

Distribution limited

WHC-2000/CONF.204/7
Paris, 16 November 2000
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fourth session

Cairns, Australia
27 November – 2 December 2000

Item 7.1. of the Provisional Agenda: Periodic Reporting: Report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage in the Arab States

SUMMARY

This document contains the final report of the synthesis of the periodic reports for the Arab Region submitted in accordance with the strategy approved by the 23rd session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1999 in Marrakesh (Morocco).

The report contains 10 Section I reports received from 12 States Parties scheduled for the exercise, and 36 Section II reports received on 43 sites participating in the exercise. It contains the conclusions and recommendations for the establishment of an action plan, which the World Heritage Centre can put in place after its eventual adoption by the Bureau in June 2001.

It is to be noted that ten sites have proposed new statements of significance, nine sites would need to revise their site boundaries and buffer zones, six sites have estimated that the values for which they were originally inscribed have changed, and finally one site (Tipasa in Algeria) requests the inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Decision required:

Paragraph 17: The Committee is requested to approve the final report contained in this document and to examine the proposals therein concerning the study of a plan of action conceived as a pilot project which has to be completed in order to cover the activities relative to the other regions of the world in future years and whose realization will be the responsibility of the World Heritage Centre, particularly in developing the framework of policies and strategies to be adopted by the World Heritage Committee for the next decade.

PERIODIC REPORTS OF THE ARAB REGION

Final report - October 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1- PREAMBLE	3
2- RECAPITULATION OF AGREED ACTIONS	3
2.1- Objectives.....	3
2.2- Guidelines, operational programme and timetable	4
2.2.1. Timetable	5
3- OPERATIONAL PHASES OF IMPLEMENTATION IN THE YEAR 2000.....	5
3.1- Regional Conference of Beirut (6-9 March 2000)	5
3.1.1 States invited having properties inscribed before 1993	5
3.1.1.1 The States	5
3.1.1.2 Properties inscribed before 1993	6
3.1.2 Objectives of the regional meeting:	6
3.1.3 Documentation at the disposal of the States Parties	6
3.1.4 The work of the meeting	7
3.1.4.1 The discussions	7
3.1.4.2 Recommendations:	8
3.2- National meetings.....	9
3.2.1 objectives	9
3.2.1.1 Presentation	9
3.2.1.2. Co-operation.....	9
3.2.1.3 Site visits	9
3.2.1.4 Assistance needs	9
3.2.2 States concerned	9
4- ELABORATION OF THE FINAL SUMMARY REPORT	10
4.1. Reception of the reports and processing of the information received	10
5- Introduction	12
PERIODIC REPORTS - SECTION I	12
6. Identification of cultural and natural properties	13
6.1. <i>National inventories</i>	13
6.2. <i>Tentative Lists</i>	14
6.3. <i>Proposals for Inscription</i>	14
7- Protection, conservation and presentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage	16
7.1 <i>Adoption of a general policy</i>	16
7.2 State of protection, conservation and presentation services	18
7.3 <i>Scientific and technical studies and research</i>	19
7.4 <i>Identification, conservation, presentation and promotion measures</i>	21
7.5 <i>Training</i>	23
8. International co-operation and fund raising.....	25
9. Education, information and strengthening of awareness raising	27
10- Introduction	28
PERIODIC REPORTS - SECTION II	28
11. Identification of World Cultural and Natural sites	30
11.1. <i>Information at the time of inscription</i>	30
11.2. <i>Updating of the Statement of Significance</i>	31
12. Statement of Authenticity / Integrity.....	32
13. Management	34
13.1 <i>Institutional and legal framework</i>	34
13.2 <i>Management and planning</i>	35
13.3 <i>Management plan of the site and statement of the objectives</i>	36
13.4 <i>Capacities in human and financial resources at the site level</i>	38
13.5 <i>Additional information concerning Protection and Conservation</i>	40
13.6 <i>Scientific, technical and educational studies</i>	42
13.7 <i>Other questions</i>	44
14. Factors affecting the property	46

14.1 Degree of threats.....	46
14.2. Prevention of human and natural threats and pressures	48
15. Monitoring	50
16- Lessons learned from the exercise.....	53
16.1.Concerning the questionnaire submitted to the States Parties.....	53
16.2.Concerning assistance and the method adopted	54
16.3.Concerning contradictions	55
16.4 In conclusion.....	55
17- Final Conclusions and Recommendations	57
Goal I - Identification of Properties	58
Goal II – Management Plans and Integrated Conservation.....	59
Goal III - Factors affecting Properties.....	60
Goal III (continued) – Preventive Conservation and Monitoring	61
Goal IV - Promotion of the Convention and the Inscribed Properties.....	62
Objectif V – Training and International Co-operation	63

PERIODIC REPORTS OF THE ARAB REGION

Final report - October 2000

By Abdelaziz Daoulatli and Hadi Saliba

1- PREAMBLE

The submission of periodic reports concerning the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the monitoring of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List results from decisions taken by the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention and the twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO. The monitoring exercise is clearly stipulated in Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention. The present exercise applies directly to the decisions of the twenty-second session of the Committee (paragraph VI - Methodology and Procedures for the Submission of Periodic Reports, pages 4-6; Annex III, pages 87-92).

It comprises two complementary aspects:

- the analysis and the implementation of the Convention at the level of each of the States Parties (**Section I**);
- the evaluation of the state of conservation of each of the sites inscribed before 1993 (**Section II**).

The reflection on the periodical reports initiated in 1982, led to conclusions and results more or less operational in 1993. That year, the Committee decided to devote for the first time a chapter of the budget to the systematic monitoring of the state of conservation of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The process of periodical submission of reports took shape during the twenty-first and the twenty-second sessions. At the same time, a regional approach was recommended in order to encourage regional co-operation and the exchange of information amongst States in the same region. Finally, a rigorous and flexible monitoring methodology was devised to enable consideration of the particularities and regional characteristics.

Concerning the implementation of the periodic reports, whilst stressing the responsibility of the States Parties with regard to their preparation, the Committee envisaged for this procedure, recourse in case of need and at the request of the States Parties, to outside assistance and advice, using consultants designated by the Secretariat and recruited as far as possible from the same region.

2- RECAPITULATION OF AGREED ACTIONS

2.1- Objectives

It is in this spirit and in application of these resolutions, that the conception of a methodological approach, the development of a budgeted action plan and the implementation of the submission of Periodic Reports were undertaken.

Document WHC-99/CONF.209/12, which presents the action plan for the Arab region, was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session from 24 November to 4 December 1999, in Marrakesh. It was defined as follows:

Within the Arab States, 12 State Parties will be called upon to prepare reports concerning 44 sites (41 cultural, 1 mixed, and 2 natural). The exercise for the Arab region, that should entirely take place in a period of less than eleven months, comprises the following phases:

- *An analysis of the information available at UNESCO and from the advisory bodies (inscription files, statutory reports, mission reports, etc.);*
- *An information and training phase for national officials who will be responsible for preparing the reports of their countries (regional seminar, preparatory work, national seminars);*
- *A phase of preparing national reports in which international consultants could participate in order to assist the States Parties;*
- *A phase of summarising the reports and presenting the regional report that should be ready in September 2000 for submission to the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee.*

The exercise carried out in the Arab Region, that will serve as a test for the other regions, will allow:

- (i) eventual harmonisation of the national tentative lists,
- (ii) validation of the utility of this exercise for the revision of previous proposals for inscription which are incomplete with regard to the new format,
- (iii) testing of the questionnaires with a view to the continuity of the exercise,
- (iv) validation of the criteria to the realities of the sites,
- (v) identification of regional and national priorities in terms of international co-operation,
- (vi) finally, improvement of the Secretariat's information on the sites inscribed, from which the States Parties will also benefit.

2.2- Guidelines, operational programme and timetable

In the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (WHC.99/2 - March 1999, Chapter II-B), the procedures for the submission of periodic reports which were almost non-existent in the earlier «*Guidelines*», have been extensively revised and elaborated in the new text adopted by the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1998. This is the text of reference for the implementation of Article 29 of the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage which should be recalled and serves as the basis of the Action Plan for the Arab region.

These texts are precise and provide a framework and means for the implementation of periodic reporting. The description of the procedure for the presentation of the periodic reports (according to Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6), provides a general framework that can be adapted to all regions, and on the basis of which action plans appropriate to each region should be defined.

These are concrete actions planned to result in the submission of periodic reports by the Arab States Parties to the Convention, according to a precise timetable and within the designated deadlines (December 2000).

This programme began in January 2000 and should be achieved with the adoption of the periodic reports by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee, in December 2000.

Within this timetable, two essential actions enabled the concrete implementation of the procedure for the preparation of periodic reports:

- 1) a regional meeting
- 2) national meetings

2.2.1. Timetable

October 1999	<i>Final elaboration of the action plan by the consultants in charge of Periodic Reports .</i>
December 1999 January 2000	<i>Adoption of the action plan by the 23rd session of the World Heritage Committee in Marrakesh</i>
December 1999 to March 2000	<i>Final elaboration of the documents and preparation of the regional meeting in Beirut (Lebanon)</i>
From 6 to 9 March 2000	<i>Regional meeting in Beirut on periodic reporting with the participation of the representatives of the States Parties.</i>
From 1st April to 15 July 2000	<i>Organisation of national meetings in the States with properties inscribed, and preparation of the Reports</i>
From 15 August to 15 October 2000	<i>1) Analysis and synthesis of the periodic reports by the consultants, 2)Final drafting of the regional report to submit to the Committee</i>
December 2000	<i>Examination of the regional report by the 24th session of the World Heritage Committee</i>

3- OPERATIONAL PHASES OF IMPLEMENTATION IN THE YEAR 2000

3.1- Regional Conference of Beirut (6-9 March 2000)

This is the most important event. It was conceived to be the main preparatory information and decision-making meeting in which participated, other than the representatives of the Arab States (one representative per State), the two consultants in charge of the conception and implementation of the Action Plan and representatives of the advisory bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN).

3.1.1 States invited having properties inscribed before 1993

3.1.1.1 The States

All 16 Arab States Parties to the Convention with or without sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, as well as the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait (not party to the Convention, which expressed the desire to adhere in the very near future), were invited to participate.

The delegates of 13 of the 16 Arab States Parties participated in the meeting. Kuwait was present as an observer. Bahrain, Qatar, Yemen and the Sudan did not attend.

STATES INVITED	Properties inscribed before 1993
1. ALGERIA	6 cultural sites + 1 mixed site
2. BAHREIN	no site inscribed
3. EGYPT	5 cultural sites
4. UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	no site
5. IRAQ	1 cultural site
6. JORDAN	2 cultural sites
7. KUWAIT	no site
8. LEBANON	4 cultural sites
9. LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	5 cultural sites
10. MAURITANIA	1 natural site
11. MOROCCO	3 cultural sites
12. OMAN	2 cultural sites
13. QATAR	no site
14. SAUDI ARABIA	no site
15. SUDAN	no site
16. SYRIA	4 cultural sites
17. TUNISIA	6 cultural sites + 1 natural site
18. YEMEN	2 cultural sites
TOTAL:	40 cultural sites
18 States invited	1 mixed site
14 States present	2 natural sites

3.1.1.2 Properties inscribed before 1993

- 41 cultural properties (including Jerusalem)
- 1 mixed property
- 2 cultural properties

The 41 cultural properties are actually 43, if one takes account of the fact that in the Sultanate of Oman, the site of Bat, Al-Khutm and Al-Ayn (No. 29, 30 and 31) are a series inscription which groups 3 sites in one inscription.

3.1.2 Objectives of the regional meeting:

The objectives of this workshop were to

1. *Explain the Regional Action Plan adopted by the Committee at its twenty-third session (December 1999) to the duly accredited representatives of their countries.*
2. *Obtain the adhesion of their countries to the operational programme as well as their active participation in this programme.*
3. *Promote regional co-operation, notably through the exchange of information and experience, in the framework of the application of the Convention and more particularly as concerns the periodic reports and monitoring.*
4. *Present and explain the format for the submission of the periodic reports.*
5. *Define the particular needs of the region in the field of assistance, with a view to the creation of systematic monitoring bodies and the elaboration of periodic reports.*

3.1.3 Documentation at the disposal of the States Parties

These documents are either of general interest, giving information on the Convention and the heritage of the region, or more specific to each country and each site, and presenting recapitulations of the assistance received, the missions carried out, the minutes of the Bureau and Committee meetings, etc.

For the most part, they were compiled from the documentation available at the World Heritage Centre and transmitted to the representatives of the States Parties present in Beirut. These documents were:

- Regional list of Arab properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.
- Table of properties inscribed by country and by type (natural, cultural, mixed).
- Table of the tentative lists of the Arab region.
- Review of the extracts of the recommendations and decisions of the Bureau and the Committee on the inscriptions and the state of conservation of the sites of the State concerned.
- Review of the extracts of the recommendations and decisions of the Bureau and the Committee on technical co-operation, international relations and the tentative lists.
- General recapitulative table of assistance provided to the Arab region.
- List of missions carried out by country and by site with a summary of the recommendations.
- Comparison of the new '97 nomination format and the old nomination forms.
- Format for the presentation of periodic reports.

All these documents are accessible directly on a site created specially for the periodic reports (www.unesco.org/whc/reporting/arab) and which gives all the information available at the Secretariat for each State, including the inscription files.

3.1.4 The work of the meeting

3.1.4.1 The discussions

Discussions occurred over five sessions and positive results were recorded: distribution of the programme of periodic reports in the region and better application of the content of the Convention to guarantee better conservation conditions of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The participants studied the format for the periodic reports, the inherent difficulties, and ways to overcome them. They then discussed the national meetings to be organised and their modalities. Whilst reaffirming that the preparation of these reports was the responsibility of each State Party, they requested the World Heritage Centre to make available all necessary assistance to this end.

Finally, the participants stressed the possible benefits from inter-Arab co-operation and with the World Heritage Centre.

The following points were stressed during the discussions:

1. Encourage the Arab States that have not yet ratified the Convention to do so and to encourage the States already Party to the Convention to quickly submit their properties for inscription on the World Heritage List ;
2. Introduce the issue of heritage conservation into policies for sustainable development in order to attain economic, cultural and social balance and encourage the responsible heritage authorities to establish strategies and frameworks of action at the national level to implement the Convention ;

3. Co-ordinate the actions of the Cultural Heritage and Education sectors of UNESCO, to introduce the issue of the preservation of the natural and cultural heritage in education programmes, and encourage the authorities of the States Parties and the national agencies to develop programmes for heritage identification and promotion, and more particularly for World Heritage.

3.1.4.2 Recommendations:

1. Revise, systematise and harmonise the updating of the tentative lists at the levels of countries, sub-regions and the entire Arab region.

2. Improve the balance of inscriptions between the different types of properties (cultural and natural), so they are more equitable and representative of the diversity of the heritage of the Arab countries and in proportion with the properties inscribed in the other regions of the world.

3. Give greater consideration to the notion of authenticity, such as defined in the Nara document, whilst respecting the specific characteristics of the heritage of the Arab region.

4. Systematic and orderly archiving at the Secretariat of all the documents, calling upon the States Parties, where necessary, to supplement and complete them. Establish files for properties inscribed, those on the tentative lists and those presented for inscription and include all the information concerning each property, each country and the region to which they belong. Priority should be given to the state of conservation, maintenance and rehabilitation.

