporting and Monitoring

The State of Conservation Monitoring of existing World Heritage sites is increasing year by year. This is posing significant challenges for the Convention, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Actions to include the current situation could include the following:

- Reviewing and improving mechanisms to improve the rigour and focus of conservation reporting for natural and cultural sites.
- Reducing the number of sites reported on and giving an associated increased level of attention to sites with significant rather than peripheral problems. A summary of sites with lesser conservation problems and actions being taken to address them could be simply tabled for information with the opportunity for interested parties to comment in writing to the World Heritage Centre for action and the tabling of updates at subsequent meetings.
- Giving more attention to practical measures (including financing) for the smaller number of sites which are reported on. There should be a particular emphasis on examining ways to mobilise resources for sites in danger and to address generic issues, such as tourism, which are flagged in a large number of conservation reports.
- Ensuring that there is a clearer and more effective link between reactive and periodic monitoring. There should be particular emphasis on ensuring that the experience of the Advisory Bodies, developed through many years of experience in reactive monitoring, are fully applied and made available to States Parties in the

development of periodic monitoring systems.

International Cooperation

The funding available through the World Heritage Fund, although small, plays an important role in supporting conservation at existing World Heritage Sites. It is critical that this fund is used in the most effective manner. The existing review of international cooperation should provide an effective base for developing recommendations to improve the way in which international cooperation is implemented. Action to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Ensuring that funding available through the World Heritage Fund is used in a synergistic way, that is, that it is used to leverage and mobilise other sources of funding for World Heritage Sites.
- Trying to shift the focus of international cooperation from annual funding to multi-year funding.
- Focusing on the outcomes of international cooperation and effectively assessing the impact of past international cooperation in specific areas before deciding to continue funding in these areas.
- Ensuring that international cooperation is focusing on priority issues, such as those identified in the State of Conservation reporting and particularly in support for sites listed on the World Heritage in Danger.
- In general there needs to be a much sharper linkage in State of Conservation monitoring and international cooperation than currently exists.

Programming and Budgeting

The links between workplanning and budgeting are not clear at present. Actions to improve the current situation could include:

- Ensuring there is a functioning strategic plan and work plans, which set out key directions, and then ensuring that budgeting is applied to address the priority task identified within these directions.
- Establishing an effective World Heritage Committee budget sub-

committee with input into presentation of the budget proposals to the Committee sessions.

- Ensuring that the budget presentation is streamlined to avoid the full World Heritage Committee being involved in micro-management as was the case at the World Heritage Committee session in Marrakech.
- In general, programming and budget must be clearly linked and it must be linked to the achievement of clearly identified outcomes.

Timing and Sequencing of Meetings and Decisions

At present there are many World Heritage meetings, both statutory and other meetings such as regional strategy meetings. Actions to improve the current situation could include:

- As previously mentioned, considering whether Committee meetings could be held on a two-year rather than annual cycle. Also considering whether in the long term, the Bureau and Committee meetings could be merged in association with the establishment of an effective sub-committee system, which meets inter-sessionally in a working session.

THE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGY OF THE CONVENTION

Preparation, Presentation and Volume of Documentation

The material currently considered by the World Heritage Bureau and Committee meetings is daunting and is a barrier to the effective review and focused discussion of specific issues. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Shorten all background papers that are prepared for consideration by the Bureau and Committee.
- Enforcing recommendations from the General Assembly of State Parties, relating to reducing the number of sites nominated by States Parties.

- Combining papers on closely related issues.
- Exploring how electronic means can be used to reduce the paper volume, such as through the preparation and distribution of CD Roms.
- Reducing the number of statutory and other meetings.

Information System Relating to Sites

Considerable information is held in relation to individual World Heritage Sites, by the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. This can lead to duplication of information and potential inefficiencies. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Harmonising information collection systems between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and States Parties.
- Giving consideration to strengthening information bodies such as the World Conservation Monitoring Centre to ensure that they have the key up to date information base relating to sites.
- Harmonising the collection of information relating to sites.
- Ensuring all site-based information is stored electronically and is easily available to use.

