



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

36 COM

WHC-12/36.COM/14

Paris, 11 May 2012

Original: English / French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-sixth session

**Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation
24 June – 6 July 2012**

Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Examination of International Assistance requests

SUMMARY

This document contains under Part I the International Assistance requests received by the World Heritage Centre and which are for decision by the Committee, under Part II the status of implementation of the International Assistance request from Madagascar as requested by the Committee in Decision **35 COM 14**, and under Part III some proposals to improve the international assistance process.

This document also contains under Part III proposed revisions of the *Operational Guidelines* which the open-ended working group on the *Operational Guidelines* may wish to take into account.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 14, See Point IV.

I. EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

A. Conservation & Management assistance

A.1. Cultural properties

N°	Region	State Party – Name of activity	Amount requested (US\$)	Amount recommended for approval (US\$)
1	Arab States	Jordan – The Quseir Amra conservation project	65,000	30,000

Funds available as of 11 May 2012 for approval: US\$ 178,776 (on the basis of the revised World Heritage Fund budget)

Total amount of requests submitted for approval by the Committee: US\$ 65,000

Comments of the Secretariat: sufficient funds.

Details of this request on the following page.

REQUEST N° 1
Conservation & Management Assistance
Cultural Heritage
Arab States

State Party: JORDAN

Status of dues to the World Heritage Fund as at 31 December 2011: contributions settled.

Name of activity: The Quseir Amra conservation project

Amount requested: US\$ 65,000

Previous contributions from the World Heritage Fund for this property/activity:

- technical co-operation (1995), US\$ 20,000
- technical co-operation (1999), US\$ 20,000

Background:

Quseir Amra is a unique Umayyad (Early Islamic) site with a rich presence of figurative paintings. The paintings are at risk because of a variety of factors including environmental conditions, previous improper conservation approaches, excessive visitation and vandalism. The project will assess conditions, proceed with careful cleaning of a test area, consolidate the exterior of the building, repair and improve the windows and other openings, and recommend a plan of action for the complete conservation and management of the site.

The project will address and respond to the requirements of the periodic reporting exercise (Cycles 1 and 2) as well as the recommendations of the ICOMOS mission and report of November 2006.

Implementation reports will be provided by the team to the DoA (Department of Antiquities) Director and shared with the World Heritage Centre (WHC) and UNESCO office in Amman.

The Jordanian team includes two architects, archaeologists, and 12 specialized labourers. The Italian team is composed by: Giovanna De Palma, Carlo Birrozzi, Carolina Gaetani, Marie-Jose Mano, Francesca Mariani, Arabella De Angelis.

Gaetano Palumbo from World Monument Fund advises on aspects related to the management planning process, and monitors the evolution of the project during the field campaigns.

Claude Vibert Guigue from CNRS (National Centre for Scientific Research) and Frederic Imbert from the University of Provence (France) advise on issues related to conservation and epigraphy.

Spain mission's director Ignacio Arce is involved in the production of high resolution imagery.

The project includes a training component for conservation technicians and another in site management planning, in the use of traditional materials in the conservation of the exterior (masons, specialized workers, engineers and archaeologists), and on mural paintings conservation techniques (conservators and archaeologists). DoA staff trained in these disciplines will be able to apply their skills at other World Heritage properties such as Um er-Rasas and Petra, where both building conservation and site management planning capacities are needed.

Objective:

1. Assess and understand the causes of deterioration of the mortars and paintings at the site;
2. Outside, apply compatible mortars on the roofs and at the base of the walls to avoid water infiltration. Previous conservation structures made applying cement will be removed and replaced with lime mortar. Window frames, and other modern elements such as porthole covers, grids and barriers, will be replaced. Water drainage around the monument will be improved. Part of these objectives has already been achieved during 2011 (most wall bases and most of the vaults extrados have been repaired);
3. Inside, perform cleaning and consolidation tests on the mural paintings, initially on the south wall of the west bay (main hall), in order to agree on the appropriate method to be applied to the whole of the site. Change the barriers which presently allow vandals to scratch the mural paintings. During 2011 approximately 7 square meters of the wall have been conserved;
4. Develop a site management plan for the building and the archaeological areas surrounding it.

Duration of the project:

Dates: from spring 2012 to fall 2013 (it is possible however that more funds may be available from the Italian government and private donors, allowing more work to be conducted on site).