5. It is necessary to revise and update the old nomination forms which were used in the inscription of the properties of the Arab Region, in order to bring them into conformity with the 1997 format. This operation would be planned in accordance with the means and the reciprocal resources of the States Parties and the Secretariat. This revision should begin within the framework of the elaboration of the periodic reports and the missions to be carried out in this context.

6. To facilitate the monitoring operations for the application of the World Heritage Convention and the drafting of the periodic reports, all efforts should be made to assist these States in accordance with their requests, whilst taking account of both the complexity of the operation and the extreme care with which it should be carried out.

7. The Arab region being the first region to produce periodic reports, all efforts should be made to assist these States in accordance with their requests, whilst taking account of both the complexity of the operation and of the extreme care with which it should be carried out.

8. Request the World Heritage Committee to discuss the modalities for application of the international Convention with regard to sites covering large areas.

9. Request the World Heritage Committee to examine specific modalities to encourage the representatives of the natural sites to participate in its work, at the global and regional levels, for example by organising special meetings and workshops related to these sites or by any other similar activities.

10. The participants reiterate the necessity of working to prevent the dangers that threaten the city of Jerusalem inscribed on the World Heritage List, particularly under pressure from the profound and dangerous upheavals being experienced in the region.

11. In view of the tourism project that threatens to disfigure the World Heritage Site of Byblos, the regional Arab workshop recall the need to preserve the values and criteria that enabled the inscription of this site, and expresses its full sympathy with the municipality of Byblos.

In conclusion, the participants expressed their satisfaction with the high quality of the documentation presented and the organisation of the meeting. They also expressed their satisfaction with the new Internet site devoted to the World Heritage of the Arab States, and praised the efforts made to present all the documents in Arabic and to facilitate the discussions in the Arabic language.

3.2- National meetings

3.2.1 objectives

National meetings were organised, at the request of the States Parties, by the Secretariat and, following the regional meeting, were intended to bring together the site managers as well as the national or local persons directly concerned by the conservation of the sites.

The consultants, chosen by common accord by the State concerned and the Secretariat, had the following main tasks:

3.2.1.1 Presentation

Present the format for the presentation of the periodic reports on the application of the World Heritage Convention to the participants.

3.2.1.2. Co-operation

Co-operate with the national authorities and assist them in drawing up the periodic reports.

3.2.1.3 Site visits

Visit the sites concerned by the periodic reporting, and provide advice and evaluations to the national authorities, site managers and persons responsible as to their state of conservation.

3.2.1.4 Assistance needs

With the persons responsible for the sites, define their particular needs, especially with regard to various assistance.

3.2.2 States concerned

Only the 12 States having properties inscribed on the World Heritage List before 1993 were concerned by these meetings:

Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Mauritania, Oman, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Yemen.

Of the 12 States concerned, all requested the assistance of a consultant for the organisation of national and/or local meetings, but only 6 States received this assistance: *Algeria, Morocco, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Oman.*

For the others, Tunisia, Egypt and Lebanon, the Centre called upon local or associated experts.

In Jordan and in Iraq, a delegate of the UNESCO Office in Amman assisted the national authorities.

To carry out these missions, the experts made use of the above-mentioned documentation, which exists on a Web site devoted to, and made available to, the Arab countries (www.unesco.org/whc/reporting/arab/).

The City of Jerusalem, although officially inscribed by Jordan, was not considered in the framework of the periodic reports of the Arab region.

4- ELABORATION OF THE FINAL SUMMARY REPORT

4.1. Reception of the reports and processing of the information received

In accordance with the calendar, the States Parties were advised of the necessity of submitting their Periodic Reports before 15 August 2000, in order to give the consultants sufficient time to undertake the necessary analyses and synthesis, and to draft the final report, due to be completed in October, for submission to the World Heritage Committee at its 24th session 27 November- 2 December 2000. That was not the case for most of the countries. Only Yemen was able to submit its reports by the deadline.

Unfortunately, in spite of our insistence and the obvious interest shown by the persons in charge of organisation in the Arab States and responsible for the heritage, most of the reports arrived at the Secretariat of the Centre several weeks late; others never arrived. Consequently, the reports analysed hereafter were received during the period from 1 September to 5 October 2000.

At that date, 10 reports for Section I and 36 reports for Section II had been received. These documents were analysed for the final report on the Arab region.

Finally, on 12 October the Section II report for the Banc d'Arguin (Mauritania) was received, followed on 30 October, by the Section I report for Algeria. However, these two reports were received too late to be taken into account in the following analysis.

Their erratic submission over such a long period (15 August to 5 October 2000), hindered the progress of the study. It should be recalled that it was absolutely necessary to terminate the final report for the Committee before the end of October. If all the reports had been received at the Centre at 15 August 2000, there would have been two full months to analyse them in depth.

Because more than half of the reports were still missing on 15 September, only partial progress could be made at that date, which cut the amount of time for processing and analysing the reports in half (one month instead of two).

The theoretical period for the drafting of the reports by the persons in charge in the States, was from the 1 April to the 31 July 2000. However, the reports were almost all drafted after the 1st of June and they mostly rushed their submission to the Centre after the deadlines and in various forms: some by direct mail, others through the Permanent Delegations to UNESCO, and others by e-mail.

This delay was probably caused by the fact that, as all the countries had requested expert assistance, the persons responsible preferred to wait for the arrival of the experts before beginning to draft their reports.

The documentation that accompanied the reports received unfortunately did not meet expectations. It seems that the allotted time was too short for the writers to draft the reports and prepare all the necessary documentation to provide better information. (See the tables on the status of the reports received in the introductions to Sections I and II).

The following observations can be made on the reports received:

- Of the **44** properties in Section II, **8** were not reported on, or their reports did not arrive in time to be examined, or else they were not solicited to do so (1 property). The only two natural properties, either did not make a report (Ichkeul National Park in Tunisia), or did not present the report in time (Banc d'Arguin in Mauritania).
- Of the **12** States with properties inscribed, **1** State did not submit a report on Section I, relative to its situation in regard to the Convention: Libya. Algeria's report, which arrived 30 October 2000, was not submitted in time to be included in this analysis.

- Of the **12** States with inscribed properties, **4** did not submit reports on all the properties concerned: Algeria (3 sites), Oman (1 site), Tunisia (2 sites) and Mauritania (the report on the Banc d'Arguin was received too late).

In spite of the lack of response, the results of this exercise, the first of its kind, remain very positive. The reports received (for both Section I and Section II), total about 1500 pages of text and 250 questions posed. We are thus informed with more or less detail and precision, of the status of the adaptations of the countries in regard to the Convention and the state of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

From all the above, after careful examination, analysis, and synthesis of the replies received, it was possible to draw conclusions and recommendations for improving the conservation conditions of these properties.

We would have wished to process the information electronically, through a computerized information management system. Unfortunately the periodic report format was not designed to enable this type of treatment, and it was thus necessary to proceed in the most traditional manner, by regrouping the information in the form of tables (by types of questions and themes), mostly using percentages. The statistics were analysed and accompanied by remarks, comments and other observations. The conclusions drawn on the state of the properties and their national environment attempt to be as objective as possible. Finally, the proposals for actions are presented in the form of recommendations for the future.

On one side, the periodic reports could bring improvements to the properties, to the States and to the Region, and on the other side to the World Heritage Committee. However, this will require the definition of a medium-term strategy. We have proposed the broad outline of an action plan, the execution of which could be extended over a period of five or ten years, according to the available means.

To this end, we have grouped at the end of this report, the conclusions and recommendations made following the analyses of the different sections of the study.

Of all the possible actions, we have retained those that seem to require priority and urgent action, taking account of the recommendations of the participants in the Beirut Meeting. The many positive results of that meeting already enable us to propose the convening of other meetings of the same type, according to a regular schedule that remains to be determined.

Periodic Reports - Section I

APPLICATION OF THE CONVENTION BY THE STATES PARTIES

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF THE STATES PARTIES' REPORTS

5- Introduction

As explained above, this analytical document will cover the ten Section I reports received. It is regrettable that Algeria's report was received too late to be included in this analysis, and that Libya was not able to submit its report.

It is unfortunate that these two countries could not be included in this part of the final report, as together they have 12 World Heritage sites inscribed, representing 27% of the sites inscribed before 1993.

Consequently, the following reports will be included in the analysis: Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Mauritania, Oman, Syria, Tunisia and Yemen.

The documents received are essentially the questionnaires, sometimes accompanied (rarely) by documentation. The administrations in charge of Heritage in the different countries should be recontacted in this regard, in order to obtain all the missing documents which are indispensable for the constitution of a coherent data base that is as complete as possible.

Status of the submissions and type of reports received:

PERIODIC REPORTS - SECTION I

States Parties	Received	Documents	Legislation	Other
ALGERIA	30/10/2000			
EGYPT	22/09/2000		Antiquities Law	
IRAQ	25/09/2000			
JORDAN	03/09/2000			
LEBANON	10/08/2000		Antiquities Law	
LIBYA	Not received			
MOROCCO	04/09/2000			List of personnel
MAURITANIA	21/09/2000			
OMAN	03/09/2000			
SYRIA	10/09/2000			
TUNISIA	29/09/2000		Heritage Code	
YEMEN	29/07/2000	Five-year plan for Gophcy	Law of 1983	List of personnel and budgets

6. Identification of cultural and natural properties

6.1. National inventories

		YES	NO	Type of inventory	Observations
a	Preparation of lists or inventories, dates	9		C. 9 N. 1	<p>Natural: Oman, under preparation, Jordan, foreseen</p> <p>Cultural: Syria, under preparation Lebanon, since 1933 ? Yemen, no inventory, except foreseen for Wadi Hadramout.</p>
b	Institutions responsible for the preparation and update of these national inventories	10			<i>Always departments or organisms responsible for preservation, including in Yemen</i>

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of the 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are from Algeria and Libya.

With the exception of Algeria and Libya which have not completed Section I of the Periodic Report, and Yemen which states that it does not yet possess an inventory for cultural properties, all the remaining nine countries, (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Mauritania, Oman, Syria, Tunisia), have only an inventory of cultural heritage. Only the Sultanate of Oman is presently establishing an inventory for natural heritage. These inventories remain for the most part under preparation, with no fixed date for their completion.

The names of the institutions, organisms or administrations, responsible in principle for the cultural and natural inventories, are provided. For natural heritage the following are cited:

- "Royal Society for Conservation of Nature" in Jordan,
- "UNESCO National Committee" in Egypt

Finally, Yemen, which requests international assistance to launch an inventory of its heritage, disposes of two institutions responsible for heritage, GOPHCY for historic cities and GOAMM for antiquities.

These inventories are carried out in different ways, and we have noted that:

- In Lebanon, the response gives the impression of confusion between the notions of a general inventory and classification.
- Tunisia, with its "division of Inventory and Research" in the framework of the INP (National Heritage Institute), is preparing an archaeological map covering a third of the territory. A computerised cartography of cultural heritage (IPAMED) is underway in the network programme "UNIMED HERITAGE", in partnership with France and Italy and with the participation of several countries north and south of the Mediterranean.

No information on the modalities of the inventories, nor of the incidences of the inventory and the nomination process has been received. Furthermore, inventories for cultural landscapes and natural sites have not yet been carried out.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE INVENTORY

1. Assist States Parties which so request, in the preparation of inventories of their cultural and natural heritage, more particularly for natural and mixed sites, and cultural landscapes.
2. Organise meetings between persons responsible for the inventories in the Arab Region, to study the possibility to standardise the inventory systems implemented in the respective countries, particularly taking into account the ongoing experience of IPAMED. (Computerised Heritage Cartography).

6.2. Tentative Lists

		YES	NO	Observations
a	Submission of the lists	7	2	Negative responses: Jordan, Oman
b	Dates of submission	6		New submission in 2000: Iraq
c	Dates de revision	3	2	Revisions: Egypt, Morocco, Yemen
d	Preparation and revision process	4	1	Egypt: No-response Morocco: addition of 4 natural sites Yemen: hazard Tunisia: ICOMOS Tunisia
	Association of local authorities	1	5	
	Association of the community	2	4	Yemen: learned persons were associated
	Responsible institution	7		

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Only eight of the ten countries having submitted a Section I report, have tentative lists accepted as complying with the Operational Guidelines. Some claim earlier tentative lists updated or not: Egypt (1994), Iraq (June 2000), Lebanon (1996), Morocco (1995 and 1998), Syria (June 1999), Tunisia (1998), Yemen (1980 and 1989) ; others have not responded (3 countries).

Preparation of tentative lists remains for the most part, a closed process, with neither the local authorities nor the population being consulted. The only exception is Morocco, which recently began to work in a consultative manner.

The national authorities do not yet give the same importance to tentative lists as the Convention does.

It is recalled that the WHC has prepared the translation into Arabic of the Convention, the Operational Guidelines, the format for the tentative list, the format for nominations, the documents for periodic reporting and all the forms for requests for international assistance. This has been done to better inform the national bodies and assist them in the implementation of the Convention.

6.3. Proposals for Inscription

		YES	NO	Observations
a	List the sites which have been proposed for inscription on the World Heritage List.	8		-Mauritania: C. 2 -Lebanon: C. 5 -Yemen: C. 3 -Morocco: C. 7 -Oman: C. 2, N. 1 -Syria: C. 4 -Egypt: C. 15, N. 2 -Iraq: C. 7
b	- Analysis of collaboration and co-operation with local authorities and the population,	4	1	Tunisia and Egypt did not reply - Lebanon : No methods - Yemen : nominations initiated by foreigners, with obstacles: no awareness, or inventory - Jordan : Subsequent difficulties with the population at Petra. - Morocco : co-operation for recent nominations, improvement. - Oman : Motivation: transmission to future generations - Syria : Motivation: great wealth of heritage of universal value.
	- Analysis of the preparation process for nominations,	6		
	- Analysis of motivation,	4	1	
	- Analysis of obstacles and difficulties met during the process	4	2	
	- Advantages perceived and lessons learnt.	6	1	

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a):

The answers do not always reflect the reality. Apart from Egypt and Iraq, the writers give the figures corresponding to the number of sites inscribed and not the number of sites proposed for inscription. This makes any analysis hazardous.

Question (b):

The persons in charge have informed us of difficulties in the preparation of nomination dossiers. The responses are more informative than those for the tentative lists. Without being analytical, they provide information on the modalities for establishing these nomination dossiers.

As for the tentative lists, there was little consultation during the preparation of the dossiers. The principal motivations are those of the national decision-makers who

choose the properties to be inscribed in function with historical, prestigious, or tourist criteria, or in the case of Oman, the transmission to future generations. Yemen explained that the nominations of its three sites came on the initiatives of non-Yemenis.

Finally, some countries have requested overall assistance, starting from the establishment of the inscription dossier to the preparation of documentation required at the moment of inscription.

In general, with regard to the tentative lists and the preparation of nominations, responses are often negative as concerns consultation of the populations and the local authorities and poorly detailed with regard to obstacles, difficulties encountered, advantages perceived and lessons learnt.

Consequently, it would appear that a large number of dossiers whose sites were inscribed according to the former procedures and nomination forms, would today have been either rejected or deferred until a later date, as not being in conformity with the requirements, or for lack of information or management plans for example.

This clearly demonstrates the need for the countries of the Arab Region to pay more attention to the implications of their adhesion to the World Heritage Convention in its implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Strengthen preparatory assistance to States Parties who request it with a view to helping them to prepare:

- a) tentative lists or their update,
- b. nomination dossiers of sites listed on the tentative lists,

and encourage the harmonisation of tentative lists at the sub-regional level and in the Arab Region through the organisation of regional and sub-regional meetings between the responsible parties.

