

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION  
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-second session  
Kyoto, Japan  
30 November - 5 December 1998

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee**

**SUMMARY**

**Background**

At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee requested that the Consultative Body examine the following four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical Issues
2. Communication and promotion
3. Management Review of the World Heritage Centre
4. Use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising guidelines.

The Consultative Body met to discuss these four issues on 29-30 April 1998. The Consultative Body used as the basis for discussion, preliminary papers prepared by designated members of the Consultative Body. At its twenty-second session (22-27 June 1998), the Bureau, examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and its recommendations and prepared specific recommendations for submission to the World Heritage Committee. Some of the Bureau's recommendations have required substantial follow-up on the part of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as well as by members of the Consultative Body.

**Summary**

This document presents the recommendations of the Bureau to the Committee on these four issues, reports on follow-up to these recommendations and suggests, at the end of each section of the document, particular decisions to be made by the Committee.

## **BACKGROUND**

At its twentieth session in December 1996, the Committee requested a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund for the year ending 31 December 1996 and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, the Committee established a Consultative Body “to take action on the proposal adopted by the Committee, to undertake a review of the way in which the World Heritage Centre has assisted the Committee in implementing the World Heritage Convention”.

At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee had requested that the Consultative Body examine four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical issues
2. Communications and Promotion
3. Management Review and Financial Audit
4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.

The Consultative Body had asked Professor Francioni (Italy) to chair the Consultative Body in 1998. Members of the Consultative Body are Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, United States of America and Zimbabwe. A meeting of the Consultative Body was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 29 and 30 April 1998. At the invitation of the Chairperson, representatives of Germany and Greece also attended, as did observers from Ecuador and Hungary and the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

In accordance with the decision by the Consultative Body in December 1997, preliminary discussion papers on each of the four issues were prepared by designated members of the Consultative Body. These discussion papers then formed the basis of the Consultative Body’s deliberations on the four issues during their meeting in April. The Report of the Rapporteur of the meeting of the Consultative Body was adopted on 24 June 1998 and was subsequently discussed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

At its twenty-second session (22-27 June 1998), the Bureau, examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and made specific recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. Some of the Bureau’s recommendations have required substantial follow-up on the part of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as well as by members of the Consultative Body.

This document presents the recommendations of the Bureau to the Committee on these four issues, reports on follow-up to these recommendations and suggests particular decisions for the Committee at the end of each section of the document.

### **1. Technical Issues**

The following technical issues were examined by the Consultative Body at the request of the twenty-first session of the Committee:

- (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi);
- (b) the test of authenticity;
- (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List; and

(d) the implementation of the Global Strategy.

A paper prepared by Australia, contributions from Malta, Zimbabwe, ICOMOS and Greece, and the report of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands in March 1998 (see Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7), formed the basis of discussion on the Technical Issues.

**(a) The application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi)**

The text of cultural criteria (i) and (vi) are currently included in Paragraph 24(a) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Bureau adopted the following recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi):

*15. With reference to a more stringent interpretation of cultural criterion (i), the Amsterdam Expert Meeting has set up a working group, chaired by Madam Bercé (France) to finalise the wording for a new set of criteria, to operationalize them, and to bring forward recommendations regarding this to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. It is suggested that Mr Demicoli's proposals on wording be referred to this group.*

In addition, the Bureau adopted the following recommendations:

*In light of the endorsement of the recommendations of the Amsterdam meeting of experts ... by the Consultative Body, the Bureau recommends to the Committee that it endorse the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts.*

*The Bureau asks the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the advisory bodies, to co-ordinate the preparation of draft revisions to the sections of the Operational Guidelines relating to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity for submission to, and the final decision of, the twenty-second session of the Committee.*

The proposed revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* have been examined by the Advisory Bodies and the participants of the Amsterdam meeting.

**Decisions required:** That the Committee discuss the proposed revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* under **Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention.**

That the Committee examine the report of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands in March 1998 (Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.12), under Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: **Progress Report and Action Plan for the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List.**

**(b) The Test of Authenticity**

The Test of Authenticity is currently included as Paragraph 24(b)(i) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Consultative Body and the Bureau concluded that there should be a more stringent application of the Test of Authenticity, to places where the fabric is the most important. They also recommended further examination of the meaning of “authenticity” in different regional contexts and particularly for living cultures.

The following recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the Test of Authenticity was adopted by the Bureau.

*21. The Consultative Body concluded by asking that the text on criteria, including integrity and authenticity, prepared as a result of the Amsterdam expert meeting be referred to the Bureau. The Delegate of Australia noted that the final contribution should refer to the papers submitted by Malta, Zimbabwe and Greece.*

The proposed revisions to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity included in the *Operational Guidelines* have been examined by the Advisory Bodies and the participants of the Amsterdam meeting.

**Decision required:** That the Committee discuss the proposed revisions to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity included in the *Operational Guidelines* under **Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention.**

**(c) The imbalance of the World Heritage List; and, (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy**

The Consultative Body discussed the balance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List in detail. The main issue of discussion centred on the question of how to move faster in the implementation of the Global Strategy whilst maintaining the rights of States Parties.

The following recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the balance of the List and the Global Strategy were adopted by the Bureau:

*35. Noting that it had, in general, endorsed the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts, the Consultative Body referred them to the Bureau;*

*The Consultative Body recommended that:*

- *in particular, in line with the discussions at the meeting of experts, that further work be undertaken on breaking down the cultural themes outlined at the 1994 Global Strategy Experts Meeting into sub-themes that would assist identification of those types places that are over- or under-represented on the World Heritage List. This work should recognise the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage;*
- *when considering ways of improving the balance and representativeness of the World Heritage List, the sovereign rights of the States Parties be fully respected and reference is made to Paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines.*

- *the World Heritage Centre prepare a prioritised action plan to ensure an acceleration in the implementation of the Global Strategy. The action plan should include reference to (i) methods for communicating the objectives and regional and thematic approach of the Global Strategy to all States Parties, (ii) objectives to be set in relation to regions and sub-themes currently underrepresented in the World Heritage List, and (iii) ways of channelling and increasing resources available to States Parties to ensure the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties in the long term. The preparation of an action plan, which should be submitted to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee, is in line with Paragraph 43 of the report of the 1997 Management Review.*

*In summary,*

*The Bureau asks the World Heritage Centre to prepare, in close co-operation with the Advisory Bodies, a prioritised action plan for the future implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List, to be submitted for the approval of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.*

The prioritised Action Plan for the future implementation of the Global Strategy, prepared by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN, is presented as part of Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12.

**Decision required:** That the Committee discuss the Action Plan for the Global Strategy under **Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Progress Report and Action Plan for the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List.**

## **2. Communications and Promotion**

A discussion paper on communications and promotion was prepared by Canada and reviewed by the Consultative Body on 29 and 30 April 1998.

The following recommendations relating to World Heritage communications and promotion were made by the Consultative Body and endorsed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 1998:

### ***Recommendation I***

*The World Heritage Committee should adopt a set of principles and guidelines for the future governance of the communications and promotion activities. While any individual, organisation or enterprise is free to publish or produce products associated with World Heritage, any authorization to do so in formal association with UNESCO and use of the emblem is the prerogative of the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO and will therefore adhere to the following principles and guidelines. These would apply to States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, the UNESCO Publishing Office and the UNESCO Office of Public Information.*

**Principles:**

- *States Parties retain full control over the content of texts and images related to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories*
- *Quality of content takes precedence over the quantity of products*
- *Communications and promotion products respect the values and objectives of the Convention*
- *Priority is given to products of educational, cultural, scientific or artistic value*
- *Authorized products do not exploit or endanger World Heritage sites*
- *Revenues flowing from communications and promotion activities benefit World Heritage Sites or the World Heritage Fund in agreement with the relevant States Parties*

**Guidelines:**

- *Standard texts and images are updated regularly by States Parties and then disseminated by the World Heritage Centre on demand without further approval from States Parties*
- *Texts and images for World Heritage communications and promotional products are reviewed and approved in writing by States Parties, with respect to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories, before authorization is granted to use the emblem*
- *The choice of external partners to sponsor communications and promotional products follows annex 5 of the UNESCO Internal Guidelines and requires the States Parties' approval; doubtful cases are referred to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee*

**Recommendation II**

*The World Heritage Committee should review and approve a strategic plan for communications and promotion activity, including target markets, anticipated reach, cost implications (including potential for cost recovery) and performance measures. Performance against this plan should be reviewed annually and adjustments made as required. The Committee should evaluate periodically the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.*

**Recommendation III**

*A Business Case for the quarterly World Heritage Review should be tabled for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, since it has never received formal approval. The Business Case should include information on circulation, readership, quality, sustainability, cost (financial and staff time), policy on corporate sponsorship and options.*

The Bureau, at its twenty-second ordinary session adopted the following recommendations regarding World Heritage communications and promotion:

1. *The Bureau endorses the principles and guidelines as enumerated in paragraph 52 of the Consultative Body Report ... and recommends their adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.*

2. *The Bureau instructs the Centre to prepare a strategic plan as referred to in the Consultative Body Report ... for the future work on World Heritage communications and promotion activities for adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session. The plan should contain provisions for periodic review. The Bureau recommends that the Committee periodically evaluate the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.*

3. *The Bureau asks the Centre to prepare a business case as stated in the Consultative Body Report ... for the World Heritage Review for submission to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.*

Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 includes a ***Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities***, which represents the UNESCO World Heritage Centre's proposed World Heritage communications and promotion strategy for approval by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session.

Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 also presents a ***Business Case for the World Heritage Review*** as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session.

**Decision required:** That the Committee discuss the proposed *Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities* and the *Business Case for the World Heritage Review* included in Working document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 under **Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: World Heritage documentation, information and education activities.**

### 3. Management Review and Financial Audit

The Consultative Body examined the recommendations of the Management Review and Financial Audit with reference to a discussion paper prepared by France and Italy.

The Bureau subsequently adopted the following recommendations:

1. *The Bureau,*

*Having taken note of paragraphs 79 to 89 of the "Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee", adopted the following decision:*

*That a detailed document be prepared by the Director-General of UNESCO and made available to the Committee members before the end of October 1998. The report should specify:*

- *the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention;*
- *the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialised sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage;*

- *the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre.*

*The document will be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee, which will then formulate its recommendation to the General Assembly of the States Parties.*

2. *The Bureau,*

*Taking into account paragraph 90 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has recommended that:*

*UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre:*

- *ensure that all the permanent posts of the Centre are clearly identified with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public.*
- *fill all the permanent posts.*

3. *The Bureau,*

*Taking into account paragraphs 91 to 109 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has adopted the following:*

*Shares the view that ambiguities exist in the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the programmes and projects relevant to the 1972 Convention;*

*Reaffirms that this concern should form the subject of an urgent and scrupulous examination;*

*Recommends to the Director-General to clearly specify (in the report requested in Recommendation 1 above):*

- *the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;*
- *the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre with respect to the use of funds as Secretariat to the Convention.*

The Director-General is currently preparing such a report.

The World Heritage Centre has prepared a *Progress Report on Follow-up to the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention”* which is included in **ANNEX I** of this document.

The “*Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention*” is made again available to the Committee for reference as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.16.



**Decision required:** The Committee may wish to examine the *Progress Report on Follow-up to the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention"* which is included in ANNEX I.

#### 4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines

A discussion paper on the use of the World Heritage emblem and Fund-raising was prepared by Japan and the United States of America.

The following recommendations concerning the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising were adopted by the Bureau after having examined the work of the Consultative Body:

*The Bureau asked the United States of America and Canada, who have already taken measures to protect the Emblem, to supply a legislative text as an information document for the Bureau at its twenty-second extra-ordinary session.*

At the time of finalisation of this document these legislative texts had not been received.

*Whilst the guidelines concerning the use of the emblem, quality control and Fund Raising were endorsed in-principle, the Delegates of Japan and the United States of America proposed to amend them, in co-operation with the Centre, to reflect the decisions reached in the discussions. The amended guidelines will be prepared for the twenty-second extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau prior to submission to the Committee.*

A meeting with relevant Sectors and units of UNESCO was held on 3 September 1998 to discuss the proposed guidelines for the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising prepared by the United States of America and Japan. The aim of the meeting was to seek the advice and comments of these Sectors and units as input to the preparation of the revised guidelines. The results of the meeting were conveyed to the United States of America and Japan. A meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the United States of America and Japan has been organised for 20 and 21 October to further discuss these matters. It is expected that a report of the outcomes of these meetings will be presented to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Kyoto, Japan from 27 to 28 November 1998.

**Decision required:** The Committee may wish to acknowledge the progress made in revising the *Guidelines concerning the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising*. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to decide upon the modalities and timetable for the finalisation of the *Guidelines*.