Duration: 1-2 years

Expected results:

<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Means of verification</i>
Result 1: Consolidation and protection of the building exterior, new and improved fixtures, improved drainage	Execution of the works	Report to DoA Director and verification of the executed works
Result 2: Environmental analysis of the building interior, high resolution documentation and assessment of building and painting damage	Charts of monitoring readings; high resolution photographs of site, 3D model derived from laser scanning	Provision of copies of photographs, digital models and charts to DoA archives
Result 3: Completed tests on cleaning and consolidating the paint layers	Tests completed with the total conservation of the south wall of the western bay (main hall)	Report to DoA Director
Result 4: Development of an action plan for the complete conservation of the interiors	Action plan prepared	Report to DoA Director

<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Means of verification</i>
Result 5: Management planning process to define the site significance and its proper boundaries, in order to enhance its protection as World Heritage site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setting up of a management planning team - Completion of site assessments and of conservation and management issues - Values assessment - Stakeholders workshops and focus groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Periodic reports to DoA Director - Compilation of site management plan
Result 6: Training of personnel in mural painting and site management practices	Training conducted	Report to DoA Director

Budget:

	From World Heritage Fund	From other sources
Total activity budget (in US\$): 291,000	65,000	226,000
1. Organization	10,500	15,850
Office expenses	2,000	4,000
Translation		4,000
Interpretation		3,000
Audio-visual equipment	7,500	3,000
Other	1,000	1,850
2. Personnel / consultancy services (fees)	15,000	90,000
International experts (US\$ 1,500 x 12 persons x 5 weeks)		90,000
Coordinator (US\$ 150 x 20 weeks)	3,000	
Workers (US\$ 100 x 6 persons x 20 weeks)	12,000	
3. Travel	3,000	17,000
International travel cost		12,000
Domestic travel cost	3,000	5,000

4. Daily Subsistence allowance	12,000	42,000
Accommodation DoA (US\$ 15 x 6 persons x 80 days)	7,200	
Board DoA (US\$ 10 x 6 persons x 80 days)	4,800	
Accommodation international experts (US\$ 60 x 12 persons x 35 days)		25,200
Board international experts (US\$ 40 x 12 persons x 35 days)		16,800
5. Equipment	20,000	45,000
Tools	10,000	20,000
Conservation material	10,000	25,000
6. Evaluation	4,500	13,000
Evaluation		2,000
Reporting	1,000	2,000
Editing, layout	1,500	5,000
Printing	2,000	2,000
Distribution		2,000
7. Miscellaneous	0	3,150
Visas (US\$ 15 x 10 persons)		150
Other		3,000

National or other contributions:

National agency(ies):

Provision of scaffolding, material, salaried personnel and workers

Other contributions:

Italy: the Ministry of Culture of the Italian Government is providing funding towards the project and the participation of experts from the Istituto Superiore per la Conservazione ed il Restauro (100,000 Euros available);

Spain: the Spanish cultural mission is providing high resolution imagery to be used for the documentation of the site conditions;

France: the French mission and the CNRS are providing unpublished documentation and advice on the treatment of the mural paintings;

USA: World Monuments Fund, New York, a US NGO, is providing financial and technical support to the project (US\$ 100,000 available).

Comments of the Advisory Bodies:

ICOMOS, 16 March 2012 – For revision

This is a request for conservation interventions at the World Heritage property of Quseir Amra which responds to concerns raised as part of the periodic reporting cycles and monitoring missions to the property.

The field component includes activities for documentation (high resolution documentation), assessment (including environmental analysis), monitoring and conservation intervention on the exterior, cleaning of test areas on the mural paintings and the development of a plan of action for the complete conservation and management of the site, including the development of an action plan for the complete conservation of the interiors. The project also includes a training component for conservation technicians and another in site management planning. The potential beneficiaries from the training activities are staff from the DoA, who will apply skills learned in other properties in Jordan where these are lacking upon completion of the activities.

The project notes that different States Parties (Italy, Spain, France and USA) are providing financial and technical support for the implementation of the project.