7- Protection, conservation and presentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage

	YES	NO	No response	Observations
a Describe the efforts made by your country to integrate Heritage in a national management and development policy , at the following levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national • provincial • local 	5 4 4	2	4	-Iraq: Annual budget for preservation -Jordan: 5% study costs, devoted to Heritage and environment -Lebanon: miscellaneous by Ministries of tourism, environment and urbanism -Morocco: awareness strategy -Syria: 5-year plan, no integration strategy in the development process -Tunisia: Code for heritage protection (1994) -Yemen: policy exists, but not priority

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

There was a high proportion of non-response to this question. Jordan made a real effort, because it imposed a 5% tax to go to Heritage on all building studies.

Tunisia made an important effort in the adoption of very modern legislation, the

"Code for Heritage Protection" of 1994. However, we are aware that major difficulties exist for its strict application, in spite of all the benefits of this Code for the safeguarding and integration of Heritage.

It is difficult, in the light of the responses, to measure the efforts described. The non-responses and negative ones, in majority (6), demonstrate that the integration of Heritage in a national policy is a process which is still in the making within the Arab Region.

7.1 Adoption of a general policy

	YES	NO	Observations
a Existence of policies and plans aiming at assigning a function of cultural and natural heritage in a community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing • Operational • Being established • Envisaged 	3 2 2	3	-Egypt: under preparation -Iraq: no details, but since 1950 -Jordan: tourism projects -Morocco: integration efforts for Heritage in adapted policies -Mauritania: governmental policy adopted, safeguarding strategy + action plans -Syria: no response
b <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration in general planning • Liaison with national conservation strategy 	6	2	-Mauritania: policy co-ordination unit. -Oman: national development and national strategy plan for conservation. -Tunisia: Strategy and feasibility study
c Progress since their adoption	3		-Jordan: resources generated by the populations -Mauritania: apprehension of the cultural planning concept and the durability of the actions – comprehension of the cultural dimension of sustainable development. -Oman: protected areas, restoration, craftsmanship.
Desired fields for improvement	6		-Iraq: more excavations, Web site for Hatra. -Jordan: Better restoration and preservation. -Lebanon: Presentation, protection, conservation. -Morocco: training, revision of laws, co-ordination between culture and nature. -Oman: restoration of national heritage -Yemen: desire to adopt a policy adapted to Heritage.

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a)

This question takes into consideration heritage for its cultural, natural, environmental, economical and social values, as well as its contribution to development. There are very few affirmative responses.

- In Lebanon: regret for the absence of such a policy ;
- In Mauritania: recent definition by the Counsel of Ministers of a cultural policy integrating a strategy for the preservation of heritage.
- In Egypt: this policy is in the process of being elaborated.

Question (b)

In some cases, the integration of Heritage, is envisaged in the restricted field of tourist development (Jordan). Liaison with a national strategy is not well explained. Some actions, studies and co-ordination initiatives are cited. Only Oman mentions a development plan and a national strategy for conservation.

Question [c]

Progress achieved and described is not, on the whole, due to these policies, but are attempts and projects aimed at developing such a policy. They concern the following fields:

These countries have not yet succeeded in giving the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community, despite considerable efforts and numerous, very positive adaptations. Attempts have been made, but they are not systematic. This policy cannot be solely dependent upon the institutions responsible for the preservation of Heritage. To be really effective, the integration and co-ordination of heritage policies must be the responsibility of the highest authorities, who will give it the widest and strongest support.

RECOMMENDATION

Given the need and urgency that protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage be the object of true national strategies aiming at their integration into social and economic development plans, and land management and development, States Parties are requested to pool their efforts within the Arab Region and with the help

- Better means for protection and better specialised institutions in the case of Morocco (The Institute of, and Direction for, Cultural Heritage, established respectively in 1985 and 1988).
- In Morocco and Tunisia: a better understanding of the importance of the role of heritage in development. Tunisia is establishing, through World Bank funding, a global strategy study, for the integration of heritage into planning and economic and social development.
- In Syria, Morocco, Iraq and Jordan: details are provided on efforts made to integrate heritage into national policy and to assign it a new function.... However, no mention is made of existing strategies or planning underway.

The areas where improvement is desired, are better human resources (Yemen, Tunisia, Mauritania) and financial, logistical and technical resources (Syria, Yemen...). The Iraqis wish for new archaeological discoveries, the Jordanians and the Omanis, a better restoration of national Heritage.

and assistance of UNESCO and other international bodies, to achieve this objective in the short or medium term.

One possible action is the preparation and elaboration of a charter on the integration of conservation in the plans for economic, social and land development.

7.2 State of protection, conservation and presentation services

		YES	NO	Observations
a	Dependence of services responsible for protection			
	• ministry	8	1	
	• interministerial committee	1	1	
	• multisectoral committee	3		
b	Responsibility for these services			
	• protection/conservation	8		
	• presentation	7		
	• exploitation	4		
c	Means			
	• appropriate staff	8		
	• others	3		- Jordan : Petra National Trust - Oman : staff according to needs - Syria : 120 architects, 50 archaeologists, workshops
d	Fields where improvement is desirable and where the States Parties concentrate their efforts	10		- Egypt : management, conservation, GIS - Iraq : digs, restoration, presentation - Jordan : co-ordination with developers - Lebanon : increase number of qualified staff - Morocco : training, legislation, co-ordination, awareness raising, labs, material and financial means - Mauritania : technical experience, qualified staff, modern work methods, communication, logistics - Oman : cartography, budget training - Syria : training, transportation, computer training, lab, workshops - Yemen : training, legislation, funding, awareness raising, decentralisation, management, co-ordination

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a)

In Mauritania, there exists a National Heritage Council having as its mission the co-ordination of programmes and strategies implemented by the executive structures, such as the National Foundation for the Safeguarding of Ancient Cities. Elsewhere, the Ministries for Culture (Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Syria, Lebanon...), of Tourism and Antiquities (Jordan), for Culture and Tourism (Yemen) ensure the responsibility for the services in charge of Cultural Heritage. The Ministries for Environment, when they exist, manage the natural heritage. Only the Sultanate of Oman has a National Heritage Ministry which manages all heritage, cultural and natural.

Questions (b) and [c]

The responsibility of the protection services (Directions, Institutes, Agencies...), covers all the areas of protection, conservation, presentation and exploitation. More often than not, the staff available is insufficient.

Question (d)

The areas where improvement is desirable are for the most part concentrated on the training and recruitment of competent professionals in all fields. The lack of equipment and especially financial resources is frequently emphasised.

Mauritania and Yemen furthermore regret the lack of co-ordination between the different actors responsible for Heritage protection.

Despite their demonstrated will in executing their tasks, and often under difficult circumstances, the Heritage Services are very ill-equipped, lack staff, skills, material and funding. These services appear to suffer from a lack of integration of their activities into a wider development arena. If this were the case, they could perhaps have easier access to the means which for the moment are not available to them.

7.3 Scientific and technical studies and research

		YES	NO	Observations
a	Important scientific and technical studies or research projects of a generic nature destined to benefit World Heritage sites, which have been started or achieved since the last periodic report.	10		- Egypt : Studies and GIS in preparation - Iraq : 2 theses - Jordan : 4 reports and studies - Lebanon : 5 studies - Morocco : doctorates and publications - Mauritania : 3 studies on the old cities - Oman : no details - Syria : 3 projects and studies in co-operation - Tunisia : inventory of listed sites - Yemen : restoration, construction methods, traffic, gardens, material
b	Are study results available so that directors of sites or the local population can benefit for the protection and conservation of heritage?	9		- Lebanon : results made available and published - Morocco : seminars, congresses, media - Mauritania : limited information, unreliable - Oman : access to archives, round tables, media - Tunisia : documentation, 300 files listed by site, data base, etc. - Yemen : minimal availability
c	List the areas where improvement would be desirable and upon which the State Party is concentrating its efforts.	8		- Iraq : digs, scientific studies - Jordan : digs, preservation, management, tourism - Lebanon : documentation for presentation - Morocco : research, publications, funding for research, international co-operation, NGO - Mauritania : better local resources, integrated development, funding, safeguarding strategy, monitoring reports and systematic evaluation - Oman : prepare 5-year action plan - Syria : management and presentation - Yemen : funding, equipment, information data bases

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a)

-No negative responses to this question. The studies and research cited remain however, for the most part, of an archaeological or historical nature: articles, thesis, monographs, seminar reports. Studies devoted to the fields of conservation, restoration and presentation are rarely undertaken.

-However, the global strategy study on « Heritage and Development » undertaken in Tunisia with assistance from The World Bank merits mention.

-In terms of scientific and technical documentation, there is little mention of the existence of specialized centres inside the official heritage agencies.

Question (b)

-In Yemen and Syria, it appears that studies, publications, reports and other documents undertaken bilaterally are not always made available (even in a photocopied form), to the competent national services.

-In Egypt, a Documentation Centre for Cultural and Natural Heritage exists, CULTNAT.

-In Tunisia, the Association for the Safeguarding of the Medina of Tunis has a Documentation Centre specialising in the historic city.

Question [c]

-Amongst the desired improvements concerning studies and research, the need to carry out more in-depth studies on site management and the elaboration of action plans is more particularly emphasised. According to certain reports, this research should be given priority, especially as regards the aspect of co-operation.

-More precisely, Morocco proposes to finance a study of world heritage properties with the following goals:

1. update the declarations of value, including the criteria.
2. involve all the actors.
3. propose participative management.

4. bring the heritage potential of development policies.
properties into the arena of

The reports demonstrate what we already know, that major studies and research have been carried out at a large number of World Heritage sites. In the majority of cases, these studies have been carried out by foreign missions. More and more frequently, theses and studies are undertaken by local researchers in co-operation with national or foreign universities and research centres.

However, it is the availability of documentation and the management of foreign missions which are causing problems, notably in the cases of Syria, Yemen and Mauritania. The foreign missions unfortunately rarely deliver their mission reports to the national authorities. In the case of Yemen, another problem arises because even if such studies were made available, they would not automatically be transmitted to the services responsible for Heritage.

7.4 Identification, conservation, presentation and promotion measures

	YES	NO	Observations
<p>a -Legal and administrative measures for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation, promotion of heritage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific legislation • Impact on the WH Convention • Comment <p>-Are restoration and conservation a priority consideration?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions undertaken to identify sites • Actions undertaken to encourage participation • Actions undertaken to involve the private sector 	<p>7</p> <p>5</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>-Egypt: sites supported by local funds, bilateral co-operation and UNESCO</p> <p>-Iraq: annual budgets, equipment and staff, recruitment local staff</p> <p>-Jordan: planning prior to excavation authorisation</p> <p>-Lebanon: laws, decrees, decisions, but priority for reconstruction, co-operation with private specialised offices</p> <p>-Morocco: national debate</p> <p>-Mauritania: strengthening of institutional framework, symposia</p> <p>-Oman: measures for handicrafts and rehabilitation, free expertise from the private sector</p> <p>-Syria: revision antiquities law, local labour at site</p> <p>-Tunisia: several decrees and laws, important technical and human means, study of protection plans, presentation</p> <p>-Yemen: no measures undertaken</p>
<p>b - Is a reform of the general policy and/or legal policy judged necessary?</p>	6	4	
<p>c Other conventions signed.</p> <p>How is the application of these different legal instruments coordinated and integrated into national policy and planning?</p>	7		<p>-Iraq: 2 conventions</p> <p>-Jordan: 7 conventions</p> <p>-Lebanon: 7 conventions, national committees and voted laws</p> <p>-Morocco: 2 conventions</p> <p>-Oman: 7 conventions</p> <p>-Syria: 2 conventions</p> <p>-Yemen: 7 conventions</p>
<p>d Appropriate scientific and technical measures undertaken for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and promotion of cultural and natural heritage.</p>	7	1	<p>-Egypt: Inadequate measures</p> <p>-Iraq: conferences, research specialists and university graduates, test laboratories</p> <p>-Jordan: university budget, research institutes, public security</p> <p>-Lebanon: studies</p> <p>-Morocco: restoration, inventory, digs, archaeological map</p> <p>-Oman: funding</p> <p>-Yemen: research and handicraft centres</p>
<p>e Media mobilised</p>	7		
<p>f Areas where improvement is desired and to which States Parties devote their efforts</p>	9		<p>-Egypt: GIS, risk maps, conservation, analyses, various studies</p> <p>-Iraq: digs, restoration, presentation in the media and schools</p> <p>-Jordan: scientific funding, training, technical activities, Internet, funds</p> <p>-Lebanon: publications, CD-ROM, films, Web</p> <p>-Morocco: publication of studies, involvement of authorities and local populations</p> <p>-Mauritania: new technologies, media, awareness raising, delimitation of responsibilities and co-ordination in the heritage field</p> <p>-Oman: international publications,</p> <p>-Syria: multimedia and the Web</p> <p>-Yemen: education, Internet, TV, publications, bilingual guides</p>

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a)

-The cultural heritage of the Arab Region is protected by specific national laws of which the impact on the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List is undeniable. Some of these laws are quite old, may require updating (1933 in Lebanon), are already updated (Syria) or have been entirely revised (Algeria, Tunisia...). In the responses, they are never judged as being inoperative.

-All the countries prepare or envisage reorganisation or improvement of their laws.

-Concerning the priority given to restoration and conservation, the responses are less precise and relate to national debates, bilateral co-operation or diverse measures.

-With regard to participation of the local community, the measures most often cited are the use of local labour.

-The private sector is involved in the role of provider of services, free or remunerated.

Question (b)

-Opinions differ regarding the need to reform the general policy. The desired changes focus more on the operational management structures than the legal ones, especially in Yemen, Mauritania....

- Six positive responses: Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Mauritania, Yemen, Morocco;
- Four negative responses: Syria, Oman, Jordan, Tunisia.

-In Egypt, in spite of the clearly expressed wish for reform, neither the legal procedure in force, nor the heritage

conservation policy adopted, are questioned.

-In fact, the opinions expressed, whether they be positive or negative, often lack clear justification in their support. The only exception is Yemen, which supports the need on the basis that the problems are not treated in a fundamental manner.

-Mauritania judges the situation to be precarious and supports the implementation of an action plan as cited above.

-Tunisia, undergoing a reform (Heritage Code and operational, institutional, training, funding measures...) responds negatively.

Question (d)

-The scientific and technical measures are numerous and diverse, but often judged insufficient. The Egyptian report judges them to be inadequate.

Question (f)

-Whether or not they are in favour of a general reform, almost all the authors judge that the safeguarding of heritage is not felt or considered to be a priority action by the public bodies. The only exceptions are: Jordan and Syria.

-The fact that it is not considered as a priority does not signify negligence, abandon or disinterest. Progress is reported in all fields of conservation, even if improvement is widely desired: especially as concerns the use of new technologies (GIS, computerisation, Internet) scientific publications, visitor control of sites, information and public awareness through wide use of the media...

The above answers coincide perfectly with those observed in Chapter 3.2 on the state of services. The fact that the concerns for the preservation and the safeguarding of Heritage are not a priority is not without consequence on the state of conservation of the sites. This is in spite of the devotion and professionalism demonstrated by the services responsible for the preservation and conservation of the sites.