## ANNEX I

**PROGRESS REPORT ON FOLLOW-UP TO THE "REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR TO THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNESCO ON THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION"**

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
	<p><b>Preamble</b> I have carefully read the above Report and taken note of the 35 recommendations put forward by the External Auditor. I wish to thank the Auditor General of Canada for their considered work and advice.</p> <p>Most of the recommendations proposed are rather general. Hence, in their current form it is very difficult to see how they can be considered for immediate application with a view to further improving the efficient functioning of the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre. This is perhaps due to the extremely limited time which was set aside for the Review (approximately 3 months).</p> <p>In my view, in addition to those issues raised in the Report, the most important need is to enhance the conservation of World Heritage sites through a closer and decentralised monitoring of the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites.</p> <p>I have tried to respond to each of the recommendations in as positive and constructive a manner as possible. I am also interested in knowing the Committee's views, both on the Report and its recommendations. In particular I now wish to see a detailed set of priorities established and a timetable of implementation agreed upon. Finally, I wish to assure the members of the World Heritage Committee that I am at their service to implement those concrete recommendations which they may identify as pertinent, and whose implementation is feasible.</p>	<p><b>Background</b> At its meeting on 29-30 April 1998, the Consultative Body examined the recommendations of the Management Review and Financial Audit with reference to a discussion paper prepared by France and Italy (Section D of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11).</p> <p>The Delegate of France presented the first part of the discussion paper which had been prepared by France and Italy. He stated that no new recommendations had been added, but an analysis of the Report of the External Auditor had been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The functioning of the WHC, which has been itemised in three categories;</li> <li>▪ The technical capacities of the WHC;</li> <li>▪ Human Resource management.</li> </ul> <p>The French Delegate commented that the Report was extremely thorough and dealt with many day-to-day difficulties at the Centre. Yet he recalled that the World Heritage Committee, convened in Naples in December 1997, held the view that the auditors had gone beyond their terms of reference in expecting the role of the World Heritage Committee and Centre to be redefined. On this point several Delegates insisted that it was equally important for the Management Review to have considered and commented on the role of the Committee and of the Centre.</p>	<p><b>Background</b> At the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (22-27 June 1998) the Delegates of France and Italy presented the conclusions of the Consultative Body on this subject and drew the Bureau's particular attention to the recommendations concerning the Management Review in Paragraphs 78 to 90, and the Financial Audit in Paragraph 110 of the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.).</p> <p>During the Bureau's discussion on this subject, the Chairperson emphasised the need to clarify and reduce the ambiguity concerning the different roles and the institutional context of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and of the different Sectors of UNESCO. The Director of the Centre responded by informing the Bureau that the Director-General of UNESCO was committed to ensuring that the Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee be both efficient and effective.</p>	<p><b>Background</b> The <i>Management Review of the World Heritage Convention</i> was performed by the UNESCO External Auditor (Auditor General of Canada) between September and November 1997. The Management Review report was forwarded to the Director-General of UNESCO on 20 November 1997 (see Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.16).</p> <p>This synoptic table summarises the actions undertaken by UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre to address the recommendations in the Report of the Management Review.</p> <p><b>Decisions required by the Committee are clearly indicated throughout the table.</b></p>

<b>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
<p><b>Strategic Direction</b></p> <p>27. The Committee should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct a Strategic Review exercise, fully supported by the Centre, using as a starting point a follow-up on the goals, objectives and recommendations adopted by its at the sixteenth session and contained in the 1992 document entitled "Strategic Orientations for the Future";</li> <li>• ensure that an updated strategic framework, containing as a minimum a vision, goals, objectives and short-, medium- and long- term action plans, be produced by December 1998 and systematically followed up through an action plan specifying accountable parties, time horizons and reporting mechanisms ; and</li> <li>• adopt the review of the status of the strategic framework as a permanent item on its agenda.</li> </ul>	<p>The conduct of the systematic strategic review is an important first step because the implementation of nearly all the other recommendations of the Management Review Report will depend on the outcome of such a review.</p>			<p>An updated, coherent strategy for the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> is needed. It would be helpful if the Strategic Orientations of 1992 were updated as was proposed to the Committee at its twentieth session in Merida, Mexico in December 1996.</p> <p><b>Decisions required:</b> The Committee may wish to establish a <b>World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force</b> which would work with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to bring forward a coherent strategy for the future implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> to the Bureau and Committee at its twenty-third sessions in 1999. This strategy could include, as was suggested in the Report of the Management Review, a long-term vision, measurable goals and objectives, priorities, delegation of responsibility for implementation, action plans, a timetable for implementation and an appropriate mechanism for follow-up. Key questions relating to whether the <i>Convention</i> is being implemented effectively would need to be addressed.</p>

<p><i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i></p>
<p><b>Implementing the Convention</b></p> <p>32. The Committee should examine whether its existing structure and operating procedures are still appropriate for today's environment and make any recommendations for improvement.</p>	<p>I fully agree; it is important that the Committee minimises redundancy in the work agenda of the Bureau and the Committee and ensures that the work of the Committee involves, to a much greater extent than at present, renowned experts in both fields: conservation of cultural and the conservation of natural heritage.</p>			<p>In addition to reinstating a biennial budget and planning cycle for the use of the World Heritage Fund (see recommendation 150 below) it is proposed that that the Committee could delegate more responsibility to the Bureau and strengthen the role of the Chairperson. The use of sub-committees such as the World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force (see recommendation 27 above) by the Committee is also suggested.</p> <p>To avoid duplication and to better define the differential roles of the General Assembly of States Parties, the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau it is proposed that in future,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the General Assembly of States Parties will approve the World Heritage Fund accounts, elect members of the World Heritage Committee and examine regional synthesis reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and their general implementation of the <i>Convention</i> submitted by States Parties and already examined by the Committee.</li> <li>• the World Heritage Committee will examine and approve a biennial budget and plan for the use of the World Heritage Fund (see recommendation 150 below). The Committee will make decisions relating to the inclusion of properties on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger and only examine those state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties suggested for inclusion in the World Heritage in Danger List.</li> <li>• the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee will prepare the work of the Committee in relation to the inclusion of</li> </ul>

<b>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
32. (continued)				<p>properties on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, process all state of conservation reports and will have the financial responsibility and authority to approve International Assistance over US\$30,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chairperson will have the financial responsibility and authority to approve international assistance requests up to US\$30,000.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision required:</b> In order to implement the above streamlining in functions, the Committee may wish to examine the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12) under item 10 of the Provisional Agenda.</p>

<b>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
<p><b>Site Listing and inscription</b></p> <p>43. The Committee should request that the Centre prepare an analysis of the sources of the imbalances in the World Heritage List and the list of sites being nominated, with a view 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 including missions to particular regions or countries, allocation of preparatory assistance, and allocation of funding for preparation of tentative lists. The Centre should also prepare a set of options that reflect their findings for discussion and decisions by the Committee.</p>	<p>There have been some past efforts to undertake a partial analysis; for example, as part of the meeting of natural and cultural heritage experts which was held in Parc de la Vanoise in March 1996.</p>			<p>The World Heritage Centre, in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies has prepared such an analysis as part of the Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12).</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to examine the Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12) under item 10 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>
<p>51. The Committee should examine options for changing the timing of the nomination process or limiting the number of nominations considered each year.</p>	<p>I do not agree with this recommendation. In my view, what is important is that the Committee uses its authority and capacity to judge the merit of each site nominated according to its quality.</p>			<p>The timing of the nomination process has recently been changed and no further change is necessary.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to maintain the present timing of the nomination process.</b></p>
<p>52. The Committee should consider revising the Operational Guidelines for nominations and evaluations to enforce application of Article 11 paragraph 1 of the Convention requiring that all States Parties submit tentative lists for both cultural and natural heritage; and extend the time-frames for nomination evaluations, preparation of evaluation summaries and consultation with States Parties, thereby providing for a "fast track" option in compelling cases. Any revisions should be done in consultation with the advisory bodies.</p>	<p>Submission of tentative lists must be made an obligatory requirement for natural sites as well. The recommendations of the Global Strategy, approved by the Committee at its eighteenth session (1994) identifies regions and categories of properties which are under-represented and could provide a basis for determining the compelling cases. Advisory Bodies, in particular ICOMOS, should be requested to take into full consideration the recommendations of the Global Strategy, and bring more rigour in the evaluation of nominations of categories of properties which are already well represented on the List.</p>			<p>The proposed obligation for all States Parties to submit tentative lists for both natural and cultural properties is foreseen in the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16).</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to examine the proposed revision to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12) under item 10 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>

<b>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
53. The Centre should consider preparing separate guides for different players and for different activities instead of revising all-inclusive Operational Guidelines. For example, the States Parties could receive a guide outlining the steps of the nomination process, the expectations for nomination submissions, and relevant deadlines. For the advisory bodies, these requirements could be incorporated into the contracts, possibly with a penalty for late submission.	The Committee should assess the advantages and disadvantages of preparing separate guidelines as proposed, and instruct the Centre of its decision for implementation of this recommendation.			<p>The Centre is prepared to publish and distribute separate guidelines for different audiences subject to the granting of the necessary funds by the Committee. Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education outlines a proposal to prepare the following guides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Assistance</li> <li>• The preparation of tentative lists and nominations</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting</li> <li>• The organisation of World Heritage ceremonies and plaquing events (to include reference to the use of the World Heritage emblem)</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision required:</b> The Committee may wish to approve the means for the Centre to prepare the above mentioned guides as recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education under item 13 of the Provisional Agenda.</p>

<b>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
<p>59. The Committee should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amend the Operational Guidelines or the contracts with the advisory bodies to require the nomination evaluations to describe clearly the important values at each site and how they related to the criteria applied to the site ; and</li> <li>• periodically and selectively obtain an independent second opinion on nomination evaluations. This second opinion should be rendered by experts who are clearly independent of the original evaluations and should involve a site visit.</li> </ul>	<p>This requirement is already clearly well-established in the present Operational Guidelines (see Paragraph 63).</p> <p>I am of the opinion that the full responsibility for independent evaluations has to lie with the advisory bodies. In making its decisions, the Committee has to express its views on the quality of these evaluations.</p>			<p>The proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16) include reference to the Advisory Bodies preparing a statement of significance (1 to 2 paragraphs) for each site evaluated for inclusion in the World Heritage List. This statement, once approved by the Committee, could then be used for information purposes as the official statement relating to the outstanding universal value of World Heritage properties.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> to include reference to the preparation of a statement of significance by the Advisory Bodies as is recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16 to be examined under item 14 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p> <p>UNESCO does not consider that a second opinion for nomination evaluations is required. Furthermore, it must be stressed that it is the Committee which decides on whether to include a property on the World Heritage List, not the Advisory Bodies.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to decide to maintain the present mode of co-operation with the Advisory Bodies responsible for the evaluation of properties nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List.</b></p>



<i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
<p>60. The Centre should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure that each nomination is checked carefully by a staff member experienced with the contents of nominations and familiar with the current Operational Guidelines. Only if the nomination is complete, should it be forwarded to the advisory bodies. If technical questions arise, the relevant technical staff should be consulted and sign the nomination checklist before sending it on. The advisory bodies could, at their discretion, take incomplete files with information to be filled in later ; and</li> <li>• work with the advisory bodies to prepare a proposal to the Committee for other steps to promote high-quality and credible evaluations.</li> </ul>	<p>The Centre will further improve its method for checking the completeness of the nomination files. The Advisory bodies will be asked to provide a detailed list of the information necessary for considering a nomination ready for evaluation by them.</p> <p>The Director of the Centre will raise this matter at the Centre's next meeting with the Advisory Bodies.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1: Verification of the content of each nomination file</b></p> <p>As the Operational Guidelines clearly state, it is the responsibility of the WHC staff to check the content of the files in order to assist the States Parties, while preserving the neutrality of the Secretariat.</p> <p>The technical capacity of the WHC to ensure this function will strengthen its image as a structure in the service of the Parties, while allowing the ICOMOS and IUCN experts to concentrate on evaluating the properties as soon as the inscription files are received.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 2: Evaluation of the properties</b></p> <p>Together with the advisory bodies responsible for evaluating the nominations (ICOMOS and IUCN), the WHC will define clear rules governing their collaboration in order to further involve the Centre's staff in the procedure, with a view to providing better information to the Committee and assistance to the Parties.</p>		<p>Each regional desk officer in the World Heritage Centre checks the contents of nominations, acknowledges receipt of all nominations and if necessary requests additional information and transmits the nomination to IUCN and/or ICOMOS.</p> <p>The World Heritage Centre works closely with the Advisory Bodies to ensure the preparation of high quality, credible evaluations. This matter is the subject of continual discussion between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.</p>

<i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
<p>64. The Committee should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider the implications of a growing World Heritage in Danger List, especially now that monitoring activity under the Convention steps up ; and</li> <li>• set strategic priorities for action on sites on the List.</li> </ul>	<p>The World Heritage in Danger List is indeed a tool for improving the conservation of threatened properties. Its potential for protection and conservation of World Heritage properties however, has not been fully exploited. The Committee should ensure that the implementation of this recommendation too is linked to the overall strategic review as recommended in paragraph 27.</p>			<p>The World Heritage in Danger List would grow considerably if it was to contain all World Heritage properties under potential or actual threat. The main purpose of this listing is to reverse a situation which would impact the World Heritage values for which the property was listed. In many cases the prospect of in Danger listing has led to States Parties taking immediate steps for improving the conservation of properties. World Heritage in Danger listing is a particularly powerful instrument as it provides the mechanism and process for negotiating for the better conservation of properties. However, a number of properties are forever on the in Danger List and may be justified for de-listing. It is important for the option of de-listing to be applied when justified.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to ask the World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force proposed above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to discuss and clarify a future policy concerning World Heritage in Danger listing and the potential delisting of World Heritage properties.</b></p>

<b>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
<p>65. The Centre should strengthen co-operation with the Culture and Science-sectors of UNESCO :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to monitor sites, especially those on the World Heritage in Danger List, and</li> <li>• to develop joint approaches to provide assistance to those sites.</li> </ul>	<p>I shall set up a Task Force involving professionals from the Centre and the Science Sector to develop joint approaches for monitoring and international assistance to those natural heritage sites which are also Biosphere Reserves as well. In the case of cultural properties the Centre and the Cultural Sector will develop an information exchange system to notify one another before undertaking activities so that the activities could be better co-ordinated .</p>			<p>For natural World Heritage properties, a task force made up of representatives of the World Heritage Centre, the MAB Secretariat and IUCN-WCPA was established following the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves in July 1998. The task force will define a workplan and associated funding requirements to support World Heritage conservation.</p> <p>Similar arrangements will be made to reinforce the co-operation with other sectors notably the Culture Sector.</p> <p>In further developing co-operation with the different sectors of UNESCO, and with the Advisory Bodies, States Parties and other partners involved in World Heritage conservation, priority is being given to the monitoring of properties, especially those on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the development of bi-lateral and multi-lateral approaches to providing assistance to these properties.</p>