The requested amount for assistance is US\$ 65,000, with US\$ 226,000 budgeted from other sources. Regarding the presented budget ICOMOS notes the following:

- US\$ 3,000 and US\$ 12,000 are budgeted for fees (1 coordinator @ US\$ 150 for 20 weeks and 6 workers @ US\$ 100 for 20 weeks). This corresponds to half of the specialised labourers expected to participate in the project. However, the request indicates that the State Party will provide an in kind contribution for scaffolding, material, salaried personnel and workers. ICOMOS considers that given the amounts requested under other items, the amount pertaining to this portion of the budget (US\$ 15,000) should be covered in full by the State Party and subtracted from the total amount requested;
- US\$ 7,500 is requested for audio-visual equipment. This needs to be clarified as the request indicates that Spain will produce high resolution imagery for the documentation of site conditions;
- The portions of the budget necessary for the formulation of the management plan are not clarified, particularly considering the implementation of stakeholder workshops and focus groups.

The expected time frame is 1 to 2 years, expected from spring of 2012 to fall of 2013, with more time if additional funding becomes available. ICOMOS considers that the time allocated for the development of the management plan is not sufficient given that the documentation and assessment phases foreseen are to be concluded four months later than the finalization of the management plan. There is no correlation between the components of the proposal, that is the development of the management plan and the documentation, assessment and interventions in the building and mural paintings. Formulating a management plan for the property is necessary to ensure the conservation and protection of its Outstanding Universal Value but it should preferably take a participatory and holistic approach into account. Considering the attributes of this property, it would be preferable to develop the conservation action plan for the mural paintings in tandem with the management plan.

Recommendation

ICOMOS supports this request in principle but recommends that the request be revised by the State Party to consider the following:

- revise the objectives: objectives 2 and 3 (that refer to interventions on the outside and on the mural paintings) are not objectives but rather actions to be implemented;

- clarify the requested budget, particularly in regard to the formulation of the management plan;
- revise the timeframe to consider the development of the conservation action plan in tandem with the management plan;
- clarify how training is to be carried out and how capacity building will be replicated to ensure a multiplying effect.

ICCROM, 04 April 2012 – For revision

The request is for Conservation and management assistance for the wall paintings found at the Quseir Amra World Heritage property in Jordan. The request calls for various activities such as documentation and assessment of the property and its surroundings, structural consolidation, tests of damaged wall painting, development of an action plan for repair work, development of a management plan, as well as the capacity building of staff involved in heritage conservation in the country. The State Party expects to implement the project within an international framework created with financial and/or technical assistance from France, Italy, Spain, and World Monuments Fund.

ICCROM supports the request in principle, which would address the conservation issues that the State Party is currently facing. ICCROM, however, has the following comments:

- ICCROM notes that the scope of the project is very ambitious with a variety of components. The request, however, does not adequately clarify how these different activities are related to each other and the necessary sequencing of the activities within the timeline provided. For example, documentation and assessment work will need to be carried out before consolidation and conservation activities can begin.
- ICCROM further notes that a number of the activities being proposed are less developed within the request. In particular, there is not sufficient information on the management plan, nor the capacity building activities being proposed.

The State Party requests an amount more than double as compared with usual requests for the Conservation and management assistance. ICCROM feels indispensable that the request justifies this exceptional amount.

1. In regard to the budget, ICCROM commends the State Party for finding additional financial resources in addition to what is being requested from the World Heritage Fund. This illustrates the idea of using the World Heritage Fund in a catalytic manner to attract other financial resources.
2. ICCROM does note, however, that the amount of the request (US\$ 65,000) is larger than most requests being made to the World Heritage Fund in recent years. Given the serious constraints on the Fund and the large number of requests, ICCROM considers that it might be possible to prioritize the activities to be carried out and to limit the request to the most important activities.
3. In addition, the budget does not detail the items listed as “tools” and “conservation material”. It would be useful to have more information on the types of materials needed. ICCROM also questions the need for audio-visual materials within this request.
4. Finally, ICCROM notes that Jordan is an upper-middle income country and is therefore not considered a priority for International Assistance according to the *Operational Guidelines*.

Taking note of the above points, ICCROM would recommend that the request be returned to the State Party for reformulation. ICCROM feels that it would be reasonable that the amount for the request is limited under US\$30,000 by means of the prioritization of the activities or the revision of the budget breakdown.