Mechanisms for Exchanging Information and Experience

There is a continual need to explore ways to improve the way in which information and experience is disseminated and shared. Actions to improve the current situation could include the following:

- Making greater use of established mechanisms for information exchange such as the World Heritage Bulletins and the relevant information channels of the Advisory Bodies.
- Building on the current work of the Centre in information dissemination and expanding it, with particular emphasis on use of the media.

- Providing support to the efforts of States Parties in areas relating to information exchange and experience, such as the Asia/Pacific focal point being developed by Australia.
- Encouraging the more effective use of existing meetings, so that they clearly serve a function of exchanging information and experience in relation to World Heritage.

Jce/world heritage/comments

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Twenty-third session
Marrakesh, Morocco
29 November – 4 December**

Rapporteur Draft Report

TASK FORCE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

At the request of the World Heritage Committee, a working group chaired by Canada submits to the Committee proposals relating to the composition and terms of reference of a Task Force aimed at improving the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Composition of the Task Force:

The same as the working group established by the Committee in Marrakech 1999, chaired by Canada and including Australia, Belgium, Hungary, Morocco, Mexico, South Africa, Thailand, and the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN) and a representative of the World Heritage Centre. Australia has agreed to act as rapporteur.

Terms of reference of the Task Force:

To identify and propose for consideration of the Bureau in June 2000 priority practical measures for more effective operation of the Convention, taking account of pressures affecting the Convention over the next coming years. Those measures, some of which should be applicable in preparation of and during the Committee meeting of December 2000, will focus on:

- The organisation and running of the statutory meetings,
- The procedures for decision making,
- The information and documentation management,
- The Operational Guidelines

The Task Force will take into account and further build upon all discussions in previous General Assembly, Committee and Bureau meetings (see WHC-99/CONF.209/9), the management review and financial audit, and proposals made by State Parties.

Working methods:

The Task Force will operate in a way that maximises the opportunity for State Party input. A concise draft paper will be circulated by March 2000 and comments will be sought by fax and e-mail. The draft paper will be posted on the UNESCO homepage.

Possible further developments:

After having considered the proposals of the Task Force, the Bureau, at its meeting in June 2000, will recommend for Committee consideration a possible new working group to reflect in depth on the objectives and fundamental priorities in implementing the Convention.

taskforce/draftreport.htm
24 January 2000

REPORT

Meeting of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre UNESCO Headquarters, 21 February 2000

Attended by:

- WHC** Mounir Bouchenaki (Chairperson)
Georges Zouain
Galia Saouma-Forero
Herman van Hooff
Elizabeth Wangari
Sarah Titchen
Josette Erfan
Peter Stott
Feng Jing (Rapporteur)
Fédérique Robert
Julie Hage Laurie Chamberlain (observer)
- ICOMOS** Jean-Louis Luxen Henry Cleere
Regina Durighello
- IUCN** Rolf Hogan
- ICCROM** Marc Laenen
- SC/ECO** Mireille Jardin
Sami Mankoto

1. Opening of the meeting

The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mounir Bouchenaki (Chairperson) opened the meeting by welcoming participants from the Advisory Bodies. He thanked the Advisory Bodies for having respected the date set for the meeting despite the difficulties this may have caused. He expressed his gratitude to ICCROM for initially having invited the meeting to be held at ICCROM Headquarters in Rome. He then briefly introduced the WHC staff present at the meeting. The Director reflected on the multitude of follow-up actions to the decisions and recommendations of the Committee and referred to the key work being carried out by the Task Force and Working Groups of the Committee who were addressing fundamental issues relating to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda for the meeting (Annex I) was adopted with one change. At the request of the Director-General of ICCROM, Mr Laenen, an item on planning and budget programming of the World Heritage Fund for the 24th Committee session was included in the agenda (Item 11). It was proposed that in the future the Centre prepare the budget document for the Committee with the Advisory Bodies, i.e. during the meeting with the Advisory Bodies in September.

3. Review and adoption of the report of the previous meeting, held at UNESCO Headquarters 29 September 1999

The meeting adopted the report of the previous meeting without change.