7.5 Training

	YES	NO	Observations	
a	Information on training and education strategies to strengthen the professional capacities, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-operation mechanisms • Identification of training needs for institutions or individual concerned 	6	2	<u>Co-operation</u> -Iraq: transfer technology, geophysics, magnetism, metal work -Jordan: co-operation with training organisms, UNESCO and Italy -Lebanon: bilateral, France, EU, etc., co-operation with specialised universities and municipal councils -Morocco: Euromed Heritage -Mauritania: New technologies, media, -Syria: bilateral and European Union -Tunisia: researchers abroad, EUROMED, UNESCO -Yemen: Netherlands, France, UK
		5	1	
	Information on creation or development of national regional training or education centres in the field of heritage protection, conservation, presentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training opportunities • WH training modules and programmes • Natural and cultural heritage training for staff 	6	1	<u>Training needs</u> -Iraq: maintenance labs, training workshops, protective materials -Jordan: planning, data bases, conservation, monitoring, mosaics, management -Lebanon: heritage skills, conservation, management -Morocco: restoration, specialised labs, private enterprises. -Mauritania: all types of training needs -Yemen: planning, institutional capacities, management, urbanism
	Degree to which training was integrated into the university and school teaching system.	1	4	
	4	2	<u>Training opportunities</u> -Iraq: archaeological training centre, regional conservation centre for Arab States' cultural sites -Jordan: Italy, Iraq -Lebanon: France, UK, Lebanese University -Morocco: national training centre -Tunisia: universities, Tunis course, further training	
b	5	2	-Iraq: post university studies and regional centre for conservation in the Arab States -Jordan: seminars, conferences and co-operation -Morocco: support to the Institute of Archaeological and Heritage Sciences -Mauritania: exchanges with foreign universities, creation of Chinguetti Prize Committee -Syria: State support	
c	7		-Egypt: scientific research, micro-environment, GIS, risk maps, and others -Iraq: excavations, restoration, scientific research -Jordan: improve the mosaic school -Morocco: funds for research and publication of results -Mauritania: documentation, safeguarding, promotion, New technologies in the educational system, WH training, national training and conservation centre for Heritage -Oman: specialist training and work task force	

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a)

-The training problem was given consideration by the ten countries responding to Section I. Almost all the questions have been answered and the number of unanswered questions is not really of great consequence for this chapter. This proves the high level of

concern that this problem generates with the heritage conservation authorities in the Arab world.

-Indeed, the evaluation of training in the fields of heritage protection, conservation, restoration, management, presentation and promotion, without being negative,

indicate the existence of a certain number of shortcomings:

- rigorous identification, both quantitative and qualitative, of needs and priorities.
- Identification of existing training opportunities or ones to be created at the regional level.

-The positive aspects are:

1. The existence in certain countries of training opportunities at universities, on-the-job training and short or long-term training abroad (training courses and lectures).
2. The existence of regional training courses: Maghreb, Tunis Course (for Heritage Architects), Rabat and Algiers Courses (archaeological and traditional arts conservation). In Amman, the "Technical School for Training" (mosaics) and the course on the management of sites reserved for Jordan and Syria.

-Although rather limited in capacity and funding, these regional courses, often supported by UNESCO, the European Union, ICCROM and countries such as France or Italy, are examples to follow and strengthen.

-It would also be appropriate to encourage the Baghdad Centre for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage (created in 1970 for the Arab Region by ALECSO and ICCROM), to re-establish its activities.

All types of needs are constantly repeated, clearly demonstrating that in the majority of cases, except perhaps for the Sultanate of Oman, the main problem is the lack of funding. However, the provision of funds would not be a substitute for the lack of qualified professional staff, nor for the lack of researchers and scientific personnel. This reminder is important because the reports strongly underline the expectations in the way of international co-operation and aid. They do not provide sufficient indication as to how to remedy the situation.

RECOMMENDATION

In this framework, UNESCO/WHC and ICCROM would certainly have a role to play with States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in assisting them to

-Instead of creating multi-disciplinary training centres of science and technology for cultural and natural heritage in each country, as expressed by Mauritania, it would be better to benefit from the existing structures (courses, training periods, laboratories...), in the different Arab countries. Equally, to use the basic training and recycling potential available abroad and to develop them in accordance with the growing needs of the countries,

-The training needs are not clearly identified. This requires hard work in identifying these needs in terms of quantity and quality.

Question (b)

-The measures undertaken for research by the States still remain limited and the responses (numbering 5), give more importance to bilateral or international activities than those carried out at the national level.

Question [c]

-The fields for improvement are clearly identified and cover all fields of activity linked to cultural heritage. Once again, the responses emphasise the deficiencies already indicated above and which are repeated like a leitmotiv.

define national strategies and/or regional training and promotion strategies in the fields of science and technology as well as for the heritage professions.

8. International co-operation and fund raising

		YES	NO	Observations
a	- Co-operation with other States Parties for the identification, protection, conservation and preservation of cultural and natural heritage situated on their territory.	8	1	- Egypt : France, USA, Germany, Italy - Jordan : Saudi Arabia and foreign missions - Lebanon : Germany, Italy, France, The Netherlands - Morocco : Sultanate of Oman - Oman : Morocco - Syria : IFAPO, IFEAD, Germany
	- Documentation for the promotion of the Convention	1	1	- Tunisia : bilateral, UNESCO, Europe universities, America, ICOMOS, ICCROM, European Union, France, Italy - Yemen : Western countries
b	Measures taken to prevent direct or indirect endangering of world heritage situated on the territory of other states.			- Jordan : aid to Bahrain, excavations in Saudi Arabia - Lebanon : 7 activities described
	• Bi or multilateral activities	4	2	
	• Internationally-twinning sites	2	4	
	• Persons in charge of the co-ordination of other conventions	2		
c	• Bilateral or multilateral funding	1	3	
	National and private foundations or associations created to encourage fund-raising and donations for world heritage protection.			- Egypt : 1 foundation - Jordan : Petra National Trust - Lebanon : 7 foundations - Mauritania : 2 foundations for Banc d'Arguin, 1 foundation for historic cities - Tunisia : important mobilisation of funds and aid requested - Yemen : charity and preservation associations
	• Listing	7	1	
	• Annual grants for protection	7	3	
d	• Specific grants for a site		1	
	Has the State Party provided support towards this aim?			- Iraq : problem of freezing of Iraqi credits - Morocco : NGO, public interest status, technical assistance from the State.
	• Governmental assistance programme	2	6	
	• Co-ordination mechanism between heritage and education	1	6	
e	• Voluntary government contributions to improve the work of the Convention		7	

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

Question (a)

-International co-operation holds an important place in the field of heritage of the Arab countries. Archaeological missions are the most frequent in some countries (Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Oman, Yemen...). The need for greater diversity exists in the fields of intervention and co-operation for the conservation, restoration and presentation of monuments and sites, as well as in the field of museology (Tunisia, Morocco, Mauritania, Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, Oman).

-The countries that most regularly offer co-operation are France, Italy, Germany,

the Netherlands, Switzerland, United States and Canada. Since the creation of the MEDA Programme, the European Union has increasingly become an influential actor and partner that favours networking and consequently encourages North-South exchanges by involving official specialised institutions and civil society represented by the non-profit sector. However, this type of multilateral co-operation has not been the subject in any of the reports of an in-depth analysis. Tunisia reported on the UNIMED Programme devoted to the project for Computerised Heritage Cartography. Moreover, Tunisia and Morocco placed

emphasis on the Maghreb courses of Rabat, Algiers and Tunisia, for conservation and restoration training.

Question [c]

-Local associations and foundations for Heritage Protection are cited in reports from Egypt (NEHRA, National Egyptian Heritage Revival Association, Jordan (Petra National Trust), Yemen (Shibam Welfare Association), and others such as the Associations for the Safeguarding of the Medina numbering approximately twenty in Tunisia. These official associations receive, for the most part, grants from the government and regional

and local communities to carry out their objectives.

-However, these associations have not yet been accorded the importance and the scope they deserve within the Arab world in general, for the protection and safeguarding of natural and cultural heritage. In this domain, the principal responsibility still remains with the State.

-With regard to foundations and private initiatives, their number and their influence is of very little significance. Furthermore, they receive very little support from public bodies.

At the present time, the Arab States do not appear to have, except in rare cases, a recognised and ongoing framework for co-operation in the domain of heritage. They benefit from assistance from diverse sources, but not sufficiently from neighbouring Arab States. It would be desirable, for example, if an Arab Fund for Heritage Aid could be established with contributions from the richer Arab countries.

RECOMMENDATION

The States Parties are called upon to encourage the creation of foundations and associations as well as private initiatives to provide assistance and support required for the safeguarding and presentation of the monuments and sites.

Towards this end, the World Heritage Committee and its advisory bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM) are in a position to play an effective inciting and advising role.

9. Education, information and strengthening of awareness raising

		YES	NO	Observations
a	• Awareness raising measures for decision-makers, property owners and the public at large in heritage protection and conservation.	8	2	-Iraq: books, articles, media – priority: schools -Jordan: workshops -Lebanon: the DGA assists private individuals in restoration work -Morocco: public communication and European Heritage Days -Mauritania: congresses, workshops, seminars -Oman: protection, conservation and five-year plan -Syria: festivals, media, press
	• Education and awareness raising programme for the public.	2	3	
	• What priorities and for whom?	1		
b	• Education and public information programmes on threats to heritage and the application of the Convention.	5 4 5	3 3	Awareness raising measures -Iraq: school visits to the sites and museums. -Jordan: shows, seminars, celebrations, festivals -Oman: guided school visits, brochures -Tunisia: Heritage Month
	• Education and public awareness programmes			Integration measures -Iraq: primary and secondary schools -Jordan: awareness raising in schools foreseen -Lebanon: programmes included in history classes -Mauritania: heritage integrated into educational programmes -Tunisia: convention with national education and NGO actions (integration) -Yemen: programme in primary schools
	• Programme priorities			
	• Measures for integration of values in educational programmes. Details			
c	• Does the State Party participate in the Special Project 'Participation of Young People in the Preservation and Promotion of World Heritage' ?	5		

Countries having submitted Section I of the periodic report number 10 out of 12 States having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The 2 missing reports are those from Algeria and Libya.

All the reports give information on educational, information and public awareness actions. These actions are carried out using the mass media (press, Radio, T.V.), school visits, documentaries, brochures, conferences, etc. All levels of society are targeted and more particularly young people. Most frequently, the principal actors are the State and civil society. However, the phenomenon has not reached the same height in all the countries. It is far from having the same level of influence and impact on society. The difference is sometimes significant between countries having long experience in this field (school educational programmes and regular public awareness raising events) and the others who have to make major efforts to implement a real education and awareness raising policy.

Amongst these initiatives, can be cited the Heritage Month in Tunisia (18 April- 18 May) and in Algeria, and the events during International Days for Monuments and Sites (18 April) and Museums (18 May) in Morocco, which are celebrated at the same time as the Heritage Days in Europe.

In spite of these differences, only two countries replied in the affirmative concerning the question of existing education and information programmes on threats to the heritage. No positive responses were received on the application of the Convention. Also, no positive responses on the measures for the integration of World Heritage values into educational programmes.

The integration measures cited are the programmes and the school and university teaching manuals, in which some countries state having inserted (notably, in the history classes) national heritage values (Lebanon, Iraq, Tunisia...). Other countries have announced their intention to do so (Yemen, Mauritania...) or to consolidate existing information (Syria, Jordan, Morocco...).

Concerning participation in the Special Project for the Participation of Young People in the Preservation and Promotion of World Heritage, five countries replied in the affirmative.

Periodic Reports - Section II

STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE PROPERTIES OF THE ARAB REGION

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF THE REPORTS OF THE INSCRIBED PROPERTIES

10- Introduction

As explained above, this analytical document covers only thirty-six Section II reports received. Algeria's reports on the Kasbah of Algiers and the M'Zab Valley were only received on 07/11/2000, and no report on Tassili N'Ajjer. Mauritania also sent its report on the natural site of Banc d'Arguin National Park late (10/10/2000), Oman sent no report on Bat, Al Khutm and Al Ayn, and Tunisia did not send reports on the Medina of Sousse and the natural site of Ichkeul National Park.

The results from the 44 sites inscribed by Arab countries before 1993 is the following:

39 reports received by 7/11/2000, 5 reports not received, including Jerusalem due to its current situation. This amounts to 90% of the reports expected.

Consequently the following reports will be included in the analysis below:

1. Algeria: 4 sites (Al Qal'a of Beni Hammad, Timgad, Tipasa and Djemila)
2. Egypt: 5 sites (Islamic Cairo, Memphis, Thebes, Nubia and Abu Mena)
3. Iraq: 1 site (Hatra)
4. Jordan: 2 sites (Petra and Qusair Amra)
5. Lebanon: 4 sites (Byblos, Tyr, Anjar and Baalbek)
6. Libya: 5 sites (Sabratha, Leptis Magna, Ghadames, Cyrene and Tadrart Acacus)
7. Morocco: 3 sites (Fez, Marrakesh, Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou)
8. Sultanate of Oman: 1 site (Bahla Fort)
9. Syria: 4 sites (Damascus, Aleppo, Bosra and Palmyra)
10. Tunisia: 5 sites (Tunis, Carthage, El Jem, Kairouan and Kerkouan)
11. Yemen: 2 sites (Sana'a and Shibam).

The documents received are essentially the questionnaires, sometimes accompanied (rarely) by documentation. The administrations in charge of Heritage in the different countries should be recontacted, in order to obtain all the missing documents which are indispensable for the constitution of a coherent data base that is as complete as possible.

Status of the submissions and type of reports received:

PERIODIC REPORTS - SECTION II

Country	Received	Plans	Study/bibliography	Other
ALGERIA				
Beni Hammad	29/08/2000	General plan I + 7 details		9 photos
Timgad	22/08/2000	General plan I + 7 details		8 photos
Tipasa	22/08/2000	General plan I + 7 details		10 photos
Djemila	29/08/2000	General plan I + 7 details		9 photos
M'Zzab Valley	07/11/2000	General plan	13 on-site studies	Photos+ CDRom
Kasbah of Algiers	07/11/2000	7 general plans		14 photos
Tassili N'Ajjer	Not received			

Country	Received	Plans	Study / bibliography	Other
EGYPT				
Cairo	22/09/2000		Rehabilitation Historic Cairo	
Memphis	22/09/2000			
Thebes	22/09/2000			
Nubia	22/09/2000			
Abu Mena	22/09/2000			
IRAQ				
Hatra	25/09/2000		2 books on Hatra	
JORDAN				
Petra	03/09/2000		Petra Workshop Status report on preservation	
Qusair Amra	03/09/2000		Tourist statistics Visitors house plans Restoration report Protection plan Activity report 97	
LEBANON				
Byblos	10/08/2000	General plan	Tourism brochure	8 photos
Tyr	10/08/2000	General plan	Tourism brochure	11 photos
Anjar	10/08/2000	General plan	Tourism brochure	8 photos
Baalbek	10/08/2000	General plan	Tourism brochure	6 photos
LIBYA				
Leptis Magna	15/09/2000			
Sabratha	15/09/2000			
Cyrene	15/09/2000			
Tadrart Acacus	15/09/2000			
Ghadames	15/09/2000			
MOROCCO				
Fez	04/09/2000		Urban development plan	
Marrakesh	04/09/2000		Bibliography Urban development plan General plan Revitalisation plan Regional development study Hotel statistics	68 slides
Ait Ben Haddou	04/09/2000	4 plans on state of conservation		13 photos
MAURITANIA				
Banc d'Arguin	10/10/2000			
OMAN				
Bahla Fort	03/09/2000			
Bat, Al Khutm	Not received			
SYRIA				
Damascus	10/09/2000			
Bosra	10/09/2000			
Palmyra	10/09/2000			
Aleppo	10/09/2000			
TUNISIA				
Medina Tunis	29/09/2000			
Carthage	29/09/2000			
El Jem	29/09/2000			
Ichkeul	Not received			
Kerkouan	29/09/2000			
Medina Sousse	Not received			
Kairouan	29/09/2000		Historical overview	
YEMEN				
Sana'a	29/07/2000			5 photos
Shibam	29/07/2000			

11. Identification of World Cultural and Natural sites

11.1. Information at the time of inscription

		Response	No response	Observations
a	justification for inscription	Revision of text 94%	6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fez (Morocco) did not respond • The 4 Syrian sites propose a modification to the Justification for inscription
b	Criteria retained by Committee	Revision of text 100%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carthage proposes to add criterion (iv) to the criteria retained for the inscription
c	Observations made by the advisory body for evaluation	Revision of text 50%	14%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No observations made by ICOMOS for 11% of the responses
d	WHC observations during the inscription	Revision of text 61%	39%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No observations made by the WHC for 8% of the responses
e	Your reactions to these observations	Reactions 64%	36%	In the reactions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations taken into account in 44% of the cases, without comment. • The remaining 20% reflect the concerns on the present state of conservation • Shibam (Yemen), expresses regret for the non-inscription of Wadi Hadramout.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

The persons in charge of the sites did not possess the inscription files. We had to provide all of them with this information.