<p><i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i></p>
<p><b>Monitoring of sites</b></p> <p>72. The Centre should institute consolidated record keeping and reporting for monitoring reports starting as soon as possible, ensuring that they can be matched with nomination files. This information should be supplemented with the reports from previous years as soon as possible, drawing on the files of ICOMOS and IUCN if necessary.</p>	<p>The Centre will institute appropriate systems for record keeping and reporting on monitoring in full consultation with its partners, both inside and outside of UNESCO.</p>			<p>A new system for handling state of conservation and periodic reports will be implemented as part of the follow-up to the report of the Expert Group Review of the World Heritage Centre Data and Information Structure.</p> <p>A data base is presently being developed for the state of conservation reports presented to the Bureau and the Committee and of their respective decisions. A next step will be to link this data base to a technical report depository.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the proposal for the establishment of a state of conservation data base as recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 to be examined under item 13 of the Provisional Agenda. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to support the proposed development of a modern integrated World Heritage Information System as presented under Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>
<p>82. The Committee should request the Centre :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to prepare an outline of different types of monitoring activity and identify which organization (or combination of organizations) could most effectively carry out the activity. This outline should be prepared in consultation with the advisory bodies and the UNESCO Sectors and agreed to by them.</li> </ul>	<p>The Committee should instruct the Centre to undertake work necessary to implement these proposals which in my view are important to accomplish.</p>			<p>Procedures for reactive monitoring of properties that are under threat have been discussed with the Advisory Bodies and sectors of UNESCO. Whilst the World Heritage Centre has a co-ordinating role, it is recognised that other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies, as well as other organisations and experts, play an important role in information gathering and examination of technical documentation relating to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.</p>

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee
<p>82. (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to develop a mechanism for co-ordinating actions on an on-going basis with all parties who carry out monitoring at World Heritage sites.</li> </ul>				<p>As for monitoring properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, clear indications are given in paragraphs 82 to 89 of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Co-ordination of monitoring activities and missions takes place on a continuous basis with the Advisory Bodies and other sectors and units of UNESCO, as well as during the biannual consultative meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (February and September of each year).</p>
<p>84. The Committee should request the Centre :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to prepare in consultation with the Advisory Bodies a format for the periodic reporting by the States Parties for approval by the World Heritage Committee ; and</li> <li>to develop mechanisms for the handling and record keeping of the periodic reports.</li> </ul>	<p>I attribute great importance to this recommendation. The Centre is ready to implement the Committee's decisions on this matter.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 4: Monitoring of sites</b></p> <p>As the Audit proposes, the Centre could strengthen its competency in this domain - systematic and reactive monitoring - (Recom. 72 and following), while respecting the sovereignty of States Parties, particularly in view of the decision of the General Assembly of States Parties for the monitoring of sites.</p> <p>The draft for the periodic reporting requested in Naples, on harmonising the reporting (and the frequency of the reports) will allow the Centre to co-ordinate the preparation of concise, thematic monitoring reports on the state of the properties by the relevant States Parties.</p>	<p>The Bureau examined a draft format for periodic reporting by States Parties and considered the handling, examination and response by the Committee to these reports.</p> <p>The Bureau requested the Centre to study in further detail different scenarios for the handling, review process and examination of the periodic reports. It requested the Centre to continue to refine the document in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and on the basis of the comments and observations made by the Bureau for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will implement the decisions of the World Heritage Committee with regards to periodic reporting.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may decide to adopt the methodology and procedures for periodic reporting proposed in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6 under item 6 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
<p><b>International assistance</b></p> <p>88. The Centre should establish a management information system that will enable easy access and analysis of trends and patterns of international assistance projects.</p>	<p>The Centre will improve its information management capabilities, particularly with regard to enabling the Committee to regularly publish an updated list of properties to which the Committee has granted international assistance.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3: International Assistance</b></p> <p>The Consultative Body decided not to approve the Management Review recommendation concerning the use of external expertise or the allocation of funds for International Assistance and an external evaluation of the appropriateness and impact of the assistance provided.</p>		<p>All International Assistance projects approved by the Chairperson, the Committee or the Bureau, have been regularly reported to the World Heritage statutory bodies. In the future the Centre's information management systems will be improved to ensure easy access and analysis of trends and patterns of these projects. These trends are likely to reflect the fact that International Assistance requests are often received on an ad hoc basis from States Parties.</p> <p><b>Decision required: As the trends and patterns of International Assistance projects have so far not been analysed, the Committee may wish to set aside funds for a consultant to perform such a study. Following the results of the study, the Committee may wish to pursue a policy debate on the future granting of International Assistance projects. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to support the proposed development of a modern integrated World Heritage Information System as presented under Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee
89. The Committee should take necessary steps in order to fulfil its obligation, as per paragraph 5 of Article 13, to establish, regularly update and publicize a List of properties to which it has granted international assistance.	The Centre will improve its information management capabilities, particularly with regard to enabling the Committee to regularly publish an updated list of properties to which the committee has granted international assistance.			<p>Extensive lists of international assistance projects have been distributed to the World Heritage Committee and Bureau showing details of these projects. Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 on World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education outlines a proposal to prepare and publicise this list on a biannual basis.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to provide the means to prepare and publicise the list of international assistance projects as proposed in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 to be discussed under item 13 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>
<p>94. The Committee should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider revising the Operational Guidelines to give greater flexibility to the Centre to allocate international assistance, while requiring the Centre to provide proper accountability and performance reports ; and</li> <li>• develop strategic priorities among and within categories of international assistance, considering the niche of the World Heritage Fund, the role of Regular Program funds, and the actions of other Sectors within UNESCO and other donors.</li> </ul>	<p>A very welcome recommendation. It will have significant beneficial impacts on nearly all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, particularly with regard to bettering the current implementation rates for funds set aside for international assistance projects.</p> <p>This must constitute an important component of the overall strategic review recommended in paragraph 27.</p>			<p>All International Assistance requests are to be examined by the World Heritage Centre and submitted to the relevant Advisory Bodies for review prior to submission to the either the Chairperson or Bureau.</p> <p>The following suggestions for changes to the system for International Assistance are included in the proposed revisions to the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ceiling for Preparatory Assistance to be increased from US\$15,000 to US\$20,000.</li> <li>• Emergency assistance up to US\$30,000 to be approved at any time subject to the agreement by the Chairperson and the overall availability of funds.</li> <li>• Requests for over US\$30,000 to be screened by the Bureau and submitted to the Committee.</li> <li>• Creation of a new category of educational assistance.</li> </ul>

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
94. (continued)				<p>The complementary funding available from different budgetary sources should be laid out in a transparent way.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to approve the proposed revisions to the International Assistance section of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i> as recommended in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16 to be examined under item 14 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>
95. The Committee and the Centre should jointly develop performance expectations for international assistance provided under the banner of the World Heritage Convention.	I shall instruct the Centre to take necessary action to follow up on this matter			<p>International Assistance is provided under contractual arrangements which clearly state the proper procedures for evaluation and financial reporting.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to ask the proposed World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force to address this issue in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.</b></p>
96. The Committee should request the Centre to prepare draft revisions of the Operational Guidelines. These revisions should include preparing a separate description for States Parties of the types of international assistance available, procedures for obtaining that assistance, and obligations of that assistance.	In the preparation of the draft revisions of the Operational Guidelines, the decisions of the Committee with regard to the recommendations in paragraphs 93 and 94 will have to be taken into account. A small brochure on the World Heritage Fund was produced during the early 1990s and the Committee may consider updating that brochure to reflect all the proposed changes to the Operational Guidelines.			The follow up to this recommendation has been addressed in relation to recommendation 53 above.
97. Centre desk officers should obtain a formal peer review and sign-off by one other desk officer on the technical merits of any particular project they are reviewing before funds are approved internally by the Centre.	The establishment of a Task Force between the Centre and the Science Sector and an information exchange system between the Centre and the Cultural Sector will provide an in-house peer review mechanisms.			In-house peer review may be promoted through the task force made up of representatives of the World Heritage Centre, the MAB Secretariat and IUCN-WCPA established following the 5 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Advisory Committee for Biosphere Reserves in July 1998 and through information exchange with the Culture Sector.



<p><b>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b></p>	<p><b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b></p>	<p><b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b></p>
<p>106. The Committee should request the Centre to conduct an outside evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of international assistance provided. This information should provide a baseline for a follow-up evaluation in three years.</p>	<p>An evaluation will be undertaken by the Central Evaluation Unit of UNESCO and/or outside organisations.</p>			<p>The Central Evaluation Unit of UNESCO has been requested to perform this evaluation. <b>Decision required: The Committee should decide whether to allocate the necessary funds for this purpose, in accordance with the proposal made in Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.</b></p>
<p><b>Management of the World Heritage Centre</b></p> <p><b>Management of activities</b></p> <p>117. The Centre should examine its current span of functions and activities in line with :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Committee's strategic priorities; and</li> <li>• a clarified statement of its roles, responsibilities and accountability relationships for World Heritage activities that are not directly linked to statutory meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>Upon the completion of the strategic review as recommended in paragraph 27, and once the Committee has set strategic priorities for the Convention's future work, I intend to update the terms of reference of the Centre's work in consultation with concerned Sectors and units.</p>			<p>The World Heritage Centre as a unit of UNESCO is in charge of World Heritage matters. The Centre not only services the World Heritage statutory bodies (the General Assembly of States Parties, the World Heritage Committee and Bureau) and States Parties to the <i>Convention</i> but also the UNESCO statutory bodies (the General Conference and Executive Board) and UNESCO Member States. The World Heritage Centre's work is therefore organised to service all these particular clients.</p>
<p>125. The Centre should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop, under guidance by the Office of Public Information and UNESCO Publishing Office, adequate policies and mechanisms for controlling the quality of information and publication products and protecting the rights and interests of UNESCO, the Fund and the States Parties/sites as necessary ;</li> <li>• ensure that its presentation and information activities are harmonised with the activities undertaken by States Parties in line with their obligations as signatories to the Convention ; and</li> </ul>	<p>An ad-hoc working group has been constituted by the Centre with other Sectors and units in UNESCO, notably OPI and UNESCO Publishing Office to address these concerns. It will develop policies and mechanisms to control the quality of information and publication products. The Centre will notify information and publication activities in advance to the States Parties as well as to the relevant UNESCO Sectors.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 5: Promotion and information to the public</b></p> <p>The Consultative Body recommends that the World Heritage Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ control the quality of information with UNESCO's competent services,</li> <li>▪ harmonise this information with the States Parties,</li> <li>▪ evaluate periodically its information and education activities.</li> </ul> <p>The Consultative Body noted that this recommendation should be viewed with reference to Recommendation II in section II of WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11 (Communications and Promotion).</p>		<p>As requested by the Consultative Body and Bureau, the World Heritage Centre will present to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee, strategic elements in the fields of promotion, multi-media co-operation, information and documentation. The World Heritage Centre will strictly follow guidelines the Committee may wish for future use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising. The World Heritage Centre is also currently working with other sectors and units of UNESCO and States Parties to improve the quality control of World Heritage multi-media products.</p>

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
<p>125. (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluate periodically the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.</li> </ul>				<p><b>Decision required:</b> The Committee may wish to discuss these issues with reference to the <i>Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities</i> proposed in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 under Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda.</p>
<p>128. The Centre should strive for an ideal mix of expertise based on a clear definition of the extent and nature of each activity, and the cost-effectiveness of alternate delivery modalities available.</p>	<p>The precise listing of activities for which the Centre is responsible for will have to be derived from the strategic review recommended in paragraph 27 and will enable the identification of the ideal mix of expertise.</p>			<p>Although the staff of the World Heritage Centre is as qualified as possible to respond to the transdisciplinary work, it is recognized that highly specialized input is sometimes also required from advisers and consultants when it is not available within UNESCO.</p>
<p>130. The Centre should achieve a better integration between the cultural and natural heritage functions.</p>	<p>There are certain functions common to natural and cultural heritage which can be integrated. But certain areas of expertise related to cultural and natural heritage conservation are distinct and must remain separate.</p>			<p>The World Heritage Centre has made considerable progress in this regard and the imbalance between the natural and cultural heritage expertise has been redressed. For each region, the Centre has the capacity to provide specialised inputs in both cultural and natural heritage conservation.</p>
<p>136. The Centre should develop mechanisms to enhance collegial decision-making, co-ordination and sharing of lessons learned in the following areas :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strategies and priorities ;</li> <li>• budgeting and work planning ;</li> <li>• management of activities ; and</li> <li>• reporting on activities and results.</li> </ul>	<p>The Director of the Centre will improve sharing of lessons with regard to all four areas. In-house decision making system will also be improved with establishment of a Task Force with the Science Sector and an information exchange system with the Cultural Sector.</p>			<p>In order to enhance collegial decision-making, to improve co-ordination and sharing of experience staff meetings are supplemented by frequently convened ad-hoc meetings that bring all those directly concerned with particular issues together. This has led to greater coherence in the actions of UNESCO in regard to World Heritage matters. A Task Force has been established with the MAB Secretariat and IUCN/WCPA and the exchange of information concerning World Heritage with the Culture Sector will be improved. Daily co-operation continues between the World Heritage Centre and the Associated Schools Unit of the Education Sector for the implementation of the UNESCO Special Project: "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion".</p>

<b>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</b>	<b>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</b>
142. The Committee and the Centre need to review the way in which the needs of the Committee are currently fulfilled and how they could better served.	If the Committee lists its needs in accordance with its priorities, then the Centre will organise its work in order to better meet those priorities.			<p>The World Heritage Centre's work is organized around the servicing needs as expressed by States Parties, Member States, the World Heritage and UNESCO statutory bodies. As mentioned under recommendation 27 above, an updated, coherent strategy for the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> is needed.</p> <p><b>Decision required: If the Committee establishes a World Heritage Strategic Planning Task Force (as mentioned under recommendation 27 above), it may wish to ask the Task Force to examine this issue.</b></p>
143. The Centre should consider having dedicated support to streamline preparatory work and follow-up documentation for the statutory meetings.	I believe it is better that all members of the Staff are associated with the statutory meetings so that they are fully aware of the working procedures and agenda of the Bureau and the Committee.			The work of the staff of the World Heritage Centre is focussed primarily on the preparation, servicing and follow up of the work of the statutory meetings.