4. Matters arising from the previous meeting

The Secretary-General of ICOMOS, Mr Luxen, reiterated that reactive monitoring missions should be co-ordinated through the ICOMOS International Secretariat and not by the World Heritage Centre directly with ICOMOS National Committees. The Director of the Centre agreed on this point.

5. Confirmation of contractual arrangements

The Director of the Centre explained the administrative procedures for the preparation of contracts with the Advisory Bodies. The staff of the Centre briefly explained the current status of preparation of the contracts to be established with IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM. The contracts with IUCN had all been completed during the previous week. The Centre took note of the point raised by ICOMOS that any delay in the preparation of the annual contracts caused cash flow problems. It was proposed that, in future, contracts with the Advisory Bodies would be prepared immediately after the World Heritage Committee session with each of the Advisory Bodies sending one representative to the Centre to define the Terms of Reference working together with the responsible WHC staff.

6. International Assistance

The Director of the Centre referred to the serious situation of the 2000 budget of the World Heritage Fund with regard to Preparatory Assistance requests, as funds have almost been exhausted. Status reports on International Assistance for 2000 were distributed at the meeting by the Centre's Administrative Officer. Discussion took place on the prioritization of International Assistance requests given that the World Heritage Fund is very limited. The representative of IUCN suggested that, rather than requests being reviewed as they come in, they should be reviewed en

masse once or twice a year. It was agreed that priority should be given to States Parties which are under-represented on the World Heritage List while approving Preparatory Assistance requests. This should also be in line with the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List. It was also proposed that the possibility of reallocating some of the Technical Co-operation budget to accommodate Preparatory Assistance requests should be studied. The gross disparity between the amounts approved for Preparatory Assistance for cultural and natural heritage was noted.

The Deputy Director of the Centre informed the meeting of the progress being made by the UNESCO BPE and C3E Evaluation on International Assistance. The draft evaluation report will be finished by 10 April 2000. It was recommended that the evaluation team should send a copy of this draft report to the Advisory Bodies and the Centre for comments prior to its finalization. With regard to ICCROM's evaluation of Training Assistance, it was noted that the report was almost finished and that ICCROM had found no distinction between Training and Technical Co-operation assistance and therefore the report had reviewed both forms of assistance. It was also noted that the report should be linked to the BPE and C3E evaluation report and presented to the Bureau session in June 2000.

7. Progress Report on Task Force and Working Groups

The work of the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee and the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List will be presented to the forthcoming sessions of the Bureau and Committee in June and November/December 2000. The Task Force is mainly conducting its work via electronic means. Web sites have been established for the Task Force and Working Groups.

Georges Zouain (Dep. DIR/WHC) has been designated as the representative of the Secretariat for the Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. He reported on the progress being made by the Task Force chaired by Christina Cameron (Canada). The draft report of the Task Force was received for comment and it will be finalized by April 2000. It was noted that IUCN has provided a paper to the Task Force.

Sarah Titchen (WHC) and Lyndel Prott (CLT/CH) have been designated as representatives of the Secretariat for the Working Group on Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee. The first meeting of the Working Group was convened by its chairman, Ambassador J. Musitelli (France) on 3 February 2000. The representative of Argentina had circulated a position

paper, which proposed the reduction of the term of office of the Members of the Committee from **6** to **4** years. He proposed that the number of Committee members should be increased to no less than **28** and not higher **36**. Both of these proposals would require amendments to the World Heritage Convention. The meeting established its agenda and the next meeting was scheduled to take place on 28 February 2000.

Galia Saouma-Forero (WHC) has been designated as the representative of the Secretariat for the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List. She updated the participants on the result of the first meeting on 9 February 2000.

The representative of ICOMOS said that ICOMOS would present papers to the Task Force and Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List. It was noted that IUCN did not budget for participation in meetings of the Task Force and Working Groups and requested that IUCN's global overviews be linked to the web site of this working group.

It was noted that the results of the Working Groups would be transmitted to the Task Force chaired by Canada.

8. Review of new and deferred nominations to be examined the Bureau session in June 2000

An updated list of 83 nominations to be reviewed by the Bureau in June was circulated. Peter Stott (WHC) updated the participants on this item. At the same time, new web pages on comparative studies were presented, as well as several new subject category pages on the WHC web site.