This chapter recalls the criteria, evaluations and recommendations made at the time of inscription. This information will assist the writers of the reports in making a comparison with the present state of the site. It is for this reason that the answers to the questions a, b, c and d are reproduced as they appear in the nomination file.

For question (e), the report writers were requested to make comments regarding the elements found in the nomination files.

After analysis, it is apparent that more than half the report writers have not replied to questions [c], (d) and (e). This shows that either they did not take into account the information, or they had difficulty in analysing the files, or again they were not aware of their existence.

At this stage, 20% of the report writers expressed their concern regarding the state of conservation of their sites.

11.2. Updating of the Statement of Significance

	YES	NO	No response	Observations	
a	If the statement of significance reflects the WH values of the site	97%	3%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sabratha (Lebanon) responded negatively
b	Requires new submission of the nomination dossier	8%	89%	3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lebanese sites of Leptis Magna, Ghadames and Tadrart Acacus consider a new revision necessary, without explaining why
c	- Are the boundaries of the buffer zone appropriate. - Is the boundary of the site appropriate.	80%	17%	3%	<p>The negative responses are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the buffer zone: Cairo (Egypt), Tunis (Tunisia) and La Kalaa des Beni Hammad (Algeria). • For: Cyrène, Leptis Magna, Ghadames (Libya), Marrakesh (Morocco) and Timgad (Algeria).
d	Should a revision or an extension of the site be envisaged.	9%	80%	11%	Responses rarely coherent and in line with what precedes, because the majority do not wish for a revision of the boundaries, in spite of the declaration in [c] concerning their shortcomings.
e	New statement of value, if necessary	30%	47%	23%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary: for Marrakesh (Morocco), Hatra (Iraq), Tadrart Acacus, Ghadames, Cyrène (Libya), Timgad, La Kalaa des Beni Hammad, Tipasa (Algeria), Carthage (Tunisia). • 30% of the sites propose new statements of value: Tadrart Acacus justifies it by new discoveries, Ghadames by the disappearance of buildings and all the Egyptian sites by an improvement of their statement of values.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.

The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

It is noted that the nomination files prior to 1993 do not contain, in a certain number of cases, clear statements of significance. Furthermore, this concept, which is an essential element to justify inscription and adoption of the criteria, does not appear to be understood in the majority of cases and the responses reflect this incomprehension and demonstrate a confusion between the value statement and the general historical considerations of the sites. Because of this, the responses for (a) and (b) are bare, not credible and consequently lose all their objective value.

COMMENTS

1. Although considered in (b) as not necessary for the Egyptian sites, a new value statement is proposed in the form of improvements to the present V. S.
2. In the case of Petra, the writer even insisted upon the need to revise the entire nomination file.
3. In [c] and (d), it emerges that 17% of the sites consider that their boundaries are not appropriate.
4. The confusion noted concerning the concept of statement of significance deserves to be emphasised, and then discussed in depth with States Parties concerned.

12.Statement of Authenticity / Integrity

		YES	NO	No response	Observations	Remarks
A	evaluation if authenticity /integrity of the site at inscription is not yet recognised	69%	12%	19%	.	<i>The negative responses reflect the existence of changes in these values, even if they are not clearly formulated.</i>
B	Changes of authenticity / integrity of the present site 1.Changes of authenticity / integrity in the near future - Why 2.Modifications authenticity /integrity since inscription	14% 17%	81% 72%	5% 11%	Two types of changes noted: Negative due to man and/or nature: Alep, Damascus (Syria), Marrakesh (Morocco), Cyrène, Tadrart Acacus, Ghadames (Libya), Timgad, Tipasa (Algeria), Tunis (Tunisia), Sana's (Yemen). However, they are not sufficiently endangered as to affect the authenticity and integrity of the site. Positive: legal measures, restoration work and presentation in favour of maintaining authenticity/integrity: Kairouan, Kerkouane (Tunisia), Bahla Fort (Oman), Sabratha (Libya), Djemila (Algeria), etc.	The positive and negative factors can be combined in the same site to create both favourable conditions for the maintenance of values and negative conditions which can sometimes develop into real threats to the site. This situation of imbalance or unstable balance can be seen in the majority of sites, as is proved by the analyses under item II.6 (Monitoring) below.
C	Values under which the site was inscribed, maintained or not	89%		11%	<i>Changes and threats reported:</i> 1. Alep (Syria): an area removed; 2. Shibam (Yemen): deterioration of the green belt; 3. Marrakesh (Morocco): regrets widespread high rise and anarchical construction 4. Qusair Amra (Jordan): motorway 150 m from the and petrol station at 40 m 5. Cyrène (Libya): mixed threats, climatic and visitor factors; 6. Tadrart Acacus (Libya): nuisances from oil industry; 7. Ghadames (Libya): negligence of the old buildings and abandonment of the town; 8. Timgad (Algeria): lack of care and over-exploitation of tourism; 9. La Kalaa des Beni Hammad (Algeria): no maintenance of the monuments facing ruin 10. Tipasa (Algeria): 80% of the values are maintained. "The construction on the boundaries of the site of a building in the country town of the Wilaya, adversely affects the physical aspect of the site. The lack of legislation has favoured increased urbanism towards the buffer zone." Finally, the conservator requested the site to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that a safeguarding campaign be launched. 11. Anjar (Lebanon): military presence. (details en II.6.);.	

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

The notions of authenticity - integrity are very often confused with the state of conservation (good, less good or cause for concern). Clear cut responses to these questions are rare: more often a

tendency to evoke the present state of the site rather than its state at inscription, of which the writers are not aware for the most part.

Even if the meaning of the questions is not always understood, there is a barely concealed feeling of concern regarding the state of conservation of the sites, especially relating to question (b).

The responses reflect even more clearly the existence of changes in the authenticity/integrity of the sites. They represent 31% of the total responses when adding the present changes to those foreseen. This demonstrates clearly that the state of conservation of the sites is a cause of concern.

The non-responses to question [c] clearly indicate the difficulty facing the writers. From their perspective, a negative response

might initiate the delisting process of their sites from the World Heritage List.

Finally, it is interesting to note the distortions between the responses provided in (a) and (c). These two questions are identical and evoke different responses in 20% of the cases. This illustrates the concern of the writers with regard to the state of conservation. However, they do not presume to determinate what possible changes have occurred to the values since inscription.

For favourable or unfavourable conditions, see the detailed analysis in item II.6. (Monitoring).

GENERAL CONCLUSION ON THE STATEMENT OF VALUES AND AUTHENTICITY / INTEGRITY

In spite of the deficiencies and identified threats, admitted or not (20% of non-responses over and above the 7 properties (19%) not having provided reports), there is no mention of irreversible loss of values since inscription, likely to trigger off a process of immediate delisting of some of these properties, even the most threatened.

However, other than Tipasa, where the responsible authorities envisage its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, a certain number of other sites would also be candidates for inscription, pending subsequent examination.

PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Concerning information at the time of inscription: Provide to States Parties the missing information, concerning the data at the time of inscription and assist those that request it to update the original nomination forms.

Funds from the Committee could be allocated for this objective in the framework of a five-year plan.

Concerning the statement of value: Envisage a regional seminar initiated by WHC experts to examine in depth the « statement of value » as well as the principles and criteria of authenticity / integrity.

Concerning the statement of authenticity / integrity: In the same way as for the statement of value, organise a regional seminar on authenticity / integrity.

13. Management

13.1 Institutional and legal framework

	YES	Observations	Remark
a	100% 100%	<p>OWNERSHIP: -The archaeological sites are the property of the State and sometimes private. –For historic cities, ownership is shared accordingly between private, State, regions and communities and Awqaks.</p> <p>LEGAL STATUS: The State is responsible directly or indirectly for actions of protection, management and planning. It is represented by specialised organisms (Direction, Institute, Agency...) under the control of the ministries of Culture or in the Sultanate of Oman, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Environment</p> <p>LEGAL FRAMEWORK: Always the national law for Antiquities and Museums. The responsibility for heritage (State domain) is sometimes shared with the regions and communities.</p> <p>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK: The properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, other than the very strict heritage laws listing them at the national level, can be the object of protective or safeguarding measures at the regional and community level, in the framework of development and urbanism management plans.</p>	<p>LEGAL FRAMEWORK: In Tunisia, the law was improved with the Heritage Code (1994), comprising safeguarding clauses for historic cities, with specific statutes and protective measures. The new Algerian Law of 1998 was also an important progression in comparison to earlier legislation.</p> <p>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK: The diverse measures present advantages as well as inconveniences, such as conflicts of authority arising during decision-making and the elaboration of common strategies.</p>
b	89%	<p>Almost all the sites inscribed on the W.H. List benefit from preservation measures for the values for which the W.H. Committee inscribed them.</p> <p><i>These measures are:</i> legal, restoration and presentation programmes and studies for future management plans or global strategies for safeguarding, economic integration and tourism development.</p>	<p>Except in rare cases, the tangible and permanent actions, are the classic measures for legal protection, strengthening of guards and control of access, as well as the more or less systematic actions for restoration, rehabilitation and presentation. The plans for management, safeguarding and presentation are, for the most part, foreseen or under preparation.</p>

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.

The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

Question (a)

There is no evaluation of the effectiveness of the existing measures. The responses are limited to the description of that which exists.

Question (b)

89% of the sites announce measures for the preservation of values. The realisation of the need to elaborate management plans also exists, but the responsible persons do not have any tangible knowledge of their terms and conditions and do not have in general the means to elaborate and implement them.

13.2 Management and planning

	YES	NO	No response	Observations	Remarks
a <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable changes since inscription 1-Type of ownership 2-Legal status 3-Protection measures 4-Boundaries 5-Resources made available • Exercise level of property management 6-at site 7-in the region 8-central administration 	22%	28%	50%	<p>Type of ownership: No major changes reported. The non-responses are grouped with the "No"s.</p> <p>Legal status: Most of the responses indicate no changes since inscription of the site, notably: Sana'a and Shibam (Yemen), La Kalaa des Beni Hammad, Timgad, Tipasa (Algeria), etc.</p> <p>Boundaries: In Algeria, Lebanon and Syria, expropriation or legal measures have been undertaken for a better definition of the limits of the properties or the buffer zones.</p>	<p>Type of ownership: -Numerous expropriations in the archaeological sites of Bosra and Palmyre (Syria). -At Shibam (Yemen), denationalisation of properties.</p> <p>Legal status: Improvements are: -At Carthage - Tunisia (decree of 85 and 96 by-law). -In Syria, amended law, reinforcing protection measures for the D.G.A.M. -In Algeria (1998 Law). -At Byblos and Baalbek (Lebanon), Damascus (Syria), Petra (Jordan) and Fez (Morocco), municipal measures for improved control of construction permits.</p>
b <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant documentation attached: 1-Legal texts, 2-Management plans and/or work plans (annual) site administration and management 3-Conservation plan 4-Authority plans (national, local, regional) 5-Tourism development plan 	14%	3%	83%		

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

1. In (a), the resources made available have changed for 33% of the sites and 50% did not reply. In the majority of cases, the replies reflect a decrease in available resources, and more likely a critical lack of funds. Only Morocco and Tunisia report improved resources available.
2. In (b), the replies do not reflect the level of documentation received. The majority have not provided a single document.
 - Legal texts received: Morocco, Lebanon, Yemen and Tunisia
 - Management plans received, no documents,
 - Various plans, conservation, development, five-year or tourism received: Fez and Marrakesh (Morocco), Cairo (Egypt), Jordanian and Yemeni sites.

13.3 Management plan of the site and statement of the objectives

		YES	NO	No response	Observations	Remarks
a	<p>1-If the functional management plan exists, attach in annex.</p> <p>2-Management plan under preparation – being updated. If yes, does the plan take into account:</p> <p>3-local population consulted</p> <p>4-existing human resources</p> <p>5-existant funding resources</p> <p>6-staff training</p> <p>7-zonation multiple site use</p> <p>8-defined buffer zone</p> <p>9-regular monitoring of site</p>	12%	50%	38%	<p>Management plan: "fundamental management instrument of the site for the organisation of conservation and support for development actions relating to the site", is non existent for 88% of the sites. However, it is announced as under preparation by the majority.</p> <p>-In practically all cases, difficulties are evoked, sometimes overwhelming, encountered at the time of its preparation: technical, legal, financial, methodological difficulties...etc</p> <p>-Consultation of populations of the sites or their immediate neighbourhood in the elaboration of management plans is not frequently practised (19%).</p>	<p>Management plan: -Only Cyrène, Sabratha, and Leptis Magna in Libya, mention a functional management plan (?) with monitoring actions and revisions every 5 years. No analysis, synthesis or integral text provided in annex.</p> <p>-Petra: implementation of a plan announced for January 2001.</p> <p>-Carthage: plan in the process of being approved in the form of a conservation and presentation plan.</p> <p>-Cairo: no mention of a management plan.</p> <p>-Elsewhere, the plan is under preparation, <i>The difficulties for elaboration have been real obstacles for its completion:</i></p> <p>Tunis, Kairouan (Tunisia), Damascus, Aleppo (Syria), Sana's, Shibam (Yemen) etc. – Call for bilateral co-operation: GTZ in Aleppo and Shibam, IFAPO at Palmyre...) or UNESCO assistance, UNDP and other international organisms.</p> <p>Financial resources: -They are taken into account, but to underline their scarcity and deficiency.</p>
		50%	19%	31%		
		19%	44%	37%		
		31%	42%	27%		
		47%		53%		
		33%	67%			
		44%	28%	28%		
		56%	17%	27%		
		58%	8%	34%		
b	<p>Implementation in function with:</p> <p>1-specific legislation</p> <p>2-responsible organism</p> <p>3-local population involvement in implementation</p> <p>4-evaluation of management plan</p> <p>5-periodic revisions</p>	28%	50%	50%	<p>The populations are rarely involved in conservation and presentation operations, notably as regards historic cities.</p>	<p>Management plans do not exist, their implementation is not reality, even for the Libyan sites which have reported the existence of such plans.</p>
		28%	28%	44%		
c	<p>1-Financial support for implementation of management plan</p> <p>2-Obstacles in implementation</p> <p>3-Date of implementation of present management plan</p> <p>4-Organism responsible for the site</p>	100%				<p>We have noted that the major obstacles for all the sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Insufficiency in the</i> numbers and qualifications of staff, • <i>funding</i> always insufficient and decreasing dramatically.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

It is often the Antiquities services which are responsible for the preparation of management plans. This may cause difficult problems concerning competencies and experience in a domain which remains extremely specialized and little studied, even in countries considered as being advanced. The management of archaeological sites and historic cities has not yet, in many countries, benefited from enough attention either from conservators or from planners, and even less from the local and national authorities. In the answers, this is reflected by a lack of precision or

a total incomprehension of what a management plan really and concretely signifies. This leaves us with a feeling of discomfort in reading this part of the reports, highlighting the pressing need to explain more completely and to clarify more clearly **the objectives, methods and the means of action** involved in the study and implementation of all management plans, whatever they might be called.