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee
<p><b>Operational planning and performance measurement</b></p> <p>150. The Committee should consider harmonising its planning cycle with the UNESCO biennial planning system.</p>	<p>If requested by the Committee, the Centre will provide a paper outlining a possible biennial planning cycle to the next session of the Committee.</p>			<p>Within the context of UNESCO's <b>biennial</b> strategic planning cycle, the World Heritage Centre will contribute to the preparation of the 31C/4 (UNESCO's Medium-Term Plan 2002-2007) and the 30C/5 (Programme and Budget 2000-2001). These strategic documents refer to the allocation of Regular Programme funds and will need to be adopted by the 30<sup>th</sup> session of the General Conference in 1999.</p> <p>At present, decisions concerning the use of the World Heritage Fund are made on an <b>annual</b> basis despite the fact that Article 2 of the <i>Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund</i> states that "The financial period shall be two consecutive calendar years coinciding with the financial period of the Regular Budget of UNESCO".</p> <p><b>Decision required:</b> In order to harmonise the strategic planning, budget cycles and work planning for the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund, the Committee may decide to reinstate biennial budgeting and planning for the use of the World Heritage Fund in line with Article 2 of the <i>Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund</i> as of the financial period 2000-2001.</p>

<p><i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i></p>
<p>151. In order to improve the monitoring of the implementation of Committee decisions and other activities, the Centre should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• formalise the process for preparing and updating work plans;</li> <li>• prepare work plans presenting options with estimates of full cost implications and based on clearly established strategic priorities ;</li> <li>• monitor operations through quality management and financial information against approved work plans ; and</li> <li>• account to the Committee on a regular basis through a report on its performance against clearly targets, priorities and fully costed plans.</li> </ul>	<p>The Centre will further improve its performance in all four aspects.</p>			<p>The World Heritage Centre expends considerable time in the complex and detailed task of preparing, updating and reviewing the performance of work plans for both the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund.</p> <p>For the Regular Programme, the Centre prepares inputs into a Medium Term Plan (2002-2007) and to the biennial Programme and Budget (2000-2001) for submission to the General Conference. The Medium Term Plan (C/4) and the biennial Programme and Budget (C/5) are UNESCO's primary strategic frameworks which outline approved budgets, work plans, priorities, targets and evaluation.</p> <p>So far, for the World Heritage Fund, annual work plans are prepared for submission to the World Heritage Committee.</p> <p><b>Decision required: The Committee may wish to adopt the proposal made in recommendation 150 above, for the harmonisation of work plans, budgets for the use of the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund.</b></p>
<p>157. The Centre should report systematically on the performance (results) of its activities and projects, and of other factors which are deemed critical for the success of the Convention.</p>	<p>Special attention will be given to providing performance-focused reports to the Committee on all activities undertaken, and in particular those dealing with monitoring, international assistance and promotion.</p>			<p>It is important that evaluation of the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> (including monitoring, international assistance and promotion) be conducted with the full co-operation of the States Parties. States Parties should be encouraged, to the extent possible, to use their own means for the evaluation for these activities.</p> <p><b>Decision required:</b> The Committee may wish to adopt the proposals made under recommendations 27 above for strategic planning and under recommendation 106 for the evaluation of international assistance.</p>

<p><i>Recommendations of the “Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention” (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i></p>
<p><b>Human Resource Management Staffing of the World Heritage Centre</b></p> <p>174. The Centre should ensure that all posts are described and approved following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard and taking into account the actual responsibilities, duties and qualifications required for the posts necessary to meet the operational needs.</p>	<p>This recommendation will be rigorously followed.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 6: Human Resource Management and organization of the World Heritage Centre (Recom. 164-172)</b></p> <p>The Consultative Body recommended that the World Heritage Centre must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ensure that all the <u>permanent posts</u> are clearly <u>identified</u> with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public.</li> <li>▪ fill all the permanent posts:</li> </ul> <p>With regard to temporary assistance, the Audit noted a strong recourse to supernumeraries and contractual consultants, who in some cases have assumed the functions of permanent staff.</p> <p>However, if the tasks are clearly defined and distributed amongst the permanent staff and if the posts are filled rapidly, there will be a correspondence between the objectives of the centre and the tasks that are assigned to it.</p> <p>If, in addition to associate experts made available through agreements, the Centre feels the need to recruit temporary staff for permanent tasks, it will be necessary to either review the job descriptions and distribution of tasks, or obtain additional permanent staff, which, under the present circumstances is not authorised by UNESCO.</p>	<p>The Bureau adopted the following recommendation:</p> <p>2. Taking into account paragraph 90 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has recommended that:</p> <p>UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure that all the permanent posts of the Centre are clearly identified with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public.</li> <li>• fill all the permanent posts.</li> </ul>	<p>All posts in the World Heritage Centre are described in accordance with UNESCO Rules and Procedures. At the request of the World Heritage Centre several desk audits have been undertaken to ensure rigorous application of the classification standards.</p> <p>Considerable progress has been made in regularising staff who were previously on temporary contracts.</p> <p>Staff training in quality management should be foreseen in the future. The World Heritage Centre will approach the Bureau of Personnel on this crucial subject.</p>

<i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i>	<i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i>	<i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i>
<p><b>Financial management</b></p> <p>179. The Centre should continue to give priority to improving its financial management situation, together with the assistance of UNESCO's Comptroller and Inspector General.</p>	<p>Internal control through the Comptroller's Office will be strengthened.</p>			<p>A detailed report of actions undertaken by the Centre as follow-up to the recommendation of the External Audit was presented to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.5</p>
<p><b>Management of Information</b></p> <p>193. The Centre should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• carefully review the recommendations from the Documentation Unit to strengthen the corporate memory and improve document management procedures, and implement all the steps that are feasible as soon as possible ;</li> <li>• adapt the central filing system to take into account the UNESCO wide requirements and the operational needs of the Centre. This should involve co-ordination among professional and support staff members to select the best of their individual systems ;</li> <li>• maintain a database on the number, type and source of requests received as well as staff time spent on responding to them in order to streamline this activity through effective support mechanisms ; and</li> <li>• ensure maximum use of up-to-date technology such as voice-mail and electronic mail.</li> </ul>	<p>The Centre will control access to nomination files and will systematically file monitoring and mission reports as well as check lists and correspondence related to nominations of properties.</p>			<p>Prior to the Management Review, the World Heritage Centre identified several key deficiencies in the management of World Heritage documentation. These included a critical lack of space, absence of effective electronic document control, and a paper filing system that made retrieval of documents and information highly resource intensive. In response to this assessment, and that of the subsequent Management Review, the Centre organized a review of the Centre's information infrastructure by internationally recognized experts in information management (March 1998). This group concluded that the Centre should put in place an <b>integrated World Heritage information management system</b> using outside professional guidance and full staff participation. This new system would integrate existing and new databases, nomination files, statutory meeting documents, reports and correspondence into a unified electronic system accessible to all staff, and where appropriate, using passwords, Advisory Bodies, Committee members and the general public. During 1998, 95% of the nomination files were scanned and a new International Assistance database constructed. An expert has been identified to build the World Heritage Information System and partial funding identified from extrabudgetary sources. However, at the time of this report the modalities of this operation have not been concluded. The World Heritage Centre</p>

<p><i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i></p>
<p>193. (continued)</p>				<p>continues to experience a critical lack of space.</p> <p><b>Decision required:</b> As mentioned above in relation to recommendation 72, the Committee may wish to support the proposed development of a modern integrated World Heritage Information System as presented under Chapter I of the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund in 1999 (see Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/13) under item 11 of the Provisional Agenda.</p> <p>All staff now have, and use, electronic mail. A staff mailing address, whc-staff@unesco.org, permits the distribution of announcements and other information to all staff simultaneously. UNESCO voicemail is available to all staff members.</p>



<p><i>Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Recommendations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee</i></p>
<p><b>Co-operation within UNESCO and with International Organizations</b></p> <p><b>Role and responsibilities within UNESCO</b></p> <p>201. The Director-General should :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strengthen the existing processes for co-ordinating world heritage activities within UNESCO to ensure that these activities are administered in the most efficient way.</li> <li>• clarify the responsibilities of the Centre for world heritage activities within UNESCO.</li> </ul>	<p>The Steering Committee will be re-invigorated as a policy organ to assist the Centre's in its work to co-ordinate the implementation of the World Heritage Convention within and outside of UNESCO and in accordance with the decisions of the Committee. The establishment of a Task Force with the Science Sector and an information exchange system with the Cultural Sector will complement the work of the Steering Committee at the operational level.</p>	<p>The Consultative Body recommended that a detailed internal UNESCO document be prepared and submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ defines the tasks of the World Heritage Centre;</li> <li>▪ defines the modalities of co-ordination of the other sectors of UNESCO.</li> </ul>	<p>The Bureau adopted the following recommendation:</p> <p>1. Having taken note of paragraphs 79 to 89 of the "Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee", adopted the following decision:</p> <p>That a detailed document be prepared by the Director-General of UNESCO and made available to the Committee members before the end of October 1998. The report should specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention;</li> <li>• the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialised sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage;</li> <li>• the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre.</li> </ul> <p>The document will be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee, which will then formulate its recommendation to the General Assembly of the States Parties.</p>	<p>The Director-General is preparing such a note.</p>
<p><b>Co-operation with other international organizations involved with cultural or natural world heritage activities or related instruments</b></p> <p>208. The Committee should, as part of the strategic planning exercise, request the Centre to prepare a plan that systematically identifies international organisations that are involved in world heritage activities, and the opportunities and approaches to co-operation.</p>	<p>If requested by the Committee, the Centre will prepare such a plan.</p>			<p><b>Decision required: The Committee may decide that such a plan should be prepared as part of the strategic planning work suggested in recommendation 27.</b></p>

Recommendations of the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Paragraph numbers indicated)	Responses of the Director-General of UNESCO, 28 November 1997	Recommendations of the Consultative Body (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Recommendations of the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the Bureau (Recommendation numbers indicated)	Follow-up actions, timeframes for their implementation and recommendations to the 22 <sup>nd</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee
	<p><b>Final remarks</b></p> <p>With regard to the implementation of the recommendations, I request the Committee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• set priorities and time schedules for implementation;</li> <li>• decide whether review, analyses and studies recommended are to be carried out by the Centre in co-operation with UNESCO based units or by external organisations; and</li> <li>• estimate and provide the necessary financial resources for implementing the recommendations where necessary .</li> </ul>		<p>The Bureau adopted the following recommendation:</p> <p>3. Taking into account paragraphs 91 to 109 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has adopted the following:</p> <p><u>Shares</u> the view that ambiguities exist in the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the programmes and projects relevant to the 1972 Convention;</p> <p><u>Reaffirms</u> that this concern should form the subject of an urgent and scrupulous examination;</p> <p><u>Recommends</u> to the Director-General to clearly specify (in the report requested in Recommendation 1 above):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;</li> <li>• the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre with respect to the use of funds as Secretariat to the Convention.</li> </ul>	<p>The improvement of the functioning of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee is necessary to address the new challenges posed by the implementation of the <i>Convention</i>. The implementation of the <i>Convention</i> is a dynamic process whereby the spectrum of conservation issues is both broad and complex, especially in cases where properties are highly symbolic, of importance to particular groups of people or where short term resource exploitation threatens the long term conservation of properties. At the same time the number of properties included on the World Heritage List is steadily increasing. The human and financial resources available within the Centre to address these many challenges will be strongly bounded by the resources of UNESCO itself.</p>

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-second session  
Kyoto, Japan  
30 November – 5 December 1998

**Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda: Follow-up to the work of the of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee**

**SUMMARY**

**Background:**

At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee requested that the Consultative Body examine four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

- 1. Technical Issues**
- 2. Communication and Promotion**
- 3. Management Review and Financial Audit**
- 4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising**

Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/11 presents the work of the Consultative Body as of 19 October 1998.

**Summary:**

**WHC-98/CONF.203/11Add:**

- Contains additional work on **4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising Guidelines** which was presented to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1998 as document WHC-98/CONF.202/7. The Bureau took note of Parts I and II of the document and decided to transmit them to the Committee for further examination. A summary of the discussions of the Bureau is included in Section V of WHC-98/CONF.203/5.
- **Annex 4** presents the Green Note (DG/Note/98/53) issued by the Director-General of UNESCO on 23 November 1998 entitled *Preservation and Presentation of the Cultural and Natural Heritage*. The Green Note is being provided to the Committee at its request for discussion under **3. Management Review and Financial Audit**.

Decisions required by the World Heritage Committee are indicated at the end of Parts I and II.

# **I. THE PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM**

## **I.1 INTRODUCTION**

1. The body of this document (Section I.5) consists of "Guidelines for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem"; that section is an amended version of a discussion paper presented to the Committee's Consultative Body (29-30 April 1998, Paris) and reviewed and endorsed in principle by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its 22nd Ordinary Session. Its revision reflects discussions and comments at those meetings, as requested by the Bureau.
2. Adoption of the "Guidelines for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem" by the Bureau and the Committee is recommended. The Bureau is also asked to recommend to the Committee the level of authority required for decisions on the use of the Emblem.

## **I.2 PAST USE OF THE EMBLEM**

3. The World Heritage Emblem (hereafter "Emblem"), created by the artist Mr. Olyff under contract with UNESCO, was adopted by the second session of the World Heritage Committee as the official Emblem of the World Heritage Convention, symbolizing the interdependence of cultural and natural properties. Although there is no mention of the World Heritage Emblem or its creation in the Convention, its use has been promoted by the Committee to identify properties protected by the Convention and inscribed on the World Heritage List since its adoption in 1978. The Committee, in adopting the World Heritage Emblem, gained the shared legal use of the Emblem as well as UNESCO's logo.
4. Current practice and authorization procedure for the use of the World Heritage Emblem is summarized here for reference. The use of the World Heritage Emblem is governed by articles 122-125 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Annex 1) and UNESCO's Administrative Circular # 1922 (Annex 2) reflected in the UNESCO manual.
5. The Operational Guidelines give the Committee the prerogative to authorise the commercial use of the World Heritage Emblem whilst UNESCO's Administrative Circular # 1922 gives this responsibility exclusively to UNESCO's Publishing Office (UPO).
6. The World Heritage Centre has abided to both the Operational Guidelines and relevant texts of the UNESCO Manual in seeking authorization to use the World Heritage Emblem for projects proposed by public or private entities as well as government initiatives on World Heritage. The procedure reflected in these texts consisted in:
  - obtaining approval of the project from the National Commission or other national authority of the country concerned as well as that of the UNESCO sector(s) concerned.
  - obtaining approval from the World Heritage Committee.
7. However, the Operational Guidelines or the Manual did not foresee trademark control of the World Heritage Emblem by the States Parties individually, by the Committee or by the General Assembly of States Parties and in past years, the World Heritage Emblem was used in association with the UNESCO logo as a means of protection since the latter is protected world-wide.