Panel Recommendation, 04 April 2012 – For revision

Request to be sent back to the State Party for revision, in order to focus it on the conservation of the mural paintings, leaving aside the management plan. Considering the pressure on the International Assistance budget, it is highly recommended that the revised request be for US\$ 30,000 maximum. If the revision is fine with ICOMOS and ICCROM, there are two options:

- if the request is for US\$ 30,000 maximum, the request will be submitted to the Chairperson for approval without going back to the panel;
- if the request remains above US\$ 30,000, it will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee with a recommendation to approve it for US\$30,000, without going back to the panel.

Comments of the Secretariat:

The panel invited the State Party to revise the request in a way that gives priority to the conservation of the mural paintings for a budget not exceeding US\$ 30,000. This recommendation was transmitted to the State Party on 20 April 2012. At the time of preparation of this document, no revised request has been received yet from the State Party. Therefore the Secretariat recommends that the Committee does not approve the request as it stands now and that it encourages the State Party to submit a revised version for a maximum amount of US\$ 30,000 for decision by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

Any new information received after the finalization of this document will be conveyed to the Committee at the time of discussion of this item.

II. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUEST FOR ATSIANANA FORESTS (MADAGASCAR) APPROVED IN 2010 BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

1. In accordance with Decision **34 COM 15.2** (Brasilia, August 2010), the World Heritage Committee approved an amount of US\$ 100,000 for 'Madagascar: Rainforests of the Atsinanana', under the category 'Conservation and Management', according to five modalities. Following a first report on the implementation of this decision at the 35th session of the Committee in 2011, the Committee requested the Centre to provide another update at the 36th session of the Committee in 2012 under the agenda item relating to International Assistance (Decision **35 COM 14**, paragraph 3).
2. The five modalities mentioned above have been implemented as follows:
 - a) Prior payment of arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

The arrears were settled on 29 November 2010, when Madagascar paid its contributions for 2009 and 2010. The dues up to 31 December 2011 have also been settled.

- b) The support should be channeled through reliable and recognized organizations selected by the World Heritage Centre in communication with relevant authorities.

The World Heritage Centre carefully reviewed who could be the most appropriate partner through which the support should be channeled. It identified several potential partners with the technical capacity to undertake the requested studies. The World Heritage Centre further identified the Madagascar National Parks Foundation as the most appropriate partner to coordinate these activities. This private Foundation was created jointly by the Madagascar Government and the major conservation NGOs operating in the country with a specific goal to support the Madagascar protected areas. It has an independent board and is audited regularly; it is already managing important budgets for conservation activities in different protected areas from different donors. The Foundation has set up a Technical Committee for World Heritage, composed of representatives from the Ministry of Forests, the Madagascar National Parks, which is the site management authority, and WCS and WWF, the NGOs working at Masoala and Marojejy National Parks, in order to follow up the International Assistance activities.

On 12 December 2010, a letter was sent to the Permanent Delegation of Madagascar to UNESCO, requesting their agreement to the proposed solution. Following this request, the Ministry for Forests decided to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Madagascar National Parks Foundation to clarify its role in the implementation of the International Assistance request. This MoU was signed in March 2011.

- c) Allocation of a first payment of US\$ 35,000 to cover mapping activities, inventories of threats, impact assessment and inventories of stocks of cut and remaining precious woods, and as foreseen in the request for assistance in Document WHC-10/34.COM/15. This assessment should be finalized prior to the organization of the World Heritage Centre / IUCN on-site monitoring mission (see Decision **34 COM 7B.2**)

The first installment of USD 35,000 of the approved assistance had been released following the implementation of the mapping activities, inventories of threats, impact assessment and inventories of stocks of cut and remaining precious woods by Madagascar National Parks Foundation. The corresponding results were made available to the reactive monitoring mission, which was undertaken from 23 May to 1st June 2011.

- d) Establishment of an Emergency Plan to define corrective measures, prepared jointly with the State Party and stakeholders during the World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission and approved by the State Party

In its decision **35 COM 7A.10** (UNESCO, 2011), the World Heritage Committee adopted as part of the corrective measures a series of urgent actions to halt illegal logging operations and included in the Emergency Plan.

- e) Allocation of a second payment of USD 65,000 as a contribution to the implementation of the Emergency Plan, subject to co-financing from the government and other donors.