RECOMMENDATION

Organise short-term seminars and training sessions for persons directly involved in the management of sites to initiate them in the methods and techniques of the elaboration and implementation of

management plans for sites: archaeological, historic cities, monuments and natural sites. Appropriate documentation should be prepared and distributed to the participants.

13.4 Capacities in human and financial resources at the site level

		Provided	No response	Observations	Remarks
a	-Human resources - managerial level: -non-supervisory personnel	83%	17%	The number of professional staff (architects, archaeologists, administrators...) and non-supervisory personnel, for maintenance, control and surveillance was provided in 83% of the reports. For the majority, it is considered to be insufficient in number, but more especially as regards professional qualifications.	Sabratha, Tadrart, Acacus (Libya), Carthage, El Jem (Tunisia), Cairo and Memphis (Egypt), did not respond. Bahla Fort is the only one to describe its personnel as good and sufficient
b	-Financial resources -Funding sources -Management-generated income	83%	17%	<u>Financial sources:</u> With the exception of El-Jem (Tunisia), which does not provide any information, all the responses attempt to provide precise details concerning the provenance of their income.. <u>Management income:</u> <u>Entrance fees:</u> Cairo, Nubia (Egypt), Qusayr Amra, Petra (Jordan), Cyrène, Sabratha (Libya). -In <u>Algeria</u> , (Qalâa des Béni Hammad, Timgad, Djemila, Tipasa), they are paid to the National Protection Agency for Historic Sites and Monuments. -In <u>Tunisia</u> , they are paid to the National Agency for Heritage and Cultural Development and invested in projects related to heritage and cultural development.	Financial resources: Apart from Yemen, no figures are provided to evaluate the real budget levels. Funding sources: - Mainly , <i>State budget</i> , by Ministry of Culture, complemented by the regions and municipalities, notably the heavily populated sites or predominately urban. - Minimally by Associations, Foundations and private individuals. - In addition , by foreign missions, notably the historical and archaeological research and excavations. Other sources: The World Bank, UN agencies such as UNESCO, UNDP, Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (FADES), Arab Cities Organization.
c	-Staff training needs -Training requirements	100%		All the reports emphasize the urgent need for training and technical assistance in all fields: heritage sciences and techniques, management, maintenance, presentation and exploitation of properties. The listing of experts and professionals presented by each site are rarely quantified. They do not appear to be the result of surveys which, other than the types of professions or disciplines, evaluate the number of professionals to be trained at short-, medium- or long term.	Training needs: -High level technicians in restoration of monuments and objects: stone masons, wooden, earthen, plaster, constructions, mosaics, ceramics, and work managers. -Conservation of monuments and sites -Urbane management and sites in general -Excavation techniques, land and underwater -Computer skills and data bases. -Legal matters. Types of training required: -short-term training: seminars, courses, round-table refresher courses for local staff or training of young recruits. -long-term training: acquisition of basic knowledge and experience for all types of work.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

The financial resources, whatever their provenance, are unanimously judged to be insufficient or very insufficient (with the exception of Bahla Fort). It is noteworthy to record that the fact that these sites are listed as World Heritage does not appear to have contributed towards obtaining more substantial budgets for them. According to the reports, this is a considerable handicap in the

development of a conservation and strategy policy for restoration and presentation.

Complaints concerning the insufficient level of training for personnel as well as their number, are found in almost all the chapters of the reports. This situation demonstrates the difficulties encountered in the accomplishment of only the general conservation tasks at sites.

13.5 Additional information concerning Protection and Conservation

	YES	NO	No response	Observations	Remarks
a				<p>Sources of expertise and training: Directions of Antiquities, Heritage Institutes and specialised National Agencies cooperate with the national universities, research and professional training institutes and laboratories in the country to respond to the need for ongoing or occasional training. Protection measures: those carried out daily, without a specific programme, due to lack of human and financial resources. Policies and programmes: those approved in the framework of the allocated budgets, thus very restricted. Funding: Only the provenance is indicated. Only Yemen provides annual budget figures.</p>	<p>The existence of specialised institutes for heritage sciences and techniques is rare in the Arab world, and even when they do exist, they do not cover all the fields or respond to all the needs.</p> <p>Hence, the <u>need for training abroad, especially in Europe in the framework of bilateral and multilateral relations.</u></p>
	58%	17%	36%		
1-Sources of expertise and training techniques	58%	3%	36%		
2-Protection measures and implementation means	47%	6%	42%		
3-Established local programmes	53%	11%	36%		
4-Policies and programmes for safeguarding the site	44%	6%	53%		
5-Funding (origin, amount)					
b				<p>To overcome these deficiencies, the persons responsible at the sites inscribed on the W.H. List often call upon foreign experts and technical and scientific assistance, both bilateral and multilateral: More often than not, UNESCO/WHC is called upon to send an expert, consultant or advisory body mission (ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN). They are so numerous that it would serve no purpose to list them. As justification, the reports recall that UNESCO was at the origin of international campaigns for Carthage, Nubia, Sana'a and Tyr, crowned with success for Nubia and Carthage and with less success for Sana'a and Tyr. These campaigns have at least the advantage of setting in motion a vast movement in favour of the safeguarding of these sites. It is not possible either to enumerate all the scientific and technical cooperation programmes in the field of safeguarding World Heritage sites in the Arab Region, carried out within bilateral agreements and partnerships with France, Italy, Germany, United Kingdom, Switzerland, United States etc. or in multilateral programmes.</p>	
1-Technical assistance through United Nations system	56%	17%	28%		
2-Technical assistance provided by bilateral cooperation	53%	14%	31%		

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.

The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

Question (a)

Concerning the protection and conservation in (a), it is noted that on the whole, the expertise is vastly insufficient at the local level. In

this regard, it is interesting to draw attention to the three long-term training courses (Tunis, Algiers, Rabat) organised with ICCROM, and assistance from UNESCO (WHC) and other organizations,

foundations and European institutions, to train Maghreb architects and specialised scientific personnel in restoration conservation. In their speciality, these courses are exemplary. It would appear today urgent to take note and follow this example by defining a global training strategy for the Arab region.

Question (b)

The reports show that inter-Arab cooperation still remains very limited, in spite of the interest that ALESCO gives to heritage in

Arab countries. However, it should be noted that productive cooperation has existed for many years between the Sultanate of Oman and Morocco. It has permitted the restoration of several Omani monuments, including Bahla Fort. In the report on Bahla Fort, the Omanis, whilst acknowledging this cooperation, expressed the wish to improve their own scientific and technical performances to achieve, what they define as, "international standards".

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Training and strengthening of bilateral and multilateral cooperation comprise some of the major concerns of the persons responsible for World Heritage sites in the Arab Region. The World Heritage Committee is therefore invited to devote close attention to this

major concern upon which will depend, to a great extent, the future of the Arab sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. A global strategy for training and strengthening of the professional competencies is a priority objective.

13.6 Scientific, technical and educational studies

		YES	NO	No response	Observations
a	-scientific studies -research facilities at site -competent staff (technicians, laboratory assistants)	17%	83%		Few reports refer to scientific studies carried out at their sites. Those that are mentioned refer to expert missions. <i>Lack of human resources and scientific materials</i> are stressed throughout, often with emphasis on the positive role of bilateral cooperation which fills the gap caused by these deficiencies.
b	Research/development programmes	53%	33%	14%	Amongst these programmes, of bilateral cooperation, mention is made of: -Lebanon, at Tyr six research programmes, two at Byblos and one at Baalbek, in cooperation with IFAPO. -Algeria, at Kalaa des Beni Hammad, study concerning the irrigation system, at Tipasa, archaeological research using geophysical and seismic methods. -Jordan, at Petra, biodiversity and hydrology studies -Tunisia, at El Jem, research on amphitheatres.
c	New management techniques -computer equipment -electronic mail -Access to Internet -GIS at site	17% 22%	83% 50%	 28%	-17% of the sites possess <u>new management techniques</u> . <i>In fact this refers to computer equipment, existing at the majority of sites</i> , even those having responded negatively. However, there are no real computer data bases. -Only three sites possess <u>electronic mail</u> without having to access Internet: Byblos and Anjar (Lebanon), Kairouan (Tunisia). -No World Heritage site possesses <u>GIS</u> . It is under consideration at Bahla Fort (Oman) and it is being installed in Cairo and at Memphis (Egypt).
d	Educational activities -school visits -Educational programmes aimed at school establishments -Environmental education policy -Education policy for Cultural Heritage-themes, target public, means	90%	100%		<u>No site has any real educational activities</u> . Only school visits are really acknowledged, but statistics concerning the number of school visits and students are scarce: -In Iraq: hundreds at Hatra, -In Syria: reduced at Damascus, Aleppo, Palmyre, Bosra, -In Yemen: very reduced at Sana'a and Shibam, -In Morocco: seasonal at Ksar Aït Ben Haddou, -In Egypt: non existent in Cairo, Memphis, Thèbes, Abou Mena, -In Jordan: not specific to the site at Petra. The educational programmes mentioned and <u>the awareness raising policies for environment and heritage mentioned are the normal national education programmes</u> . Cairo, Memphis and Thebes (Egypt), evoke the need to cooperate with international authorities to establish and promote such programmes.
e	Information and awareness-raising -public information and residents -transmission of WH values to residents, visitors	92% 6%	8% 94%		<u>Actions</u> for information and strengthening of awareness, directly linked to the site, most often mentioned, <u>are due to the media</u> (radio, T.V., newspapers) <u>and the State</u> by the intermediary of its specialised institutions (guides, brochures, short documentaries, scientific publications, exhibitions, conferences, congresses, festivals...) <u>Other actions</u> are due to <u>associations for the defence of the site</u> (Safeguarding of the Medina in Tunisia for example), the impact and importance of which are judged differently from site to site. -In Egypt: Abou Mena would not be recognized by the population as World Heritage ; -In Yemen: information and public awareness are not well organised and have limited diffusion; -Tipasa (Algeria) possesses a Web page and the Medina of Tunis is preparing one.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.

The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

Questions (a) and (b)

The responses to the questions on the scientific studies carried out at World Heritage sites and the research projects and programmes in progress or envisaged do not appear to wholly reflect reality. On the one hand, the number of negative responses and non responses is relatively high (83% for the studies, 47% for research) and sometimes concern sites widely known to have been the object of serious studies or to have been the subject of reports or development programmes such as Fez, Carthage, Qusaïr Amra, etc. It is also difficult to imagine sites such as Ksar Aït Ben Haddou, Shibam, Thebes or Timgad having no scientific studies; that Kalaa des Beni Hammad has no studies except those concerning the irrigation system; that Tipasa has only archaeological studies using geophysical and seismic methods; that Petra has only studies of

biodiversity and hydrology; or that El Jem has only studies on amphitheatres.

Question [c]

With regard to new techniques such as computerised management, data bases, use of electronic mail, access to Internet or carrying out GIS, this is still in an embryonic stage and at present only the Egyptian sites indicate hope for improvement.

Question (e)

Finally, the transmission of World Heritage values are practically non existent and must be the object of awareness raising campaigns by authorities at the highest level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Scientific research

Promote scientific research activities and more particularly studies for conservation, presentation and integration of sites into socio-economic and cultural plans. Congresses and training courses in these fields for the persons responsible for the sites could be planned for the next five years in cooperation with the World Heritage Committee and the States Parties that so wish.

Educational activities

(See above).

Information and awareness-raising

Prepare programmes for the promotion of the Convention in collaboration with States Parties and more particularly with the persons responsible for the sites and ensure their implementation as well as educational programmes for environmental awareness and World Heritage.

13.7 Other questions

		YES	NO	No responses	Observations
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Heritage plaque • events and exhibitions; • info/interpretation centres for visitors • Site Museum • Discovery trails • Hotel structures • Parking and convenience areas • First aid centres • Staff and training received • Information materials • Open days • Communication actions • role of World Heritage listing in all programmes and activities. 	39% 14% 44% 53% 28% 67% 78% 64% 56% 33% 64% 28% 61% 33%	44% 6% 33% 22% 22% 6% 3% 3% 17% 19% 6% 19% 17% 8%		<p>39% of the sites mention <u>the existence of a W.H. logo</u>. Very few sites have appropriate signposting announcing access to a site listed as World Heritage (only Carthage, Anjar, Baalbek, Tyr, Petra, Qusair Amra).</p> <p>Visitor centres exist in many cases, but those with information and communication material are for the most part considered insufficient and inadequate.</p> <p><u>World Heritage listing does not appear to have played an important role</u> in the information and awareness raising activities. Nor has it had the desired effects with the public. The influence of listing is judged:</p> <p>-Not clear (Syrian, Moroccan sites) -Non-existent (Algerian sites) -However, judged "positive" at La Kalaa des Beni Hammad (Algeria) -"Very beneficial" at the Medina of Tunis -"Drew a greater number of visitors" at Leptis Magna (Libya).</p> <p>Finally, at Tyre (Lebanon), Hatra (Iraq), Petra and Qusair Amra (Jordan), there is no response to this question.</p>
b	Need to revise legal and administrative measures relating to the site.	28%	50%	22	The replies give priority to a revision of legislation with less than a quarter for an administrative revision.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
 The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

Promotion and capitalisation on the benefits of World Heritage inscription do not appear to be a concern for the persons responsible for the sites. They do not judge appropriately the impacts and the advantages to be gained from such an announcement.

The non-effect of the listing on the population is linked to the very low benefits issuing from such listing. Apart from tourism, no

consideration seems to have been given to the idea of exploitation in the framework of sustainable development. Listing is more often feared as a constraint bringing with it expenses rather than a source of development and employment.

Finally, although they exist, visitor facilities and site management are inadequate to handle the harsh effects of tourism.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING MANAGEMENT

Is it necessary to have an extensive revision to the legal and administrative measures relating to the property?

The responses to this critical question were fairly divided:

- Eight non-responses, e.g. 22%: Carthage, Cyrène, Tadrart Acacus, Ghadames, Nubia, Ksar Aït Ben Haddou, Sana'a and Shibam.
- Ten positive replies, e.g. 28%: Tunis, Kairouan, Timgad, Sabratha, Cairo, Memphis, Abou Mena, Thebes, Marrakesh and Fez.
- Eighteen negative replies, e.g. 50%: Damascus, Aleppo, Palmyre, Bosra, Petra, Qusair Amra, Byblos, Anjar, Baalbek, Tyr, Hatra, Bahla Fort, Leptis Magna, Kalaa des Beni Hammad, Tipasa, Djemila, El Jem and Kerkouane.