### I.3 EXAMPLES OF RECENT PROJECT PROPOSALS RECEIVED BY THE CENTRE FOR ENDORSEMENT

8. The following table presents examples of multi-media project proposals received by the World Heritage Centre in 1997 and 1998 for review. All proposals mentioned in this table require, or involve in one way or another, the use of the World Heritage Emblem.
9. The table was designed to help identify examples of the types of projects received by the World Heritage Centre and attempts to classify these projects into categories to serve as a basic guideline as to the kinds of communication tools that may or may not be used to promote World Heritage conservation. It will also help to identify the consequences involved in adopting tight regulations for the authorization of the use of the World Heritage Emblem.

EXAMPLES OF PROJECT PROPOSALS INVOLVING THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM  
PRESENTED TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE IN 1997 & 1998\*

**\*By private or public entities for review and endorsement by UNESCO subject to approval by the National Commissions concerned and the World Heritage Committee (in accordance with Chapter VII.A of the Operational Guidelines).**

**I. NON-COMMERCIAL PROPOSALS**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Description / background</b>	<b>Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee</b>	<b>Comments / Observations</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1. VSMM '98</b></p> <p>4<sup>th</sup> International conference on virtual reality and multimedia (Japan)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Non-commercial conference</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received:</u> late January 1998.</p>	<p>VSMM '98 is to take place in Gifu, Japan on 18-20 Nov. 98. The conference is organized by the Gifu University and will focus on applications of virtual reality in the following fields: technical, creative, industry and commerce and their relevance to World Heritage. A request was made by the organizers to co-operate with UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre for this event. UNESCO staff members have been invited to participate as members of the conference Programme Committee in matters related to applications of virtual reality technology as a management tool for World Heritage conservation and for educational purposes.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> in publications related to the conference and documents related to the conference and used on the VSMM web-site.</p>	<p>The organisers submitted a complete presentation of the Conference to the Japanese National Commission in May 1998. No answer was received from the Japanese authorities regarding this matter.</p>	<p>The growing interest in World Heritage among research and development institutions is demonstrated through Conferences such as this one offering opportunities to communicate and exchange information on new technologies related to World Heritage conservation.</p> <p>Topics during the session on World Heritage will include architectural and artifact reconstruction, education, entertainment, historical information presentation, planning and simulation, 3D geography and remote sensing, rehabilitation and tourism.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>2. Touring Club Italiano</b> Italian publisher wishing to produce a book focusing on World Heritage sites in Italy and selected sites in other regions.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial publication but promotion of corporate image</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received:</u> February 1998.</p>	<p>The Touring Club Italiano proposed to publish and distribute a book on Italian World Heritage sites (to include a balanced selection of World Heritage sites in other regions) as a complimentary “end of the year” gift to its customers.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on cover of book and inside the book.</p>	<p>National Commission: This project has the full support of the Italian National Commission and the support of the Italian Delegation. <u>Approved on:</u> 18 February 1998.</p> <p>Chairperson: The Chairperson has agreed in theory to this proposal provided that it be submitted to the Consultative Body for matters regarding the use of the Emblem and also provided that the Touring Club covers all and any costs involved in the content validation and quality control of the book.</p>	<p>This project was used as a test case for clearance in a project involving sites in several countries. The States Parties were asked to validate the proposed texts of the book on the sites located on their territory. The texts could not be approved by all States Parties due to time and language constraints (the texts were in Italian). Although this proposal received strong support from the Italian National Commission and the Permanent Delegation, and was equally supported by the Chairperson of the Committee <u>the project did not obtain the authorization to use the WH Emblem.</u></p>
<p><b>3. Abrahms Conseil</b> French media company specialised in television campaigning in the form of short programmes.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial television campaign.</i></p> <p><u>However, TV products may be licensed which implies, to some extent, commercial distribution and sale of the programme.</u></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> Dec. 1997.</p>	<p>Abrahms Conseil has proposed to produce in co-operation with UNESCO a series of short programmes on World Heritage to be broadcast daily on French national television (TF1) using photographic archives (Caixa Foundation Patrimoine 2001). This project could be sponsored and financed by a public or private entity such as Air France, Kodak for instance.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> broadcast TV.</p>	<p>Currently under evaluation by the French National Commission.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> awaiting approval from National Commission.</p>	<p>Like most proposals, this project aims to be informative and educational in presenting the World Heritage Convention using the impact of a television advertisement.</p> <p>Abrahms Conseil are offering to carry out this project at no cost to UNESCO.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>4. Osaka Junior Chamber Inc.</b> Proposal to organize, with UNESCO WHC and Education Sector, a World Heritage Education Youth Forum in Japan.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial proposal involves potential fund-raising</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> April 1997.</p>	<p>The Osaka Junior Chamber Inc. proposed to hold a World Heritage Education Youth Forum in co-operation with UNESCO and to raise funds to finance this Forum involving the use of the World Heritage Emblem.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on publications and used non-commercially to fund-raise for the Forum.</p>	<p>National Commission: This proposal has received the moral support of the Japanese National Commission. <u>Approved in:</u> April 1998.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> proceeded under Agreement between Osaka JC Inc. and the UNESCO sectors involved.</p>	<p>Since the approval of the project, the Centre and the Education Sector have been co-operating to establish the modalities of fund-raising for this event pending the adoption of specific Fund-raising guidelines by the Committee.</p> <p>The World Heritage Youth Forum will take place in Japan prior to the Committee meeting.</p>
<p><b>5. Editions OCEP – Annuaire Vert</b> Yearly directory for nature, health, fitness and beauty.</p> <p><i>Commercial publication, however this proposal is of a non-commercial nature.</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> March 1998.</p>	<p>This directory lists over 6,000 addresses in France and Europe in the fields of nature, health etc. and is used by professionals, institutions and individuals. The Annuaire Vert is sold with a complimentary diary. In 1998, Editions OCEP, in association with the WWF, published a 1 page information campaign on the activities of the WWF which was included in the diary. A proposal was made to the Centre to produce, free of cost to UNESCO, such an information campaign for World Heritage in 1999 promoting the Convention and World Heritage sites in France using photos and brief descriptions of the sites.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on page(s) about World Heritage in the Annuaire Diary.</p>	<p>Currently being examined.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> awaiting approval from National Commission.</p>	<p>The Centre has provided information required by Editions OCEP for increasing public awareness, such as brief descriptions and technical evaluations. Should the French National Commission approve this proposal, the Centre may also provide photos to illustrate the texts.</p> <p>The one-year deadline to review the proposal has now passed.</p>



Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>6. Big Image Systems</b> Swedish company specialised in the production of light weight cloth banners/panels used for exhibits or advertising.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial exhibit</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> July 1997.</p>	<p>Big Image Systems contacted the World Heritage Centre and the Swedish national authorities in 1997 with a proposal to hold an international World Heritage Exhibit. Using new techniques developed by Big Image, images of World Heritage site exhibitions are to be organised upon the endorsement of States Parties. A pilot project of the international exhibit, using 70 images of World Heritage sites was displayed in the streets of Tensta, outside of Stockholm. This first exhibit hosted by the Spanga-Tensta District Administration in conjunction with the Cultural Programme of Stockholm, Cultural Capital of Europe '98, was held from May to Oct. 98.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on publications linked with the exhibit and used on the Big Image web-site.</p>	<p>The Swedish National Commission helped this initiative by distributing printed documentation on the World Heritage Exhibition during the Power of Culture Conference, among other supporting activities.</p>	<p>Big Image Systems has repeatedly demonstrated its dedication to World Heritage by providing giant images free of charge to UNESCO for the 21<sup>st</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee in Naples and for the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union.</p> <p>The Swedish National Commission stated that it does not have the authority to provide patronage to private companies.</p> <p>However, the Swedish National Commission offered to support this initiative by distributing information about the project during the Power of Culture Conference which took place in Stockholm in March 1998.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>7. Michelin Guide</b>  Michelin Tourism Green Guides published and distributed all over the world.</p> <p><i>Commercial publication, however non-commercial proposal</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> September 1997.</p>	<p>Michelin Green Guides proposed to publish an information page on the World Heritage Convention and list the World Heritage sites in the country guidebooks. A first guide including such an information page has already been published and others may follow.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on page about the World Heritage Convention in the Michelin guide.</p>	<p><u>Status:</u> future information campaigns offered by Michelin for other country guides, will be submitted to the concerned National Commission or other responsible authority.</p>	<p>This type of information dissemination, oriented towards the general public via the tourism industry, should be authorised upon request. It is important that the public be aware of the fact that particular monuments, cities or natural areas have been inscribed on the World Heritage List.</p> <p><i>Future collaboration pending establishment of procedures regarding Emblem use by the Committee.</i></p>
<p><b>8. Ardisson &amp; Lumière</b>  French television production company proposing to produce a 3-day television entertaining educational programme to celebrate the turn of the century focusing on World Heritage preservation.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial proposal.</i></p> <p><u>However, TV products may be licensed which implies, to some extent, commercial distribution and sale of the programme.</u></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> January 1997.</p>	<p>Ardisson &amp; Lumière wishes to co-operate with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre for the production of a major television programme to be broadcast by France 2/3, French public broadcaster, on the eve of the year 2000. The programme itself will consist of a world tour with 7 visits of World Heritage sites. A group of approx. 20 young adults will travel the world to discover the meaning of World Heritage preservation.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> broadcast TV.</p>	<p>The French National Commission has agreed in principle to the concept of this programme although the final project proposal is currently being examined for validation. The project is supported morally and financially by the <i>French Mission for the Celebration of the year 2000</i>.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> awaiting approval by the National Commission.</p>	<p>This proposal involves considerable preparation to mobilise States Parties co-operation and logistical assistance but has no financial implications for the Centre. Such initiatives help to promote the Convention and World Heritage field activities throughout the world. The programme could also be used to raise funds for the World Heritage Fund.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>9. SWR</b>  German public broadcaster, is under contract with the World Heritage Centre to co-operate in the production of a series of documentary films.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial TV series, broadcast on public TV.</i></p> <p><u>However, TV products may be licensed which implies, to some extent, commercial distribution and sale of the series and other ancillary products.</u></p> <p><u>Initial proposal received in:</u> late 1994.  <u>Original contract signed on:</u> 28 February 1995.  <u>New proposal received in:</u> December 1997.</p>	<p>Over 100 films have been produced through the agreement between Euro-Media and Südwestfunk currently broadcast in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. This Project has resulted in new partnerships between Südwestfunk and other producers and/or broadcasters thus increasing the production and diffusion potential of the series. The first contract was signed in February 95 for a series of 104 films. The contract was renewed in October 1998 for the production of a minimum of 25 new films per year.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> broadcast TV and ancillary products as well as printed on publications or brochures linked to the TV series</p>	<p>This project was launched in 1995 with the approval the National Commission and all concerned sectors of UNESCO. Reports on the evolution of the project have since been provided to the Committee on a yearly basis.</p>	<p>This television project is an essential educational tool and it's awareness-building potential is considerable. Television is perhaps the most widespread communication media and a great tool for information dissemination.</p> <p>A very important financial investment was made for the production of these films by the various partners, especially Südwestfunk, who may commercialise the films and other ancillary products in the hope that this project will be self-financing.</p> <p>The Centre receives a minimum servicing fee of 3,000 DM (approx. US\$ 1600) per film produced within the framework of this agreement.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>10. Maison de la Chine et Maison de l'Indochine</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tour Operator for Chinese and South East Asian destinations</li> <li>• Organisers of exhibitions and seminars</li> </ul> <p><i>Non-commercial proposal</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> March 1998.</p>	<p>The Maison de la Chine and the Maison de l'Indochine expressed their wish to collaborate with UNESCO/WHC as a follow-up to the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union. The Maison de la Chine and Indochine have published, in their 1998 catalogues, a 1-page information box about World Heritage and wish to strengthen co-operation with the Centre through other promotional activities. They have proposed to use the Maison de la Chine exhibit space in Paris to communicate on World Heritage sites in China and South East Asia and have also offered to publish information about World Heritage activities in future catalogues.</p> <p>A weekly seminar on World Heritage sites in China and Indochina, with expert speakers selected by UNESCO, is being organised for January 1999.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> The use of the Emblem was requested but not used.</p>	<p><u>Status:</u> This project was not submitted to the Chinese National Commission. Future co-operation is still under consideration by the Centre.</p>	<p>Information campaigns via the tourism industry are needed to promote sustainable tourism within the industry itself and among tourists who need readily available information on the sites.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p><b>11. Fujitsu Akita Systems Engineering Ltd.</b> Japanese company specialised in application software.</p> <p><i>Non-commercial proposal for internet.</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> April 1998.</p>	<p>Fujitsu Akita Systems has requested permission to use the World Heritage Emblem on one of the web pages they are currently redesigning for the Akita Prefecture (Japan). These web pages will present information on Shirakami Mountain Range, Japan's largest virgin beech forest, which runs along the border between the Akita and Aomori Prefectures. The web site will be available in Japanese and English. All text included in this web site is Akita Prefecture copyright.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> to be used as a means of identification of a World Heritage site on a web page of the Akita prefecture web site.</p>	<p>This proposal is still under consideration and has not yet been submitted to the National Commission.</p>	<p>The proposed web pages (on sites in Japan) are being created for the Akita Prefecture and therefore it seems more appropriate for this request to be dealt with directly by the competent Japanese authorities.</p> <p>4 cases relative to internet are to be envisaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- States Parties web sites (including local authorities and private owners of World Heritage sites).</li> <li>- NGOs promoting World Heritage sites only.</li> <li>- Commercial entities, like Fujitsu, operating on behalf of the State Party or a local authority.</li> <li>- Commercial entities promoting their own products as well as World Heritage sites.</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u> entities can create links to any web site without requesting permission to do so. The World Heritage Information Network (WHIN) encourages the creation of links to the World Heritage web site to ensure that the information these entities present about World Heritage is accurate and up to date. Partnership in WHIN also entitles the partner to be indexed in the WHIN search engine and provides a link from the World Heritage web site to their own. The use of the Emblem by WHIN partners is a logical expectation derived from this type of partnership. Hence the Committee should establish a corresponding guideline.</p>