The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to develop a proposal for the remaining USD 65,000 to assist with the implementation of these urgent actions. On 15 December 2011, the World Heritage Centre received a proposal of

action plan for the inventory and sale of timber stocks, including a budget. On 20 December 2011, the World Heritage Centre provided comments on the proposal, requesting for a clear strategy for the sale of all illegal timber stocks, ensuring the full participation of civil society and the international community as well as the involvement of independent observers. The letter also asked for clarifications on how the generated revenue would be used for conservation and the local communities, as well as on the methodology which would be used for the inventory of timber stocks. In response, the State Party on 6 February 2012 submitted a strategy addressing the issues related to precious timber, based on a “zero stock, zero logging and zero transporting” approach for rosewood and ebony. The attached documents also contained details on different aspects of the proposed inventory and timber sale. Although the submitted documents were an important step forward, the World Heritage Centre still had some important concerns. In particular, it considered that further clarifications were needed on whether the operation would also concern timber stocks detained by timber traders, as the monitoring mission had concluded these were all illegal. The World Heritage Centre further noted that no clear reply had been given on the proposed involvement of independent observers, which was a key element for the credibility of the process. Finally more clarifications were considered necessary on the precautions taken to ensure the credibility of the inventory which will be at the basis of the operation. These concerns were conveyed to the State Party by letter on 16 March 2012. At the time of preparation of this document, no reply has been received yet from the State Party.

At the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre also announced that during a side event at the 10th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, held at Nagoya in October 2010, the Minister for Environment of Norway had pledged USD 1,000,000 in support of addressing the threats which had resulted in inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thanks to the funding received from Bulgaria, the World Heritage Centre fielded a mission in September 2011 to develop a project proposal with the different stakeholders, in order to assist with the implementation of the corrective measures in complement to the support from the International Assistance. This project proposal amounting to USD 1.5 million has been finalized and is in the process of being submitted to the Norwegian authorities.

III. PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE THE INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROCESS

Note: this Part III contains proposed revisions of the *Operational Guidelines* which the open-ended working group on the *Operational Guidelines* may wish to take into account.

A. Proposals to amend 4 paragraphs related to International assistance priorities in the *Operational Guidelines*.

A.1. Clarify the priorities (paragraphs 235 and 238)

1. The Evaluation by UNESCO's External Auditor of the Global Strategy recommended to “reconsider the priority accorded to Preparatory Assistance in comparison to assistance for conservation and management and reinforce training in the field of management and conservation.” (recommendation 16, in document WHC-11/18.GA/8).

2. Currently, the paragraph 235 of the *Operational Guidelines* states that Preparatory assistance has the priority over Conservation and Management assistance:

The World Heritage Committee co-ordinates and allocates types of International Assistance in response to State Party requests. These types of International Assistance, described in the summary table set out below, in order of priority are:

- a) *Emergency assistance*
- b) *Preparatory assistance*
- c) *Conservation and Management assistance (incorporating assistance for training and research, technical co-operation and promotion and education).*

3. Therefore it is proposed to invert the order of priority as follows (inversion underlined), in order to fulfill recommendation n°16 of the External Auditor:

The World Heritage Committee co-ordinates and allocates types of International Assistance in response to State Party requests. These types of International Assistance, described in the summary table set out below, in order of priority are:

- a) *Emergency assistance*
- b) *Conservation and Management assistance (incorporating assistance for training and research, technical co-operation and promotion and education).*
- c) *Preparatory assistance*

4. Concerning the priorities for International Assistance, the current paragraph 238 reads as follows:

To support its Strategic Objectives, the Committee also allocates International Assistance in conformity with the priorities set out by Regional Programmes. These Programmes are adopted as follow up to Periodic Reports and regularly reviewed by the Committee based on the needs of States Parties identified in Periodic Reports (see chapter V).

5. In order to clarify the priorities, it is proposed to refer also to the Committee's decisions since they include, among others, decisions taken within the framework of the examination of the state of conservation reports. The revised paragraph 238 would therefore read as follows (additions are underlined):

To support its Strategic Objectives, the Committee also allocates International Assistance in conformity with the priorities set out by-in its decisions and in the Regional Programmes it adopts as a follow up to Periodic Reports (see para. 210). ~~These Programmes are adopted as a follow up to Periodic Reports and regularly reviewed by the Committee based on the needs of States Parties identified in Periodic Reports (see chapter V).~~

6. The mention of the revision of the Regional Programmes by the Committee would be more appropriate in chapter V, where paragraph 210 deals with the development of these Programmes.