All replies (affirmative and negative) as well as the non-responses deserve in-depth examination to understand as far as possible their justification and the true intentions of their authors. However, one can consider the non-responses (22%) as eloquent witnesses to the hesitation of the persons responsible to reply clearly and openly. This, given the complexity of the situation of sites for which, in most cases, a categorical response is not appropriate. However, the author of the Timgad report does not hesitate to confirm that a global revision of these measures is necessary because of:

- Absence of national conservation charter
- Absence of definition of roles and competencies of institutions involved in conservation.
- Lack of budgets which do not take into account the management needs.

This is almost the same situation for Cairo, Memphis and Abou-Mena where it is clearly stated that revision is necessary. It is underway at Thebes, where texts would appear to have been already prepared.

The only noteworthy revision indicated in the replies could be the adoption of a management plan or its equivalent. This would justify the positive replies made by ten sites, that we know to be the subject of serious studies destined to provide them with this type of global programme, such as Tunis, Kairouan, Carthage, Marrakesh, Fez, etc.

With regard to the 18 negative replies, they are more or less justifiable and understandable for some sites like Bahla Fort, El-Jem, Baalbek, Kerkouane or Qusair Amra. Serious conservation/restoration work and presentation has been carried out since their inscription and sometimes well before inscription. Consequently, they do not require fundamental structural revisions.

However, the negative replies are less understandable for the other sites as the reports do not hesitate to reflect their concerns regarding the insufficiencies experienced at the sites: these insufficiencies concern several levels, legal, administrative, financial, technical and human resource capacities (see above chapters).

RECOMMENDATION

Organise meetings on legal frameworks and management structures in force at World Heritage sites so as to identify the insufficiencies and gaps and reflect upon solutions.

14. Factors affecting the property

14.1 Degree of threats

		YES	NO	No response	Observations
a	Development pressures Visual integrity Structural integrity Functional integrity	58% 56% 22%	14% 11% 36%	28% 33% 53%	<p><u>VISUAL INTEGRITY:</u></p> <p>-Urban pressures and illegal constructions: Bahla Fort and Carthage (around the site) Byblos, Anjar, Baalbek, Tyr, Tipasa, Cairo, Memphis. (within the site). -Deforestation: Marrakesh, Qusair Amra, Sabratha -Fallow land becoming rubbish tip: Carthage -Regression of gardens within and/or around the site: Marrakesh, Sana'a, Shibam</p> <p><u>STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY:</u></p> <p>-Poorly integrated infrastructure: (automobile and motor traffic within the site, new roads or motorways, degradation of networks): Baalbek, Palmyre, Qusair Amra, Thebes, Carthage, Tunis, Bosra, Aleppo, Damascus, Cairo, Memphis, Sana'a, Shibam. -Fires: Damascus, Aleppo, Shibam, Fez, Byblos, Cyrène... -Displacement of populations or refusal of integration: Petra (refusal), Thebes (to Qurna), Memphis (extension of a village), Bosra (occupied part of the site).</p> <p><u>FUNCTIONAL INTEGRITY:</u></p> <p>-Polluting industrial activities: Damascus, Aleppo, Marrakesh, Fez, Abou Mena -Oil companies: Tadrart Acacus -Soukisation (invasion of crafts, commercial and other activities): Sana'a, Fez, Tunis, Byblos... -Abandon of dry cultures: Carthage -Grazing at site: Cyrène</p>
b	Environmental constraints: Visual integrity Structural integrity Functional integrity	8% 8% 8%	36% 36% 31%	56% 56% 61%	<p>-Air pollution: Thebes -Eolien effects: Colonnade de Palmyre, Petra -Sand storms: Ghadamès, Sabratha -Desertification: Leptis Magna -Drying up of springs: Ghadamès, Palmyre -Loss of animal species: Qusair Amra</p>
c	Natural catastrophes and early planning,	64%	19%	17%	<p>Earthquakes: Fez, Petra, Byblos, Palmyre, Damascus, Aleppo, Bosra. Violent rains and flooding: Cyrène, Sana'a, Shibam, Kairouan. Erosion and Corrosion by sea water: Petra, Sabratha, Leptis Unseasonable waves against cliffs : Kerkouane Land slides: Petra, Anjar Drought: Marrakesh, Ksar Aït Ben Haddou Cliff rock falls: Ksar Aït Ben Haddou</p>

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.

The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

14.1 Degree of threats (continued)

		YES	NO	No response	Observations
d	Visitor or tourism pressure - frequentation - Accessibility to the site - Ease of movement at site - Tourism pressures - Tourist facilities	92% 28%	44%	8% 28%	Trampling of vestiges: Bosra, Baalbek, Timgad, Kerkouane, Tipasa... Waste and rubbish: Cairo, Memphis, Petra, Shibam, Sana'a, Bosra, Aleppo, Damascus, Byblos, Anjar, Baalbek, Tyr, Timgad, Tipasa, Tunis, Carthage Qusair Amra. Vandalism, looting, theft: Tadrart Acacus, Cyrène, Hatra, Fez, Baalbek, Anjar, La Kalaa des Beni Hammad, Timgad, Tipasa. (This phenomenon and the preceding one are connected to the factors of development and population). Increase of insecurity: Baalbek, Hatra, Anjar. Lack of tourist infrastructures: (welcome, visit and others): in many sites.
e	-Evaluation local population -Distribution human habitat -Cultural characteristics -Socio-eco considerations -Refugee problem -Insecurity and consequences -Factors affecting the site (other)	61% 31%		39% 69%	Population figures are provided, but for the most part are approximate. The non-responses or no responses to other questions shows a certain ignorance of the neighbouring socio-economic context. As regards insecurity , it is reported in all its forms, be it vandalism, social unrest, or due to the inhabitants and the tourists.
f	-measures taken against threats. -tendency of these factors -population associated with inscription	58% 36% 11%	14% 33% 42%	28% 31% 28%	To counteract the risks and fight against these dangers, more or less effective measures have been undertaken, or are being undertaken, or again are under consideration. Their objectives are: Fight against fire: Aleppo, Damascus, Byblos... Renovation of networks: Sana'a... Protection against flooding: Petra, Baalbek, Leptis Magna, Kairouan, Thebes. Strengthening of surveillance: El Jem, Hatra, Petra, Kerkouane... Increased control of constructions and more rigorous application of legislation: Kalaa, Djemila, Tipasa... Reduction of trampling: Kerkouane, Sabratha, Leptis Magna. Reduction of automobile traffic: Palmyre (deviation of the road crossing the site), Petra (trucks no longer use the nearby motorway but other roads)... Better control of tourism activities: Qusair Amra, Tyr. Halt to deforestation: Marrakesh (Oasis).

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
 The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

14.2. Prevention of human and natural threats and pressures

		YES	NO	No response	Observations
a	Preventive methods for threats and pressures 1-Natural catastrophes 2-Industrial pollution 3-Vibrations 4-Vandalism, theft, looting 5-Modification of physical context 6-Industrial infrastructures 7-Constructions 8-Urbanism 9-Tourism	42% 8% 11% 39% 11% 3% 11% 28% 44%		11%	<p>There are no concrete measures described. The writers in the majority, have limited themselves to reporting the different threats to their sites.</p> <p>According to the case, with regard to archaeological sites, the principal threats are natural catastrophes, vandalism, theft and looting, and tourism. To a lesser degree, pollution and modification to the physical context.</p> <p>The situation is different in the historic cities, where the principal threats and pressures are those of urbanism, constructions, modifications of the physical contexts and vibrations. Other threats: pollution and natural catastrophes.</p>
b	Increase or reduction of the impact of these factors on the property	44%	19%	36%	<p>Increase in negative tendencies: Hatra (Jordan), Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco), Kalaa des Beni Hammad, Timgad, Tipasa (Algeria).</p> <p>Decrease in degradation factors: Kairouan, Tunis (Tunisia), Fez, Marrakesh (Morocco), Bahla Fort (Oman).</p> <p>Stationary situation (stabilised): Palmyre, Bosra (Syria), Kerkouane (Tunisia) and Djemila (Algeria).</p>
c	Measures taken or foreseen in the future to remedy this situation	47%	6%	47%	<p>At Timgad: all measures are in vain in the absence of an adequate budget and appropriate equipment.</p> <p>At Bosra, Palmyre, Abou Mena, Cyrène, Sana's...: lack of appropriate methods, means and effective measures.</p>

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
 The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

The tables of factors affecting the property appear substantial and of multiple and diverse nature.

1) Degree of threats – tables 5.1 and 5.1 (continued)

It must first be remarked that the number of non-responses is greater with regard to environmental constraints (20 reports). At first

glance, this could be interpreted as more intense levels of threat and consequently cause for more concern in regard to pressures linked to development, natural catastrophes and especially population and tourism. These threats would be consecutively less intense and consequently less constraining when they become factors relating to the environment.

2) Prevention of threats and pressures – table 5.2

- The evaluation of the tendency of these factors of threat in item (b), increase or reduction, results in 36% non-responses (12 sites).
- The methods and means of prevention of these threats in [c] only result in 11% of non-responses (3 sites).

The differing rates of response can be explained by the fact that it is easier to identify the causes and prescribe remedies than to measure the effects. This difficulty becomes almost overwhelming when the factors of degradation are multiplied and become interlocked, requiring the establishment of precise and reliable key indicators. Apparently, this is far from being the case (see 6.b on monitoring and key indicators).

With regard to measures undertaken, information provided as an example in [c], (it is unnecessary to cite them all), demonstrates that they are differently appreciated by the authors of the reports, particularly as concerns their effect on the state of the properties.

Concerning the tendencies of the impacts of the threat factors, an **increase in negative tendencies is shown**, in spite of some

measures undertaken, but which are judged to be insufficient by the authors of the reports. This aggravation of conservation conditions, without being general, sometimes only affects certain limited aspects such as thefts and looting for example, on the increase due to armed conflicts or in certain cases because of the increase in the number of tourists.

However, these tendencies are estimated more favourably and the **factors of degradation are on the decrease**, due to the measures undertaken to avert the dangers: increased security, more control, increased public awareness.

The situation is judged to be stationary (stabilised) at Palmyre, Bosra, Kerkouane and Djemila. This does not take into account of course the non responses, numbering twelve (33%), among which there no doubt exists sites where the protection conditions have more or less improved and the deterioration factors have diminished, as could be the case for Nubia or Islamic Cairo. But, of course, this remains to be verified, as subsequently the actual state of conservation of those sites which have been declared as stationary or improving.

15. Monitoring

		YES	NO	No response	Observations
a	Regular monitoring activity at site 1-Periodic monitoring of the flora 2-Periodic monitoring of vegetation 3-Periodic monitoring of the fauna 4-Landscape monitoring 5-Monitoring of constructions, buildings, cities 6-Human resources for monitoring 7-Related material means	86% 8% 61% 33% 11%	6%	8%	No monitoring systems described and no mention of key indicators. Here again, the responses reflect the activity carried out and provide indications on available resources and the means to ensure a certain monitoring.
b	Information on key indicators.	58%	17%	28%	The key indicators cited are: -plaster witnesses -direct observations and the naked eye
c	1-Monitoring partners 2-Administrative arrangements for monitoring 3-Evolution of methodology	42% 36% 3%	14% 11% 19%	36% 44% 47%	
d	Measures undertaken following observations/recommendations Bureau, Committee.	22%	14%	67%	Two types of response: -No recommendations made, -Information not received. The non responses clearly illustrate ignorance of the recommendations or decisions of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

The sites having submitted Section II of the Periodic Report number 36 out of 44 expected. The site of Banc d'Arguin sent a report after the deadline.
The following sites were missing: Alger, le M'zab, Tassili N'ajjer (Algeria), Sousse and Ichkeul (Tunisia), Bat, Al-Khutm, Al Ayn (Oman)

COMMENTS

Most of the properties have on site technical and scientific teams who carry out the upkeep and maintenance work and ensure monitoring as regards continual checks on the state of conservation of the structures. These crews are filling in the gaps, reinforcing the threatened walls and ceilings and, occasionally carrying out emergency restoration work. This is of course valid for the isolated monuments and archaeological sites. With regard to the historic areas and cities, the situation is more complicated given the multiple factors involved, notably human factors, such as socio-economic translocation, urban transformations, adaptive reuse, and other factors affecting the property and likely to affect its authenticity and its integrity.

The objective of monitoring is therefore to ensure that the values that were at the origin of its listing on the World Heritage List are not altered by natural factors of a physical, aesthetic or cultural nature.

This is why it is indispensable to have key indicators to measure the degree of transformation suffered by the site due to these factors, and which can indicate, by simple readings, whether these transformations, when they exist, are sufficiently serious to affect the authenticity/integrity of the site, or are minimal and consequently without any long-lasting or negative effects which could endanger the specific values of the property, to the point where danger listing or delisting could be proposed.

To ensure monitoring by having easily measurable and controllable key indicators by specialised agents in the diverse domains: structures concerning architecture and plaster decoration, marble, painting, ceramics, woodwork, etc. urban structures and demographic, social, economical, functional information..., and an appropriate system established with adequate teams and equipment capable of providing updated information, on a continual basis, due to sufficiently advanced methods, with precision and rigour on the condition of the property.

As mentioned before, no monitoring system exists in any of the sites which prepared reports. Even the concept of key indicators does not appear to have been understood or implemented. Thus the rather high number of non responses (Carthage, El-Jem, Hatra, Bahla Fort), and the replies stating that it does not exist (Cairo, Thebes, Abou Mena, Fez, Shibam...) is very significant. In the majority of cases, monitoring is said to be "regular", carried out by full-time agents such as local or regional agents of the central administration, employees of the prefecture, municipality, urban agencies, specialised centres, friends organizations or local or national laboratories and universities. Representatives of foreign institutions cooperating with the national authorities are sometimes also cited as monitoring partners, as well as UNESCO and World Heritage Centre consultants and experts in the context of the missions they carry out at site at the request of the national authorities.

However, the key indicators mentioned are plaster witnesses used to measure the movement of cracks in monuments, and direct (naked-eye) observations of cracks, land slides, rock subsidence, salinity, and erosion, without any mention of the use of equipment to measure these phenomenon (Petra, Qusair Amra). In general, visual observations -- without measuring instruments, laboratory analyses or statistics or other means of detection and scientific control of the phenomenon (be they physical or non-physical) -- are almost the only means of monitoring progress of damage available to the staff at the site. The only remaining option could be to call upon specialised laboratories in their countries or abroad. Monitoring even reduced to its simplest form is not always carried out and not everywhere. It remains "weak because of the low level of means and budgets" at Timgad and Djemila, "insufficient" at Fez due to lack of appropriate means, and non-existent in Shibam.

With regard to question (d) concerning the measures undertaken by the States Parties following the recommendations of the Bureau

and the Committee, very few answers were received (only three, Fez, Tyr and Qusair Amra), which is explained by two principal reasons:

1. the property was not really concerned by the recommendations of the Bureau or the Committee and the non-response is understandable.
2. the property was concerned by the recommendations but no information reached the local persons responsible as is confirmed by the writers of the reports for Sana'a and Shibam (according to whom the information concerning the decisions of the Committee did not reach them), a fact which is surprising; these recommendations reach the correct destination, but apparently are not filed in well-managed archives, and are

rapidly forgotten. This brings us to the question of archiving of documentation concerning World Heritage properties both within the States Parties and at the World Heritage Centre.

The low number of responses to the important question of the follow up of decisions and recommendations of the Committee, deserves the full attention of the Committee. The same applies to "reactive monitoring" which is not mentioned in the questionnaire and which concerns more especially the follow up to be given by the States Parties to the report on properties under threat.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Invite States Parties to organise appropriate and updated archives relating to their properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and assist them in this task.