## II. COMMERCIAL PROPOSALS

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>12. Fabrica de Moneda y Timbre (FNMT)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Spanish Coin Manufacturer Currently working under Contract with UNESCO.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Commercial proposal</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received</u> : October 1997. <u>Original contract between FNMT and UNESCO (OPI) signed on</u>: 12 February 1996.</p>	<p>FNMT proposed to renew the contract for future coin series on World Heritage sites directly with WHC. The initial contract, between FNMT and UNESCO, was signed by the D-G in Feb. 1996 and serviced by OPI, for the production of 2 series of coins on World Heritage sites in 1996 and 1997 for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of UNESCO. Royalties from the sale of the 2 series of coins have reached approximately US\$ 200,000.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem</u>: minted on the coins themselves and on any supporting publications or brochures.</p>	<p>National Commission: The first contract received full support from the Spanish Delegation and National Commission. The last press conference launching the 2<sup>nd</sup> coin series was organized at HQ, attended by the Spanish Minister of Education and Culture, Mrs Esperanza Aguirre, and the Director-General of UNESCO.</p> <p>Chairperson: The Chairperson responded favourably regarding the proposal to renew this agreement, to be serviced by the World Heritage Centre, for the production of future coin series. However, the Chairperson wished to seek advice and guidance from the Consultative Body on this matter.</p>	<p>The extension of this project could represent considerable income for the World Heritage Fund, part of which could be earmarked for servicing and part for specific field projects. Furthermore, these commemorative coins, collectors items, distributed throughout the world are an effective and new way of raising public awareness about World Heritage, especially as they are distributed with information brochures.</p> <p>No validation of text is required for this project in the existing contract. Each coin is minted with an image of a site inscribed on the List and the use of the World Heritage Emblem would enable immediate recognition of the site as a World Heritage site.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p align="center"><b>13. Turinta</b></p> <p>Production of a Portuguese road map indicating Portuguese World Heritage sites.</p> <p align="center"><i>Commercial publication</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> November 1997.</p>	<p>Turinta produces road maps of countries and cities in Europe on various themes and has proposed to produce a road map of Portugal focusing on World Heritage sites to commemorate the Lisboa Expo '98. Other classified sites in Portugal are to be identified on the same map.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on cover of map and used as symbol to identify World Heritage sites on the map.</p>	<p>National Commission: The Portuguese National Commission has approved the project. <u>Approved in:</u> December 1997.</p> <p>Chairperson: The Chairperson has agreed, on behalf of the World Heritage Committee, to provide Turinta with support and information relative to the proposed publication and has approved the request to use the World Heritage Emblem.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> proceeded.</p>	<p>Co-operation for this project involves little backstopping on the part of the Centre. Texts, such as technical evaluations were provided by the Centre to help Turinta to identify the protected World Heritage sites.</p>
<p><b>14. Editions Arziates (Lebanon) &amp; Mr. Laurent Abad</b></p> <p>Mr. Abad wishes to publish a book using photographs of approx. 200 World Heritage sites.</p> <p align="center"><i>Commercial publication</i></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> February 1998.</p>	<p>Mr. Abad has previously worked in association with UPO for the publication of a book on the site of Baalbek and would like to co-operate further with UNESCO on a photographic art book illustrating 200 World Heritage sites. The French photo agency Magnum will supply the photographs to be used in this book. The publication of the book is scheduled for Autumn 1999 and distribution is envisaged in France, Switzerland, Belgium, Canada and Lebanon by Vilo Diffusion (France).</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> on cover of book and inside the book.</p>	<p>National Commission: This project has the full support of the Lebanese Permanent Delegation and the French National Commission (with regard to Magnum and Vilo Diffusion). <u>Approved in:</u> February 1998.</p> <p>Chairperson: The Chairperson has endorsed and approved this proposal.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> proceeded.</p>	<p>Texts, such as brief descriptions, should be provided by the World Heritage Centre to illustrate the selected sites. It is understood that the selection should be representative of the full diversity of the World Heritage List. This publication will be based on photographs supported by existing texts such as the brief descriptions that do not require content validation.</p> <p>This project was approved prior to the Consultative Body's recommendations concerning the clearance of photos and legends by the States Parties concerned.</p>

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Comments / Observations
<p align="center"><b>15. NFUAJ</b></p> <p>National Federation of UNESCO Associations in Japan is currently under contract with the World Heritage Centre and would like to amend the existing contract.</p> <p align="center"><i>Commercial project</i></p> <p><u>Initial proposal received in:</u> 1995.  <u>Initial contract was signed in:</u> February 1996.  <u>New proposal received in:</u> February 1998.</p>	<p>NFUAJ, under an Agreement with the Centre, collaborates with Tokyo Broadcasting System (TBS) to produce a series of films on World Heritage sites broadcast weekly on TBS. NFUAJ wishes to commercialise these films in a home video format in Japan only.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> Broadcast TV and home video.</p>	<p><u>Approved in:</u> 1996.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> may proceed under new Agreement describing the new terms of agreement between NFUAJ and UNESCO WHC.</p>	<p>The Centre supports NFUAJ's proposal to develop home videos of the series, but has proposed that the contract with NFUAJ be re-negotiated and that the sale of the video version of the films generate reasonable income for the World Heritage Fund. Servicing fees are contributed yearly under the existing contract by NFUAJ and a minimum of US\$ 30,000 for World Heritage field projects for the production of films for TBS. The commercialisation of these films in video format would not require extra servicing from the Centre.</p>
<p align="center"><b>16. Art'Kan</b></p> <p>French company specialised in creating and producing interactive, game-like, educational tourism guide books*.</p> <p>*These guide books are guided tours of a particular city or area. The narrator leads the reader through a site giving information on the site's history, geographical location and cultural identity.</p> <p align="center"><i>Commercial tourism/information publication</i></p> <p><u>Initial proposal received in:</u> early 1997.  <u>New long-term proposal received in:</u> March 1998.</p>	<p>Art'Kan's initial proposal was to publish, in co-operation with UNESCO WHC, an interactive guide booklet of the banks of the Seine River in Paris on the occasion of the "Journées du Patrimoine" organised once a year by the French Ministry for Culture and Communication.</p> <p>Both the event and the guide book met with great success.</p> <p>Art'Kan is now offering to collaborate on a long-term basis to publish and distribute such guide books for many other World Heritage sites. UPO is also currently examining the possibility of a co-publication between Art'Kan and UNESCO.</p> <p><u>Requested use of Emblem:</u> printed on the cover of the guide and on information page within the guide.</p>	<p>The Centre has forwarded the long-term project proposal to the French National Commission for review. It is currently under consideration by the French National Commission.</p>	<p>The Pavillon de la France and Art'Kan and UNESCO jointly organised a <i>Children's Week</i> during the Lisbon Expo '98 on the theme of marine World Heritage in which over 15,000 children participated. This project was approved by the French National Commission.</p> <p>Art'Kan has proposed to include, as they have done in the previous publication on Paris, a 1 page information sheet on the World Heritage Convention in future booklets.</p>



### III. OTHER PROPOSALS

Project	Description / background	Comments from the National Commission and the Chairperson of the Committee	Observations
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>17. L'Oréal</b></p> <p>The world's largest cosmetic group interested in supporting World Heritage.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sponsorship</b></p> <p><u>Proposal received in:</u> October 1997.</p>	<p>L'Oréal Group, has worked in close collaboration with UNESCO WHC for the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union which took place in Suzhou, China on 7-9 April 1998. The Conference was sponsored by L'Oréal to demonstrate their interest in the field of heritage preservation and sustainable development.</p> <p><u>Use of Emblem:</u> As sponsors of the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union, L'Oréal was associated with UNESCO/WHC. The printed material produced for the Conference displayed the UNESCO and World Heritage Emblems. The L'Oréal logo and the emblems of other donors (France, EU, China) were also used.</p>	<p>National Commission: This project was approved by the Chinese National Commission.</p> <p>Chairperson: This project received the support of the Chairperson.</p> <p><u>Status:</u> completed</p>	<p>L'Oréal, recently implanted in Suzhou, China, took part in the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union, and contributed US\$ 83,000 for the Conference, and also made a contribution of US\$ 24,000 to the Municipality of Suzhou for the preservation of the Suzhou's Classical Gardens to demonstrate their commitment to World Heritage.</p> <p>Partnerships with the private industry, with companies, such as L'Oréal, are motivated by 3 main ideas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To encourage outside entities to participate actively in heritage preservation.</li> <li>2) To set an example for other companies and mobilise the industry as a whole with regard to sustainable development.</li> <li>3) To help finance a particular project, activity or conference.</li> </ol>

#### I.4 COMMENTS FROM THE UNESCO SECTORS CONCERNED

10. A meeting was held on 3 September 1998 following the 22<sup>nd</sup> ordinary session of the Bureau in June 98 to discuss the draft guidelines on the use of the World Heritage Emblem and fund-raising prepared by the United States of America and Japan as a part of the work assigned to the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee. The meeting was attended by WHC staff members and other UNESCO units [Cultural Sector, Science Sector, UPO, OPI, Bureau for Extra-budgetary Funding Sources (BER) and Legal Affairs] concerned by the use of these guidelines in order to establish and record the concerns of the UNESCO “users” of the World Heritage Emblem guidelines.
11. The following comments relating to the draft guidelines were made during the discussion:
  - The difference between commercial and informative or educational projects was stressed. These different proposals should not have to undergo the same treatment.
  - UNESCO, along with the national authorities, the Chairperson, the Bureau and the Committee, should have the prerogative to authorize the use of the World Heritage Emblem as a part of its function to inform the public about World Heritage.
  - Quality control involvement from the States Parties, foreseen in the draft guidelines, for all project proposals requesting the use of the Emblem would prove to be very complicated and virtually impossible to implement.
  - The lengthy authorization procedure proposed within the draft guidelines would inevitably discourage potential partners from co-operating with UNESCO for projects relating to the promotion of the World Heritage Convention.

#### I.5 GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

##### BACKGROUND

12. The World Heritage Emblem symbolizes the Convention, signifies the adherence of States Parties to the Convention, and serves to identify sites inscribed in the World Heritage List. It is associated with public knowledge about the Convention and is the imprimatur of the Convention's credibility and prestige. Above all, it is a representation of the universal values for which the Convention stands.
13. The World Heritage Emblem also has fund-raising potential that can be used to enhance the marketing value of products with which it is associated. A balance is needed between the Emblem's use to further the aims of the Convention and optimize knowledge of the Convention worldwide and the possibility of its abuse for inaccurate, inappropriate, and unauthorized commercial or other purposes.

14. The great increase in the requests for authorization to use the World Heritage Emblem in the last few years has generated a diversification of the products proposed. Aware of the insufficiency of the guidelines contained in paragraphs 122 and following of the "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention," the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its 21st session, emphasized the necessity to elaborate concrete guidelines for use and authorization of the Emblem by the World Heritage Centre and national authorities.
15. During the Management Review Workshop (30-31 October 1997, Paris) the Consultative Body emphasized the fact that it was necessary to create Guidelines to be applied by the World Heritage Centre and other UNESCO units and in accordance with which the use of the Emblem would be authorized.
16. Guidelines for the use of the Emblem and modalities for quality control should not become an obstacle to co-operation for promotional activities. Authorities responsible for reviewing and deciding on uses of the Emblem (whether it be the Centre Director, Chairman of the Committee, the Bureau, the Committee, or national authorities) need parameters on which to base their decisions.
17. However, the authorization procedure should not only consist in a classification of the requests according to the aims pursued. On the contrary, this procedure should be based on the content of the project or on the quality of the products proposed. Consequently, the guidelines for the use of the Emblem should be limited to the definition of the framework within which the use of the Emblem is authorized or not. The types of projects and the issue of quality are dealt with separately below.

#### APPLICABILITY OF THESE GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES

18. The guidelines and principles proposed herein cover all proposed uses of the Emblem by:

- The World Heritage Centre;
- The UNESCO Publications and other UNESCO offices;
- Agencies or National Commissions, responsible for implementing the Convention in each State Party;
- World Heritage sites;
- Other contracting parties, especially those operating for predominantly commercial purposes.

*(The Guidelines are not intended to be retrospective unless specifically requested. It is also understood that, insofar as they apply to UNESCO units, the approval of the Director-General for the implementation of this policy may be required. It is intended, for example, that UNESCO publications that have not been subject to the approval process described herein bear only the UNESCO Emblem.)*

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE OF THE EMBLEM

19. The responsible authorities are henceforth to use the following principles in making decisions on the use of the Emblem:
- (1) The Emblem should be utilized for all projects substantially associated with the work of the Convention, including, to the maximum extent technically and legally possible, those already approved and adopted, in order to promote the Convention.
  - (2) A decision to approve use of the Emblem should be linked strongly to the quality and content of the product with which it is to be associated, not on the volume of products to be marketed or the financial return expected. The main criterion for approval should be the educational, scientific, cultural, or artistic value of the proposed product related to World Heritage principles and values. Approval should not routinely be granted to place the Emblem on products that have no, or extremely little, educational value, such as cups, T-shirts, pins, and other tourist souvenirs. Exceptions to this policy will be considered for special events, such as meetings of the Committee and ceremonies at which plaques are unveiled.
  - (3) Any decision with respect to the grant of authorization to use the Emblem must be completely unambiguous and in keeping with the explicit and implicit goals and values of the World Heritage Convention.
  - (4) Except when authorized in accordance with these principles it is not legitimate for commercial entities to use the Emblem directly on their own material to show their support for World Heritage. The Committee recognizes, however, that any individual, organization, or company is free to publish or produce whatever they consider to be appropriate regarding World Heritage sites, but official authorization to do so under the World Heritage Emblem remains the exclusive prerogative of the Committee, to be exercised as it may prescribe, and shall be subject to the pertinent sections of the Operational Guidelines and these Guidelines.
  - (5) Use of the Emblem by other contracting parties should normally only be authorized when the proposed use deals directly with World Heritage sites. Such uses may be granted after approval by the national authorities of the countries concerned.
  - (6) In cases where no specific World Heritage sites are involved or are not the principal focus of the proposed use, such as general seminars and or a workshop on scientific issues or building conservation techniques, use may be granted only upon express approval in accord with these Guidelines. Requests for such uses should specifically document the manner in which the proposed use is expected to enhance the work of the Convention.
  - (7) Permission to use the Emblem should not be granted to travel agencies, airlines, or to any other type of business operating for predominantly commercial purposes, except under exceptional circumstances and when manifest benefit to the World Heritage generally or particular World Heritage Sites can be demonstrated. Requests for such use shall require approval in accord with

these Guidelines and the concurrence of the national authorities of countries specifically concerned.