A.2. Reintroducing the principle of earmarking (paragraph 240).

7. Following the examination of the Recommendations on International Assistance (document WHC.06/30.COM/14A, 23 June 2006), the earmarking of funds against the different types of International Assistance was discontinued by **Decision 30 COM 14A**, paragraph 5.c (Vilnius, 2006), which was confirmed by **Decision 31 COM 18B**, paragraph 5.e (Christchurch, 2007).
8. At that time, document WHC.06/30.COM/14A stated that "*When funds are depleted for one type, a request may be transferred to another type. These transfers raise serious*

questions about the practice of earmarking of funds for each of the five types of International Assistance”.

9. This remark concerned mostly training and technical cooperation assistance. But since the categories of technical cooperation and training were merged into one single category named “Conservation & Management” as of 2008 (see **Decision 30 COM 14A**, paragraph 5.b), the possibilities of transfers between the sub-categories no longer exist. The reason for discontinuing earmarking has disappeared.
10. Furthermore, it appeared that the earmarking, by setting a fixed envelop for each type of assistance, would help prioritizing the requests. A percentage allocated to each type of assistance could therefore be determined at the time of examination of the proposed World Heritage Fund budget, as of the next one (2014-2017).
11. Currently, paragraph 240 reads as follows:

A balance will be maintained in the allocation of resources for cultural and natural heritage. This balance is reviewed and decided upon on a regular basis by the Committee and during the last 3 months of each biennium by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

12. It is proposed to revise it as follows (additions are underlined):

A balance will be maintained in the allocation of resources for between cultural and natural heritage and between Preparatory and Conservation & Management Assistance. This balance is reviewed and decided upon on a regular basis by the Committee and during the last 3 months of each biennium by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

A.3. Set up some priorities for Preparatory Assistance in order to avoid funding nomination files with little/no chances of success (paragraph 241).

13. The fact that preparatory assistance for nominations has often not led to an inscription on the World Heritage List has been noted several times in the past, either by Committee members (for example in Christchurch, 2007, when examining the referred nomination of Sarazm, Tajikistan, under item 8B) or by the auditors: “*The efficacy of Preparatory Assistance with regard to the objectives of the Global Strategy appears mediocre. Only 28% (45) of the 185 properties concerned with Preparatory Assistance were inscribed... A better selection of properties proposed for Preparatory Assistance would avoid the waste of funds in preparing files that do not fulfill the criteria required by the Guidelines.*” (paragraph 16 of document WHC-11/18.GA/8).
14. Moreover, recommendation n°8 of the External Auditor in the Evaluation of the Global Strategy was to “*condition the granting of Preparatory Assistance destined for the establishment of tentative lists on the commitment to nominate in priority on these lists sites recognized by the Advisory Bodies as corresponding to gaps on the List and to participate in the experimental « Upstream » process aiming at evaluating potential outstanding universal value prior to the preparation of a nomination file*” – see document WHC-11/18.GA/8.
15. Furthermore, article 13.2 of the *World Heritage Convention* states that international assistance “*may also be concerned with identification of cultural or natural property... when preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would be justified.*”
16. Currently, paragraph 241 reads as follows:

[Preparatory] assistance may be requested to:

- (i) *prepare or update national Tentative Lists of properties suitable for inscription on the World Heritage List;*
- (ii) *organize meetings for the harmonization of national Tentative Lists within the same geo-cultural area;*
- (iii) *prepare nominations of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List (this may include the preparation of a comparative analysis of the property in relation to other similar properties - see 3.c of Annex 5).*
- (iv) *prepare requests for training and research assistance and for technical co-operation for World Heritage properties.*

Requests by States Parties whose heritage is un-represented or under-represented on the World Heritage List will be given priority for preparatory assistance.