The Director of the Centre referred to two deferred nominations for re-examination at the forthcoming Bureau session, notably the town of Bellinzone in Switzerland and the Historic Centre Shakhriyabz in Uzbekistan. Following a discussion, it was agreed that, because of the heavy workload of ICOMOS, documentation submitted after 20 March 2000 can not be considered by the Bureau in June 2000 and will be presented to the extra-ordinary session of the Bureau in November.

ICOMOS referred to the rejected nominations which were brought back to the Committee for examination. What should be the working method in dealing with these cases?

It was proposed that, a collective review of the nomination files should be

conducted by the WHC staff and representatives from the Advisory Bodies at the pre-evaluation stage before sending out letters of acceptance. The representative of IUCN proposed that strict criteria should be established for accepting the nomination files. It was suggested that, if the State Party does not undertake periodic reporting, no nomination should be accepted. While revising the Operational Guidelines, the nomination process should also be reviewed. For instance, greater encouragement could be given to States Parties to consult with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to the preparation of nomination files so as to better space the submission of nominations and assist the States Parties in evaluating which sites on their tentative lists should be submitted. It was noted that both the Task Force chaired by Canada and the Working Group on Representativity of the World Heritage List were also examining these questions.

It was also proposed that the deadline for submission of nomination files should be changed from 1 July to 1 June to avoid the heavy workload during the ordinary session of the Bureau between June/July. This should be taken into account when proposing revisions to the Operational Guidelines.

The Director of the Centre expressed concerns about the politicization of the nomination and inscription process. He referred to the economic dimensions of World Heritage nomination and to a trend of commercialization of World Heritage inscription. This of course reflects the success of the 1972 Convention as the inscription brings prestige to the State Party. He commented that the Task Force should be informed of the implications of the ever-increasing number of new nominations and the continued imbalance between Europe and other regions of the world. For example, in 2000, Europe comprises **59%** of the total cultural nominations and **54%** of all nominations. Concerns were also expressed about the Bureau and Committee seriously questioning the expert advice of the Advisory Bodies (eg the case of the Loire Valley in France). ICOMOS stressed that consultations should be made through its international Secretariat regarding actions towards referral or deferral of nominations.

The Director of the Centre recognized that the examination process of newly received nominations by the World Heritage Centre will have to be reviewed and strengthened but that the Centre has very limited resources to do more.

As a conclusion, it was agreed that a strong consultation mechanism should be established between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies at an earlier stage in dealing with the nomination files. Also, the matter of reviewing the nomination and inscription process should be transmitted to the Task Force and other working groups.

9. State of Conservation of World Heritage sites

The Centre informed the meeting of on-going or forthcoming monitoring missions to World Heritage sites in the Arab States (Islamic Cairo, Byblos etc.), Asia (Hampi, Konarak, Taxila, Tchogha Zanbil, Isfahan, Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore, Shish Mahar, Lumbini and Kathmandu Valley). The Centre also informed the meeting on the current status of assessment at Kakadu National Park. An ISP/ ICSU inspection of Jabiluka will take place from 3 to 7 July. The Committee requested IUCN co-operation and the Centre would like IUCN to participate in the mission.

The Centre has written to the Romanian Government concerning the cyanide spill on the Tisza River and its potential effect on World Heritage sites.

For all the reactive monitoring missions, the Advisory Bodies should be notified and experts have to be arranged via IUCN and ICOMOS or ICCROM. ICOMOS emphasized that its participation in reactive monitoring be requested through its Headquarters in Paris. The participation of national ICOMOS committees or ICOMOS members without the involvement of ICOMOS Headquarters cannot be considered as formal ICOMOS participation.

Deadline for the forthcoming Bureau: the 15 April deadline was agreed for submission of State of Conservation reports from the Advisory Bodies. It was proposed that the working documents on the state of conservation should be finalized by the end of April 2000.