The Centre is not to accept any advertising, travel, or other promotional considerations from travel agencies or other, similar companies in exchange or in lieu of financial remuneration for use of the Emblem.

(8) When commercial benefits are anticipated, the Centre should ensure that the World Heritage Fund receives a fair share of the profits and conclude a contract or other agreement that documents the nature of the understandings that govern the project and the arrangements for provision of income to the Fund. In all cases of commercial use, any staff time and related costs for personnel assigned by the Centre or other reviewers, as appropriate, to any initiative, beyond the nominal, must be fully covered by the party requesting authorization to use the Emblem.

National authorities are also called upon to ensure that their sites or the World Heritage Fund receive a fair share of the profits and to document the nature of the understandings that govern the project and the distribution of any proceeds.

(9) If sponsors are sought for manufacturing products whose distribution the Centre considers necessary, the choice of partner or partners should be consistent, at a minimum, with the criteria set forth in Annex V of the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO," and with such further fund-raising guidance as the Committee may prescribe. The necessity for such products should be clarified and justified in written presentations that will require approval in such manner as the Committee may prescribe.

## AUTHORIZATION PROCEDURE FOR THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

### A. SIMPLE AGREEMENT OF THE NATIONAL AUTHORITIES

20. In addition to the plaque or plate affixed on the properties, national authorities encourage the World Heritage Sites to use the Emblem on all their documents. The procedure is then limited to the country concerned.
21. National authorities may also grant the use of the Emblem to a national entity, provided that the project, whether national or international, involves only World Heritage sites located on the same national territory.

### B. AGREEMENT REQUIRING QUALITY CONTROL OF CONTENT

22. Apart from the above-mentioned case, any other request for authorization to use the Emblem should follow the following procedure:
  - (a) A request indicating the objective of the use of the Emblem, its duration and territorial validity, should be addressed to the Director-General.

(b) The request should be examined by the Centre in accordance with the applicable guidelines, notably those on fund-raising and quality control. As a condition of granting permission to use the Emblem, the Centre should require the manufacturer's commitment to obtain, at no cost to the Centre, the review and endorsement of each country for the texts and images involving the sites located in its territory, together with proof that this has been done. Contracts for projects of a general nature shall also include similar express provisions for accuracy and quality control.

(c) After having examined the request and considered it as acceptable, the Centre can establish an agreement with the partner on condition that the National Authorities approve the use and it is otherwise in accord with the approval process established in these Guidelines.

(d) After having examined the request and considered it as unacceptable, the Centre can reject the request, by addressing to the requesting party a letter detailing concisely the reasons of the rejection.

## RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STATES PARTIES

23. Authorization to use the Emblem is inextricably linked to the requirement that the national authorities may exert quality control over the products with which it is associated.

(1) The States Parties to the Convention are the only parties authorized to approve the content (images and text) of any distributed product appearing under the World Heritage Emblem with regard to the sites located in their territories.

(2) States Parties that protect the Emblem legally must review these uses.

(3) Other States Parties may elect to review proposed uses or refer such proposals to the World Heritage Centre. States Parties are responsible for identifying an appropriate national authority and for informing the Centre whether they wish to review proposed uses. The Centre will maintain a list of responsible national authorities.

24. A draft model form to be used by States Parties for authorization of the use of the Emblem appears in Annex 3 of this document.

## LEGAL STATUS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

25. The UNESCO Legal Advisor has informed the Committee that, although the legal rights for the Emblem belong to UNESCO and UNESCO is legally responsible for managing its use, the Committee may make policy prescriptions regarding how it may be used (XXIst Session of the Bureau, VII.12). The most recent discussion of this issue appears in "Use of the World Heritage Emblem" (WHC-96/CONF.201/17), prepared by the Legal Advisor and the Secretariat. The Emblem has not, however, been registered internationally as a trademark.

26. States Parties are, under Operational Guidelines 124 and 125, also required to take all possible measures to regulate, protect, and authorize the use of the Emblem. (Canada and the United States have taken steps to do so; the legal instruments reflecting these actions appear as information document WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.8)

#### I.6 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE 22<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

(1) The issue of the authority (Director of the Centre, Chairman of the Committee, Bureau, or Committee) to be empowered to grant authorization for uses of the Emblem in accordance with the above "Guidelines for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem" is a critical issue that requires decision. The Bureau is requested to make a recommendation to the Committee. The "Guidelines" will be amended based on the Committee's action.

The following optional recommendations on this matter were originally provided as a proposed revision of the Operational Guidelines submitted to the Consultative Body in October 1997 (Proposals for New Guidelines regarding the Use of the World Heritage Emblem). This document was restricted to offering alternatives for which authorities would make decisions on the use of the Emblem.

##### Option A:

All requests to use the World Heritage Emblem should be examined by the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with LA and other concerned units of UNESCO. The Centre should seek the agreement of the responsible National Authorities of the countries concerned in case the request concerns one or two specific States Parties. In cases which involve numerous World Heritage sites in different States Parties, the Centre shall prepare a recommendation forwarded by the Director of the World Heritage Centre to the Bureau Members to authorize the use the World Heritage Emblem. The Bureau Members will be requested to respond to the Secretariat within a period of four weeks from receipt of the letter of request. Beyond this delay, the Centre will consider the proposal accepted by the Bureau Member concerned. A decision will be based on the simple majority of the Bureau. The Director of the World Heritage Centre then informs the applicant of the outcome with copy to the National Authorities concerned. A yearly report on the authorized use of the World Heritage Emblem will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee.

##### Option B:

All requests to use the World Heritage Emblem should be examined by the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with LA and other concerned units of UNESCO. The Centre should seek the agreement of the responsible National Authorities of the countries concerned in case the request concerns one or two specific States Parties. In cases which involve numerous World Heritage sites in different States Parties, the Centre shall prepare a recommendation forwarded by the Director of the World Heritage Centre to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to authorize the use of the World Heritage Emblem. The Chairperson's decision will be transmitted to the Centre within a period of four weeks. Beyond this delay, the Centre will consider the proposal accepted by the Chairperson on behalf of the World Heritage Committee. Following the decision by the Chairperson, the Director of the World Heritage Centre then informs the applicant of the outcome

with copy to the National Authorities concerned. A yearly report on the authorized use of the World Heritage Emblem will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee.

(2) The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee the adoption of the "Guidelines for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem" (Section I.5 above) and also recommend to amend paragraphs 124 and 125 of the Operational Guidelines and add a new paragraph as follows:

124. **Revised text:** States Parties to the Convention should take all possible measures to prevent the use of the Emblem of the Convention and the use of the name of the Committee and the Convention in their respective countries by any group or for any purpose not explicitly recognized and approved by the Committee.
125. **Revised text:** The World Heritage Emblem should, in particular, not be used for any commercial purpose unless specific authorization is obtained from the Committee. Its use in conjunction with the name, symbol, or depiction of a World Heritage site, or any element thereof, should not be authorized for commercial purposes unless written authorization has been obtained from the State concerned on the principles of using the said name, symbol, or depiction, and unless the exact text or display has been approved by that State and, as far as possible, by the national authority specifically concerned with the protection of the site. Any such utilization should be in conformity with the reasons for which the property has been placed on the World Heritage List.
126. **New text:** States Parties and the Secretariat should refer to the "Guidelines for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem" adopted by the Committee.

#### I.7 ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The Centre is requested to prepare a standard agreement for authorizing the use of the Emblem in conformity with the revised Operational Guidelines (paragraphs 124-126). This agreement must stipulate the obligation of the other contracting party to visibly display the Emblem with the Convention's title on related products.

(2) At the national level, taking into account the protocols of the Universal Copyright Convention and the Universal Copyright Convention revised in Paris on 24 July 1971, the World Heritage Emblem should be protected as the works published for the first time by one of the United Nations Agencies. The National Commission or other authority identified commits itself, in case it is possible, to ensure quality control.

(3) At the international level, the Centre should undertake an inquiry with a view to establishing a Communication on the Right of the Emblem through the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, in accordance with Paragraph (3) b of Article 6ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 20 March 1883 (revised in Brussels on 14 December 1900, in Washington on 22 June 1911, in the Hague on 6 November 1958 and in Stockholm on 14 July 1967, and modified on 2 October 1979).



The Centre should also examine the possibility for trademark protection of the Emblem, including through the registration of the Emblem to the WIPO International Bureau in accordance with the Madrid International Trademark Registration System.

#### I.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS

27. Distribution products: all known means of transmitting information to third parties, such as brochures, books, films, videos, CD-ROMs, websites, trading cards, etc.
28. National authorities: the body that each State Party will designate, as soon as possible, to the World Heritage Centre as responsible for content approval. This body may be the National Commission for UNESCO, the country's Permanent Mission to UNESCO, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or the national body responsible for implementing the Convention in each country. New States Parties must identify this body upon ratification of the Convention. It may also be the body referred to in Annex V(C) (Consultation of relevant National Commission(s) for UNESCO) in the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO."

#### **Decisions required:**

1. The Committee may wish to adopt one of the two options (A or B) of the procedure for the authorization of the use of the World Heritage Emblem [refer to section I.6(1) of this document].
2. Moreover, the Committee may wish to adopt the "Guidelines on the use of the World Heritage Emblem" (section I.5 above) and approve the amendments to the existing Operational Guidelines as suggested in section I.6(2).
3. Furthermore, the Committee may wish to recommend amendments required in the UNESCO Manual relating to the "Guidelines on the use of the World Heritage Emblem" and instruct the Secretariat to take action in accordance with the recommendations made by the Committee.

## II. THE PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING AND FUND-RAISING

### II.1 INTRODUCTION

1. This document is an amended version of a discussion paper presented to the Committee's Consultative Body (29-30 April 1998, Paris) and reviewed and endorsed in principle by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its 22nd Ordinary Session. It has been revised to reflect those discussions, as requested by the Bureau.
2. During the 21st session of the Bureau, a thorough discussion was held by the members on the content of "other incomes" contained in the "Statement of Income and Expenditure for the year 1996". The Bureau accepted three categories: earmarked income, non-earmarked income and interest and confirmed the necessity of guidelines for non-earmarked income, that is to say, fund-raising activities, including donations and corporate sponsorship.
3. The first portion of this paper (prepared by Japan) analyzes how external funding issues can be addressed by providing authorization procedures compatible with the adoption of UNESCO's "Internal Guidelines for Private-Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO" (WHC-97/CONF.208/INF.17 - hereinafter referred to as "Guidelines"). The second section (prepared by the United States) raises issues for further discussion on the adequacy of the "Guidelines."

### II.2 PROPOSED PROCEDURES FOR AUTHORIZATION

#### CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

4. "Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund" (WHC/7) defines the Fund and generally addresses its administration; these regulations spring from and relate directly to Paragraphs 118-120 of the Operational Guidelines. The Regulations are skeletal and do not address arrangements for cost-sharing or cooperation where contributions or monies other than those paid into the World Heritage Fund are involved. (WHC/7, however, does state that the Financial Regulations of UNESCO apply in instances not addressed therein.)
5. UNESCO'S "Guidelines" were presented to the Consultative Body in November 1997 with a request that they be endorsed by the Committee. It needs to be emphasized that the term "fund-raising" is something of a misnomer because the framework of these "Guidelines" is broadly inclusive of external financial activities and partnerships generally, not just arrangements for the joint solicitation of funds. The "Guidelines", while not comprehensive, address the circumstances under which UNESCO cooperates with external entities; they also contain basic model clauses and agreements for cooperation with private sector funding sources, voluntary contributions by States Parties, funds-in-trust, etc.

## PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING AND FUND-RAISING UNDER THE GUIDELINES

### A. SELECTION CRITERIA

All the fund-raising projects will be dealt with in accordance with the "Guidelines."

#### (1) Selection of the partners

The criteria for the selection of the partners will be based on Articles 4.1-4.4 of the "Guidelines."

#### (2) Selection of the projects

The criteria for the selection of projects will be based on Articles 5.1-5.3 of the "Guidelines". Furthermore, all the projects have to be related to the policy, aims and actions defined by the Convention.

### B. APPROVAL PROCEDURE

With a view to simplifying the procedure, the Centre should draw up a request form as well as an explanatory booklet for future potential partners.

#### (1) Request form

The request form should include such rubrics as the name of the partner, the name of the person responsible for the project, a concise description of the project and products, the aims of the project, the names of the sites concerned, a precise estimate of the funding to be received (specifying the way it will be used), and if necessary, the duration and territorial validity of the Emblem use. The form bears the signatures of the potential partner, the Director-General of UNESCO or the Director of the Centre on his behalf. This signature should be given only after consultation with the National Commission (or the authorities) of the country where the potential partner is registered and/or domiciled.

#### (2) Explanatory booklet

The Centre is also invited to draw up an explanatory booklet aimed at all potential partners to provide them with detailed information on the formalities to follow to request the authorization of projects.

## II.3 ISSUES RELATED TO THE EXTERNAL FUNDING / FUND-RAISING OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE'S ACTIVITIES

6. The World Heritage Centre has established a variety of financial arrangements that use funds from sources in addition to or in lieu of the World Heritage Fund. Examples that illustrate the complexity of these arrangements are cited below. They involve other sectors of UNESCO, other multilateral institutions and organizations, States Parties, provincial and municipal governments, international and national NGOs, private companies, and individuals.
7. Current financial regulations and guidelines, i.e., the "Guidelines" and the "Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund," do not address a number of issues and special circumstances that have arisen in the operations of the Centre. Some of these issues were expressly raised in the Management Review.