17. It is proposed to revise it as follows (additions are underlined):

[Preparatory] assistance may be requested to (in order of priority):

- (i) *prepare or update national Tentative Lists of properties suitable for inscription on the World Heritage List; a commitment will be required from the State Party to nominate in priority on these lists sites recognized in approved thematic advice, such as the thematic studies prepared by the Advisory Bodies, as corresponding to gaps on the List;*
- (ii) *organize meetings for the harmonization of national Tentative Lists within the same geo-cultural area;*
- (iii) *prepare nominations of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List (this may include the preparation of a comparative analysis of the property in relation to other similar properties - see 3.c of Annex 5). Priority will be given to requests to prepare nomination files for sites recognized in approved thematic advice as corresponding to gaps on the List and/or for sites where preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would be justified, especially in the case of States Parties whose heritage is un-represented or under-represented on the World Heritage List.*
- (iv) *prepare requests for Conservation & Management assistance for consideration by the World Heritage Committee ~~for training and research assistance and for technical co-operation for World Heritage properties.~~*

B. PROPOSAL FOR A REVISED CALENDAR OF SUBMISSION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS.

- 18. Decision **30 COM 14A**, paragraph 7.g), stated that ‘the new International Assistance system consisting of a new application form, use of indicators and reporting requirements, new database, and Evaluation of Requests panel should go into effect on a pilot basis for two years no later than the 31st session in 2007’. Following the additional Decision **31 COM 18B**, all these elements were in place and implemented as of January 2008.
- 19. After four years of implementation, the panel acknowledges that the rigorous process in place is a guarantee of quality for the States Parties, but that there is no mechanism to prevent priority-requests (from LDCs, for sites in danger...) to face a lack of funding if they arrive in the second part of the biennium, especially in the current context of a constantly decreasing International Assistance budget.

20. Therefore, it is proposed to establish a yearly cycle for International Assistance, with one single deadline to receive and examine together all requests for Preparatory Assistance or Conservation and Management Assistance above US\$ 5,000 and only one or two panels per year, as a means of ensuring a fairer and more equitable distribution of International Assistance, respecting the priorities that have been set by the Committee. The advantage of such a calendar would be that it would give a good visibility and it would help prioritizing, since all the requests which could be approved under the budget of a given year would be known and examined together at the beginning of the year.
21. The practice of single yearly deadline for all applications has been in place for several years in other small grants programmes such as the ones from Ramsar, FFEM, GEF or the US Ambassador's Fund for Cultural Preservation, and for three years by the UNESCO 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Unlike the way these programmes operate, the possibility of revising requests will be retained. Nevertheless, revised requests not coming back within the year of their first examination will go to the panel again, in order to be assessed against the other requests of the year.
22. Therefore the calendar for International Assistance could be as follows:
- a) Deadline for submission of complete applications for Preparatory Assistance or Conservation and Management Assistance above US\$ 5,000 (meaning all fields filled in and request signed by the relevant authority): **31 October**;
 - b) Completeness check: **November**. Uncomplete forms which do not come back duly completed by 30 November will be sent back to the States Parties for submission to a next cycle;
 - c) First International Assistance panel **during the first annual meeting of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre (in January)**:
 - i) Requests for which the recommendation is positive or negative will be submitted to the Chairperson/the Committee for decision, depending on their amount;
 - ii) Requests which need a few revision and which are not supposed to be examined by the panel again must come back **at least eight weeks before the Committee session** (if they are above US\$ 30,000) or **before 31 October** (if they are from US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 30,000) within the year when they were examined first. If they arrive after these dates, they will be examined again by the panel of a next cycle;
 - iii) Requests for which the recommendation is 'for revision' and which should be submitted to a next panel will be sent back to the States Parties concerned to be revised. They must come back **at least two weeks before the second panel** within the year when they were examined first. If they arrive after this date, they will be examined by the panel of a next cycle.
 - d) Possible second International Assistance panel to give a final recommendation on requests that were 'for revision' at the close of the first panel (if any): **at least eight weeks before the Committee session**:
 - i) Requests for which the recommendation is positive or negative will be submitted to the Chairperson/the Committee for decision, depending on their amount;
 - ii) Requests which still need a few revision but which are not supposed to go to the panel again must come back **at least six weeks before the Committee session** (if they are above US\$ 30,000) or **before 31 October** (if they are from US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 30,000) within the year when they were

examined first. If they arrive after these dates, they will be examined by the panel of a next cycle;