World Heritage and mining: WHC staff provided updated information on this matter. The Centre had requested information on how the ICME roundtable meeting (London) on Biodiversity and Mining between 14 and 15 March will effect the 18-22 September meeting on Mining and World Heritage (Amman, Jordan).

The representative of SC/ECO informed the meeting that a workshop on mining would be held at the Seville conference on Biosphere Reserves in November 2000. The workshop will discuss guidelines and policy in relation to mining and Biosphere Reserves.

10. Periodic Reporting

The Deputy Director of the Centre informed the meeting on the preparation of periodic reports of the Arab States. A workshop will be organized in Beirut from 6 to 8 March 2000.

With regard to the situation in Africa, the Centre informed the meeting that questionnaire/format had been sent to States Parties. There will be two periodic reporting meetings in Africa this year: **a)** A meeting will be organized in Dakar (5-8 July) for francophone Africa followed by an All-Africa meeting on transboundary sites; and **b)** another meeting in Tanzania (September/October) for anglophone Africa followed by a project formulation Workshop. The Dakar meeting will include participants of the natural sites from the Arab region.

The Centre also informed the participants of an initiative from the Department of Medieval Studies of the Central European University in Budapest, Hungary. A brainstorming session by the Hungarian authorities will be held on 8 June 2000. The meeting noted that this initiative, being the first of its kind from a European country, could be of great benefit to the periodic reporting process.

11. Planning and budget programming of the World Heritage Fund

This item was not discussed.

12. Brief update on the World Heritage Centre's Information Management System

The Centre staff briefly referred to the Expert Group Reviews of the Centre's Data and Information Infrastructure and the recommendations made at a recent meeting (7 February) held at the European Space Agency (ESA). A prototype for the Informational Management System was prepared by ESA Information Department including the possibility of an "internal web site" for the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The needs of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be taken into account and a Data Model shall be ready by the end of June 2000. It was announced that a senior expert on Information Management is urgently needed to work for a period of three months. IUCN proposed a candidate based in Zambia.

13. Brief update on the Special Project "*Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion*"

The Director of the Centre briefly introduced the Special Project which is successful and is one of the good examples for intersectoral cooperation in UNESCO.

The staff of the Centre and the Education Sector of UNESCO informed the meeting on the translation, distribution, evaluation and adaptation of the World Heritage Educational Resource Kit for Teachers "*World Heritage in young*

hands", which is now available in Arabic, English, French and Spanish. The English and French Kit has been distributed for testing/ adaptation in 700 Associated schools in more than 120 countries. Sub-regional World Heritage Education (WHE) teacher training workshops were organized to assist Member States in order to facilitate the introduction of WHE in the curricula and to formulate National Plans of Action. It is hoped that the Kit will be available in six of the official UN working languages in 2000. A web site will also be established for this Project.

Two regional World Heritage Youth Fora were organized in 1999, i.e., World Heritage Youth Forum on the Transatlantic Slave Trade, Senegal, August 1999, the Arab States World Heritage Youth Forum, Morocco, November 1999. In 2000, one regional WHYF for Latin America will be organized in Peru (Lima) in August/September 2000 and another one for the Pacific in Australia in December 2000 (not yet confirmed). The Centre requested the participation of the Advisory Bodies in the two Youth Fora.

As the project will be flourishing, regional networking, links with universities and other regional or sub-regional institutions will be explored in future.

14. Other forthcoming meetings

The Centre informed the meeting of a Task Force meeting to elaborate a five-year action plan for capacity building in natural heritage networking, education, cooperation and training (CONNECT) to be organized at UNESCO Headquarters from 17 to 20 April 2000. Participants from WWF, Conservation International, UN Foundation, MacArthur Foundation and other UN agencies will be invited.

The participants expressed some concerns over the current World Heritage calendar that includes all the activities related to World Heritage conservation. It was proposed that the calendar of events be established in the light of the following items: A) Major activities within the framework of the World Heritage Convention; B) Related events carried out by relevant institutions.

15. Date and place of next meeting

The Director of the Centre proposed that the next meeting be held on 4 or 18 September 2000. The date of **4 September** at UNESCO was provisionally agreed.

16. Closure of the meeting

The meeting closed at 17:35 p.m.