8. This refers, in particular, to the co-financing of events and activities such as on-site ceremonies, conferences and seminars organized by the States Parties and the Centre where external funding is sought to complement the seed money made available from the World Heritage Fund. Such events and activities often involve partnerships with international organizations having compatible objectives, as well as corporate sponsors.
9. Paragraph 109 of the Operational Guidelines, which calls for the use of the World Heritage Fund as seed money to generate contributions from other sources, heightens the need for explicit guidelines to orient the Centre, the Committee, and interested States Parties in such endeavors.

#### II.4 ISSUES SUGGESTED TO THE 22<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

10. The Bureau may wish to examine the following outstanding issues related to the external financial relationships of the Centre, particularly as they are not addressed in the existing regulations. Of particular significance, as noted during the Consultative Body meeting, are items 1 and 5 below:

(1) It is the Committee's policy-making decision on whether to define the types of endeavors that it wishes to encourage and any that it wishes to constrain or prohibit. The scale and nature of the undertakings should be considered, and not only the amount of input from the World Heritage Fund in the project.

(2) Guidance needs to be provided to define the manner in which the Centre is to cooperate financially with other sectors of UNESCO in developing joint projects with other partners. Means are needed to insure cooperation between the Centre and other sectors of UNESCO when World Heritage Sites or issues are involved, e.g., for fund-raising to assist a World Heritage Site in Danger. According to the Management Review, the only project that is formally carried out jointly with another UNESCO sector is the Centre's Youth Education Program that started as a pilot in 1994 and is now carried out as a UNESCO 1996-2001 "Special Project", Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion, targeted at secondary schools. The project is financed through the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Program for the Centre and the Education Sector, with important co-financing by NORAD and the Rhone-Poulenc Foundation.

The Management Review further states that the lack of clear guidelines for cooperation and resource sharing between UNESCO International Campaigns dealing with World Heritage sites and the Centre's projects for the same sites, the use of outside experts when in-house expertise may be available, and problems regarding quality control over publications and film rights, are among the issues requiring clarification.

(3) A policy could be defined to govern the manner in which the Committee expects the Centre Director to administer and account for funds received from external sources. Notably, the nature and scale of financial decisions and agreements that the Director of the Centre may be authorized to take could be distinguished from those which require approval by the Chairman, Bureau, or Committee.

(4) A policy could be established regarding the World Heritage Fund input in joint projects with external partners. It is suggested that, as a general rule, they should not require more than a catalytic input from the World Heritage Fund and that the projects be self-sustaining, especially for activities in the developed industrialized nations.

(5) The standard clauses and agreements provided in the "Guidelines" need to be reviewed, and if necessary, complemented with additional clauses regarding relations and joint financing of activities.

(6) A consistent policy would be helpful in handling extra-budgetary contributions by States Parties and others, especially those that are used to match World Heritage Fund monies in the provision of International Assistance. UNESCO's Manual (items 251, 255, 500, 545, 550) stipulates various means under which UNESCO receives extra-budgetary, voluntary contributions from donors. For projects in support of World Heritage sites, the most prevalent have been the Funds-in-Trust and Special Accounts of International Safeguarding Campaigns.

(7) From the financial perspective, the Centre's use of alternative mechanisms and contracts for the performance of specific tasks, as well as more straightforward private and public partnerships, are sources of external funding support that need to be investigated more thoroughly, aside from the issues of policy and their cost-effectiveness.

(8) Provisions in the financial regulations and agreements, and particularly the authority to grant or withhold the use of the World Heritage Emblem, are the principal tools by which UNESCO and the Centre can exert control over the quality of products, ensure content validation and protect the rights and interests of UNESCO, the World Heritage Fund, the States Parties and their sites. (Suggestions for securing those ends are discussed in part I of this document "Proposed Guidelines for Use of the World Heritage Emblem").

## II.5 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE 22<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

(1) The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee the adoption of the "Internal Guidelines for Private-Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO" which include articles on the manner in which partners and projects can be selected. The Bureau may also wish to recommend to the Committee to add a new paragraph to the Operational Guidelines, following current paragraph 120, as follows:

“---. The States Parties and the Secretariat should refer to the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO", adopted by the Committee, to govern external fund-raising in favour of the World Heritage Fund.”

(2) The Bureau is also requested to recommend that the Committee direct the working group to continue examining the outstanding issues, especially numbers 1 and 5 outlined in section II.4 above, and to report back to the Committee at its next session.

**Decisions required:**

1. The Committee may wish to adopt the “Internal Guidelines for Private-Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO” and add a new paragraph to the Operational Guidelines as suggested in section II.5(1) of this document.
2. The Committee may wish to direct the working group to continue examining the outstanding issues as outlined in section II.4.

## VII. OTHER MATTERS

### A. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and the name, symbol or depiction of World Heritage sites

122. At its second session, the Committee adopted the World Heritage Emblem which had been designed by Mr. Michel Olyff. This emblem symbolizes the interdependence of cultural and natural properties: the central square is a form created by man and the circle represents nature, the two being intimately linked. The emblem is round, like the world, but at the same time it is a symbol of protection. The Committee decided that the two versions proposed by the artist (see Annex 2) could be used, in any colour, depending on the use, the technical possibilities and considerations of an artistic nature. The emblem should always carry the text "World Heritage . Patrimoine Mondial". The space occupied by "Patrimonio Mundial" can be used for its translation into the national language of the country where the logo is to be used.

123. Properties included in the World Heritage List should be marked with the World Heritage emblem jointly with the UNESCO logo, which should, however, be placed in such a way that they do not visually impair the property in question.

124. States Parties to the Convention should take all possible measures to prevent the use of the emblem of the Convention and the use of the name of the Committee and the Convention in their respective countries by any group or for any purpose not explicitly recognized and approved by the Committee. The World Heritage emblem should, in particular, not be used for any commercial purposes unless specific authorization is obtained from the Committee.

125. The name, symbol or depiction of a World Heritage site, or of any element thereof, should not be used for commercial purposes unless written authorization has been obtained from the State concerned on the principles of using the said name, symbol or depiction, and unless the exact text or display has been approved by that State and, as far as possible, by the national authority specifically concerned with the protection of the site. Any such utilization should be in conformity with the reasons for which the property has been placed on the World Heritage List.

### B. Production of plaques to commemorate the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List

126. These plaques are designed to inform the public of the country concerned and foreign visitors, that the site visited has a particular value which has been recognized by the international community. In other words, the site is exceptional, of interest not only to one nation, but also to the whole world. However, these plaques have an additional function which is to inform the general public about the World Heritage Convention or at least about the World Heritage concept and the World Heritage List.



## USE OF UNESCO'S NAME, EMBLEM, AND IMPRINT INCLUDING THE ENVIRONMENT OR WORLD HERITAGE LOGOS IN WORKS PUBLISHED BY OUTSIDE PUBLISHERS

1. The ever-growing interest aroused by the protection of the environment and the world heritage, both natural and cultural, among Member States, has in recent years produced an important increase in the number of works published on these issues by the Organization itself in collaboration with publishers from different countries, or by public and private publishing houses exterior to UNESCO.
2. As requests are in constant increase to use the name of UNESCO, its emblem and imprint, as well as the environment and world heritage logos, in publications produced by outside publishers, it appears necessary to recall and define the existing rules.
3. UNESCO publications are governed by Item 1300 (and following items) of the *UNESCO Manual* and by Administrative Circular No. 1875 dated 3 May 1993; at the same time, Item 430 of the *Manual* governs the use of UNESCO's emblem, seal and name, as well as its sponsorship.
4. In cases where the different services of the Organization are contacted by private or public bodies wishing to have UNESCO's name, emblem, imprint, World Heritage or Environment logos, figure in one or several of their publications, negotiations in this respect should be carried out imperatively in close collaboration with the UNESCO Publishing Office (UPO). This office will be responsible for drawing up and concluding contracts or letters of agreement, which should then be signed by DIR/UPO. The intervention of UPO in this domain is, inter alia, a way of avoiding authorizations or agreements to use UNESCO's property on an exclusive basis being granted to different institutions simultaneously.
5. The term "publications" applies in the present circular to books, brochures, journals and periodicals, radio programmes, television and cinema films, as well as video-cassettes, video-discs, microfiches, CDs, CD-ROMs, CDIs or any other medium, on whatever support or technical means, intended to contain information aimed at the general public or specialists.
6. The *Manual* will be amended accordingly in due course.

For the Director-General:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Badran".

A. Badran  
Deputy Director-General a.i.



**Content Approval Form**

**[Name of responsible national body]**, officially identified as the body responsible for approving the content of the texts and photos relating to the World Heritage sites located in the territory of **[name of country]**, hereby confirms to **[name of producer]** that the text and the images that it has submitted for the **[name of sites]** World Heritage site(s) are **[approved]** **[approved subject to the following changes requested]** **[are not approved]**

(delete whatever entry does not apply, and provide, as needed, a corrected copy of the text or a signed list of corrections).

Notes:

It is recommended that the initials of the responsible national official be affixed to each page of text.

The National Authorities are given one month from their acknowledged receipt in which to authorize the content, following which the producers may consider that the content has been tacitly approved, unless the responsible National Authorities request in writing a longer period.

Texts should be supplied to the National Authorities in one of the two official languages of the Committee, or in the official language (or in one of the official languages) of the country in which the sites are located, at the convenience of both parties.

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION

UNESCO

DG/Note/98/53  
23 November 1998

**The Director-General**

To: Assistant Directors-General  
Directors of Bureaux, Units and Divisions at Headquarters  
Directors of Field Offices

**Subject: Preservation and Presentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage**

1. The preservation and the enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage constitute, since the creation of UNESCO, one of the major axes of action of the Organization. The importance of this mission, set out in the Constitution, was constantly recalled over the decades; it was reaffirmed in the 1996-2001 Mid-Term Strategy (para. 123 and 124) and the Approved Programme and Budget for 1998-1999, as well as more recently in the Action Plan on Cultural Development Policies (Objective 3) adopted on 2 April 1998 by the Intergovernmental Stockholm Conference.

2. I have already emphasized on different occasions (DG/Note/92/13, 93/4, 93/17, 95/37 and 96/47) the need to ensure full co-ordination of all the activities carried out by UNESCO in its different fields of action in favour of cultural and natural heritage, whatever their legal framework, modalities and funding sources. This particularly concerns the activities of the World Heritage Centre, the Division of Cultural Heritage and the Division of Ecological Sciences.

3. In this spirit, and in order to further improve UNESCO's action for the preservation and enhancement of mankind's heritage in all its aspects, I feel it is essential to develop the synergies between the Division of Cultural Heritage and the World Heritage Centre, entities clearly distinct by their functions and responsibilities within the Secretariat.

4. Mr Bernd von Droste (D-2) having reached retirement age at 31 October 1998, I have decided to extend his appointment until 31 January 1999 so as to allow him to assure the Secretariat of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee (30 November - 5 December 1998). The efficiency with which he has assumed the direction of the World Heritage Centre for more than six years leads me to promote him to the rank of Assistant-Director General in a personal capacity for his last three months of service.

5. Upon the departure of Mr von Droste, on 1 February 1999, Mr M. Bouchenaki, Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage, will be responsible until further notice, under my authority and by delegation, under that of the ADG/CLT or, in his absence, the ADG/SC (DG/Note/93/4 and 95/37), for the direction of the World Heritage Centre.

6. The World Heritage Centre, which was created through my initiative in 1992, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, will further strengthen its specific functions:

- assist States Parties to the Convention to identify new sites to propose for inscription to the World Heritage List;
- examine, periodically, and each time that the circumstances require, the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and encourage States Parties to establish regular monitoring methods of their properties;
- implement international assistance decided upon by the World Heritage Committee;
- promote awareness of the World Heritage Convention to the general public and particularly to the younger generation, encourage adhesion of States which are not yet Party, mobilise resources for the preservation of properties inscribed and continue the establishment of a data bank, available using the most technologically advanced means, on the different aspects of the implementation of the Convention.

7. The Division of Ecological Sciences shall co-ordinate its activities with those of the Division of Cultural Heritage and the World Heritage Centre with regard to the preservation and protection, by the different existing legal instruments, those of the Biosphere Reserves inscribed on the World Heritage List and natural sites having a cultural value, in particular cultural landscapes and sacred natural sites.

8. Mr Georges Zouain (D-1), Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre, shall assist Mr Bouchenaki in the co-ordination of the activities of the Centre with those of the corresponding divisions within the Sectors of Culture and Natural Sciences. Ms Minja Yang (D-1) continues to be responsible for the World Heritage Centre activities relating to the rehabilitation of historic centres, notably in Asia.

9. Furthermore, with regard to the Division of Cultural Heritage, and taking into account its staff and the diversity of its activities, I have decided to reinforce the internal organization through the creation of three units:

- the Unit for Operational Activities (CLT/CH/AOP), supervised by the Deputy Director of the Division, shall be responsible for all activities relating to the safeguard, restoration and presentation of monuments and sites, as well as for the development of museums and training;
- the Intangible Heritage Unit (CLT/CH/ITH) shall implement activities relating to the safeguard and revitalization of intangible heritage, particularly with regard to its relation to monuments and sites, inscribed or not on the World Heritage List, to which they are closely associated;
- the International Standards Unit (CLT/CH/NOI) shall be responsible for the establishment, promotion and implementation of international legal instruments relating to the protection of cultural and natural World Heritage.

10. I have decided to entrust the functions of Deputy Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage to Mr L. Lévi-Strauss (P-5), whose post will be upgraded to the level of D-1. Taking into account the increased responsibilities entrusted to the chiefs of the Units of Intangible Heritage and International Standards, Ms. N. Aikawa (P-5) and Ms L. Prott (P-5), I have also decided to upgrade the posts to the level of D-1. I shall consult the Executive Board in due course with regard to the promotion of the incumbents of these posts.

11. These decisions will come into effect on 1 February 1999.

Federico Mayor