- iii) Requests for which the recommendation is 'for revision' again and which should be submitted again to a next panel will be sent back to the States Parties concerned in order to be revised. They will be examined by the panel of a next cycle.
 - e) Decisions taken by the Committee on requests above US\$ 30,000: **during the Committee** session;
 - f) Notification of the decision taken by the Chairperson or the Committee to the States Parties: **within one month after the decision** was taken.
23. It has to be noted that the process for Emergency assistance requests will not change: they can be sent to the Secretariat any time during the year; they are commented by the Advisory Bodies (if they are above US\$ 5,000) and it is suggested to clarify that they do not go through the panel before being submitted to the Chairperson/the Committee for decision.
24. Consequently, the deadlines indicated in paragraph 241 of the *Operational Guidelines* should be modified to reflect the 31 October deadline.
25. Paragraph 252 of the *Operational Guidelines* should also be modified as follows (additions are underlined):

All requests for International Assistance of more than US\$ 5,000, except those of Emergency Assistance ~~up to and including US\$ 75,000~~, are evaluated by a panel composed of representatives of the World Heritage Centre Regional Desks and the Advisory Bodies, and if possible the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee or one vice-chairperson, meeting at least once or twice a year before action by the Chairperson and/or Committee. ~~Requests for the approval of the Chairperson can be submitted at anytime to the Secretariat and approved by the Chairperson after appropriate evaluation.~~ Requests for Emergency Assistance of up to and including US\$ 75,000 can be submitted at anytime to the Secretariat and will be submitted for approval by to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee or to the Committee at its next session for decision after comments by the Advisory Bodies and without examination by the panel.

26. Paragraph 254 of the *Operational Guidelines* should also be modified as follows (additions are underlined):

All requests for Preparatory Assistance or Conservation and Management Assistance of more than US\$ 5,000 for the approval of the Committee should be received by the Secretariat on or before ~~1 February~~ 31 October. These requests are submitted to the Committee at its next session. Uncomplete forms which do not come back duly completed by 30 November will be sent back to the States Parties for submission to a next cycle. Complete requests are examined by a first panel held in January during the meeting between the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies. Requests for which the panel issues a positive or a negative recommendation will be submitted to the Chairperson/Committee for decision. A second panel may be held at least eight weeks before the Committee session for requests which were revised since the first panel. Requests sent back for a substantial revision will be examined by the panel depending on their date of receipt. Requests requiring only minor revision and no further examination by the panel must come back within the year when they were examined first; otherwise they will be sent again to a next panel. The chart detailing the submission process is attached in Annex 8.

27. Finally, there is the case of the requests examined by the panel since its inception in 2008, for which the recommendation was to revise them, with or without a subsequent examination by the panel, and which have not come back yet. The following interim measure could apply: the requests revised subsequently to previous panels should be received by the Secretariat by 31 December 2012, in order to be assessed by the panel of January 2013. After 31 December 2012, they will be considered as new requests and subject to the rules of the yearly cycle.

IV. DRAFT DECISION

Draft Decision: 36 COM 14

The World Heritage Committee,

Part I

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/14 Part I,
2. Taking into account the panel's recommendation as well as the pressure on the International Assistance budget,
3. Decides not to approve the following request:
Jordan: The Quseir Amra conservation project;
4. Encourages the State Party to submit a revised request for a maximum amount of US\$ 30,000 under the category 'Conservation & Management', for decision by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

Part II

5. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/14 Part II,
6. Takes note of the status of implementation of the International Assistance request for Atsinanana Forests (Madagascar) approved in 2010 by the Committee;
7. Requests the Secretariat to submit a progress report on the implementation of this request at the 37th session of the Committee in 2013, under the agenda item relating to International Assistance.

Part III

8. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/14 Part III,
9. Considering the decrease in the International Assistance budget and the corresponding need for a strict prioritization of requests,
10. Taking also into account some of the recommendations made by the External Auditor in the Evaluation of the Global Strategy,
11. Decides to clarify the priorities in International Assistance and to reintroduce the earmarking in the International Assistance budget as of 2014, and approves the

corresponding modifications of paragraphs 235, 238, 240 and 241 of the Operational Guidelines as proposed by the Secretariat;

12. *Adopts the calendar proposed by the Secretariat for the yearly examination of International Assistance requests, to be implemented on an experimental basis until 2016, and approves the corresponding interim measure for pending requests as well as the modifications of paragraphs 241, 252 and 254 of the Operational Guidelines as proposed by the Secretariat;*
13. *Requests the Secretariat to submit a report on the implementation of the new calendar at the 40th session of the Committee in 2016, under the agenda item relating to International Assistance.*