2. Assist the persons responsible for the properties to determine specific key indicators for each site and to establish an appropriate monitoring system.

16- Lessons learned from the exercise

16.1. Concerning the questionnaire submitted to the States Parties

To facilitate the preparation of periodic reports by the countries and the sites, we have divided the questionnaire into two main tables (see illustrations below). These tables are divided into 2 columns: in the left column (shaded) the “main questionnaire” (approved by the 21st and 22nd sessions of the World Heritage Committee), and the replies in the right column. In the latter column, were added subsidiary questions and suggestions of multi-criteria choices, or positive/negative choices designed to help in the formulation of responses.

Example of questionnaire for Section I:

I.3. Protection, conservation et présentation du patrimoine culturel et naturel (suite)

I.3.1. Adoption d'une politique générale

a	Fournir des informations sur l'adoption d'une politique visant à assigner une fonction au patrimoine culturel et naturel dans la vie collective. Si OUI, préciser les dates d'élaboration de l'œuvre.	Une politique et des plans visant à assigner une fonction au Patrimoine dans la vie collective sont, Existants NON / OUI – Date: Opérationnels NON / OUI – Date: En cours d'élaboration NON / OUI – Date: Envisagés NON / OUI – Date:	
b	Fournir des informations sur la manière dont l'Etat partie ou les autorités compétentes a/ont pris des mesures pour intégrer la protection des sites du patrimoine mondial dans les programmes de planification générale.	Si ces mesures existent, quelles en sont les principales caractéristiques i) Sont-elles liées à un plan national de développement OUI / NON ii) Sont-elles liées à une stratégie nationale de conservation OUI / NON	

MAIN QUESTION

Example of questionnaire for Section II:

II.4. Gestion (suite)

II. 4.3. Plan de gestion du site et déclaration des objectifs

a	Le plan de gestion est un instrument fondamental de la gestion du site destiné à organiser la conservation et à appuyer les actions de développement relatives au bien. De brefs extraits du plan de gestion pourront être cités et le plan pourra être joint en annexe au dossier.	Un plan de gestion fonctionnel existe-t-il Si OUI, le joindre en annexe. OUI / NON Si NON, un plan de gestion est-il en préparation ou en cours de mise à jour OUI / NON Si NON, pourquoi (Pour les questions suivantes, si OUI, citer des extraits) Les populations locales ont été consultées et informées du plan de gestion OUI / NON Le plan de gestion tient-il compte des ressources humaines disponibles OUI / NON Le plan de gestion tient-il compte des ressources financières réelles OUI / NON Le plan de gestion inclut les problèmes de formation du personnel OUI / NON Le plan de gestion tient compte d'une zonation et des usages multiples du site OUI / NON Le plan de gestion tient-il compte d'une zone tampon définie OUI / NON Le plan de gestion inclut les actions de suivi régulier du site OUI / NON	
----------	--	--	--

SUBSIDIARY QUESTION

This table format method functioned well, was used by more than 90% of the reports and has proven to be very useful.

This presentation by tables was proposed to all the countries in two forms (paper and electronic - Word format), in order to encourage those responsible to fill in their tables by computer. This was possible in more than 60% of the cases. However, the electronic format presented the inconvenience of not being able to receive signatures and had therefore to be addressed to us in both forms, diskettes and paper. This could not be the case for a great number of reports.

Unfortunately, the responses suggested or given as choices or examples in the right hand column did not always give conclusive results. They sometimes provoked incomplete responses and sometimes affected the responses to the questions in the left column. In

certain cases, the writers only replied to the subsidiary questions, giving the impression of not having really read or taken into account the main questions.

The suggested responses did not always correspond to the terminology and the comprehension of the writers. Fortunately, that did not greatly falsify the exercise, but clearly showed that the method should be revised.

This is why we propose for the next exercises of periodic reports of the other regions, not to insert complementary questions in the right hand column, but to concentrate on clearly detailing the main questions of the report, by adding for example, an explanatory commentary under each part of a question.

Moreover, we had given a great deal of thought to the advisability of reformatting the questionnaires to enable automatic processing with a computer programme elaborated for this purpose. As we have already mentioned, that could not be done in the framework of this first exercise (lack of time for its preparation).

However, following this first exercise of periodic reports of the Arab region, we are obliged to revise our judgement. The automatic and computerised processing of the reports would necessitate the use of multiple choice responses once again. However, we have just indicated that these multiple choices are sometimes the cause for minimising the responses and discouraging the writers from providing more detailed responses, in particular on the state of conservation of properties.

We also think it will be necessary in the future to give free rein to the writers to give detailed replies in accordance with their own comprehension of the questions, without being influenced. This remains the best means for an objective exercise. Moreover, it allows all the cultural sensibilities to express themselves freely. Finally, it has been an opportunity to test the language used in the questionnaire and to verify if it is indeed as clear as the Committee would wish.

16.2. Concerning assistance and the method adopted

As explained above, the strategy adopted for the implementation of the Periodic Reports, in three successive stages, seems to have been effective. These stages were: the regional meeting of Beirut (March 2000), the national meetings (between June and August 2000) and finally the drafting of reports (between April and September 2000).

We must remember that the States received a synthesised and personalised documentation that gave them a precise idea of the functioning procedures of the Bureau and the Committee, and presented in a summarised form, all the decisions taken concerning them.

The exercise showed that the World Heritage site managers were very concerned, because for the most part they wished to draft reports directly, which proved to be a very good way to communicate a certain reality of their working conditions to their national authorities. It was also the opportunity to write down all the needs, shortfalls, and all the difficulties encountered.

Moreover and in a general manner, the reports received seem to have attempted as far as possible to reflect the reality in the field.

However, upon seeing this document, all the countries requested the assistance of the World Heritage Centre because only a small number of administrations responsible for

Heritage had real information on the Convention and its implications, and an even smaller number (less than 10%) were familiar with the content of the “Operational Guidelines”.

Assistance provided by the Centre focused on creating awareness and informing about the Convention, its inherent principles and modalities. Its second effect was to enable, for the first time, the visit of a great number of sites at one time by World Heritage Centre experts (23 sites were thus visited in 8 countries, out of a total of 44 sites). Of course, these visits were too short for serious evaluations, but they provided the opportunity for discussions with a large number of persons responsible for the sites and for marking the interest shown by the World Heritage Committee in their state of conservation. Finally, it appears that these visits have encouraged greater frankness and transparency in the reports of these countries.

We may deduce that site visits by the Centre’s experts is necessary to give the required impetus for drawing up the reports; the psychological impact of these visits encourages better co-operation of the States and greater transparency in the reports.

16.3. Concerning contradictions

Upon analysis of the reports, we have noted a certain number of contradictions that, without being problematic in themselves, are revealing in that, in most of the countries, the Convention is still not well known, and is most often perceived only as the instrument of inscription of World Heritage sites. It also means greater prestige for the country, a better international image and greater advantages essentially from tourism. However, the adaptations issuing from adhesion to the Convention are less well understood, particularly those concerning participation, awareness raising or communication in view of the integration of the promotion of the heritage into larger frameworks of regional planning or sustainable development.

As we have indicated throughout this report, the contradictions also stem from the lack of information on all that concerns the introduction of new methods, especially those relating to management and monitoring of the sites. It has to be noted that the chapter above relating to management plans reveals that, due to lack of knowledge, capacities and especially financial means, few sites today have such plans.

We wished to draw attention to these facts in order to throw light on the situation resulting from insufficient knowledge of the nomination dossiers, values and criteria, as well as to stress the diffusion of the spirit of the Convention through the necessary adjustments, especially at the legislative and administrative levels.

16.4 In conclusion

A number of consequences relating in particular to the above contradictions, could be taken into account in the framework of the reflection that has been carried out for several years by the World Heritage Committee. It is not our intention to introduce unwelcome criticism in view of the efforts made and continuing interest, but to contribute positively to resolving potentially problematic and urgent matters that could arise in the coming years and of which all the persons responsible for the World Heritage are extremely conscious.

Today it appears certain that the language and criteria taken into account in the framework of the Convention are and must be adapted or better explained to the different cultural sensitivities. The inscription criteria (statement of value and authenticity/integrity), can appear disconcerting for certain people who rely on universal concepts shared by the majority but which,

upon analysis are revealed to be the result of approaches that can sometimes appear too subjective and perhaps not sufficiently scientific.

Hence the confusion that is sometimes apparent in many reports on the statement of value and changes in authenticity and integrity. The persons responsible are aware of the state of conservation of their properties, but most often they do not know how to measure their actual condition against the criteria retained during the inscription of their site on the World Heritage List.

Our intention is not to make a qualitative judgement, but rather to seek to increase mutual coherence of the new concepts and practices developed in the "Operational Guidelines".

The evolution of the approach, in particular concerning the new categories of properties described in the "Operational Guidelines", is sometimes badly understood by these countries. When the Convention began inscriptions on the World Heritage List, they essentially concerned archaeology, ancient monuments and historic cities (living or dead). Today, new categories, in addition to the natural sites and ancient cultural landscapes, are innovations almost entirely taken from concepts and developments specific to developed and very industrialised countries.

However, in the Arab countries, the historic and natural Heritage of outstanding value that could still be inscribed on the World Heritage List is still widely under-represented (especially that of the Arab and Islamic civilisation) and it is imperative that it be inscribed before it is too late. This is why it is too early to take into account all the existing categories of sites, and it would be wiser to devote efforts to both the state of conservation of the sites inscribed and to new nominations.

These innovations, introduced in the "Operational Guidelines", could, in our opinion, increase the risks of imbalance already observed. From now on, they pose problems for the national persons responsible because of the greater rigour of established procedures (tentative lists, nominations, various assistance requests) which have become more technical and demanding in capacities and specialities that are still cruelly lacking in these administrations. In the meantime, they are a serious handicap for better regulation of the conservation and preparatory activities, notably the new nomination dossiers.

It would appear essential to have a broad debate on these subjects.

As this exercise of periodic reports clearly shows, the key priority should, from now on, focus on the state of conservation of the properties, and the budget devoted to this should become more and more important, which, paradoxically, would reduce the amounts made available for new nominations.

These reflections on the contradictions and the misunderstandings issuing from this exercise of periodic reports for the Arab region, go well beyond those of the Arab region alone and attempt to show that an immediate recognition of equitable and well-balanced approaches could make the very notion of World Heritage more comprehensible and enable better consideration of its inherent values.

17- Final Conclusions and Recommendations

The detailed analysis of the contents of the Periodic Reports of the Arab Region has enabled us to draw conclusions and formulate recommendations which, together, will constitute a medium-term action plan likely to bring about some improvements:

-for the properties

- better management
- more thorough advanced planning
- more effective preventive conservation and monitoring

-for the States Parties

- promotion of the Convention and the effects stemming from its application
- an impetus to planning and an improved integration of heritage into development plans
- a better management of the sites in the framework of preventive conservation

-for the Region

- a more concentrated and better targeted international and regional co-operation
- an improved targeting of policies and regional activities of World Heritage specific to the region

-for the Committee and the Convention

- a better understanding of the conditions of the properties and their needs at the national and regional level
- a better adapted policy and decision-making process.

These conclusions and recommendations can be divided into five principal themes, constituting goals to be attained:

I.	Identification of sites and inscription
II.	Integrated management and conservation plans
III.	Factors affecting the properties, preventive conservation and monitoring
IV.	Promotion of the Convention and the properties inscribed
V.	Training and international cooperation

These goals are identified below. They comprise, on the left side, the conclusions relating to the different aspects of the exercise and the chosen theme and, on the right side, the recommendations to be implemented in the framework of a plan to be studied in depth and a budget which could be submitted at a later date that the Committee may wish to determine.

Goal I - Identification of Properties

Conclusions

1. In general, the statement of value, essential element in justifying the inscription and adopting criteria, does not appear to have been clearly understood. This also applies to the notions of authenticity / integrity.
2. No State has confirmed the existence of a systematic and operational inventory of either cultural or natural sites. Most States reported that they were under preparation.
3. Tentative lists are rarely updated and never harmonised at the regional and sub-regional levels.
4. Properties already inscribed and those foreseen in the tentative lists do not demonstrate an equitable and representative balance of heritage diversity:
 - between the natural sites and the cultural sites,
 - between the diverse civilizations and cultures in the Arab region,
 - between the different Arab countries,
 - compared to neighbouring civilizations and cultures,
 - compared to civilizations and to other cultures in the world.
5. In most cases, the old nomination files are deficient in their documentary content and their archiving.

Recommendations

Consequently:

1. *In order to explore and better clarify the notions of values, authenticity, integrity and the nomination criteria, it is recommended to envisage the holding of regional seminars presented by WHC experts.*
2. *Assistance to States Parties who so request, in the preparation of inventories of their cultural and natural heritage, especially the natural and mixed sites and cultural landscapes.*

Organise meetings between the persons responsible for inventories in the Arab Region in order to study the possibility of unifying the inventory systems implemented in their respective countries benefiting from the present experience being gained in the framework of IPAMED (Computerised Heritage Cartography).
3. *Strengthen preparatory assistance to States Parties who request it for the preparation of:*
 - One)** *the tentative lists or their updating*
 - Two)** *harmonization of tentative lists at the sub-regional level in the Arab Region*
 - Three)** *the nomination files of properties registered on the tentative lists.*
4. *Invite States Parties to organize appropriate and updated archives relating to their properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and assist them in this task.*
5. *Provide to States Parties the missing information on the records at the time of inscription and assist those who request it, to update the old nominations forms.*

Appropriate funds approved by the Committee could be devoted to this goal in the framework of a five-year plan (before the preparation of the next periodic reports foreseen for 2006.

Goal II – Management Plans and Integrated Conservation

Conclusions

The measures for the protection, conservation and presentation of World Heritage taken by the authorities at the national, regional or local levels, often involve legal aspects, surveillance and control of access, over and above the more or less systematic and classic operations of maintenance and/or restoration and rehabilitation of monuments. However, these measures have rarely been the subject of real operational management plans, serving as a coherent frame for the multiple activities; even less so for strategic studies for integrated and sustainable conservation.

This deficiency is due, in most cases, to the sometimes overwhelming difficulties encountered by the responsible persons involved in the elaboration of the plans or wishing to undertake them: methodological, legal, institutional, financial difficulties....

Hence the need:

1. on the one hand, to better explain and further clarify the goals, methods and means of action that the study implies and the implementation of all management and integrated conservation plans taking into account, to the extent possible, of the legal frameworks and structures in force,
2. on the other, orient international, bilateral and multilateral co-operation towards achieving this important goal.

Recommendations

Consequently:

1. *Promote research, particularly in the field of site management, by facilitating the organization of meetings, seminars and short courses for the persons responsible to train and initiate them in the methods and techniques for the elaboration and implementation of management plans for natural sites, archaeological sites, historic cities and monuments.*
2. *Given that it is necessary and urgent that protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage be the subject of real national strategies aiming at their integration into economic and social development plans, management and town planning, States Parties are requested to combine their efforts in the frame of the Arab Region, with advice and assistance from UNESCO/WHC and other international bodies, to attain this goal in a short or medium term.*
*One of the possible actions could be the **preparation and development of a charter** concerning the integration of conservation into economic, social development plans and into town planning development.*

Goal III - Factors affecting Properties

Conclusions

The long list of factors affecting the sites caused by both human and natural impacts has differing levels of threat depending upon whether the pressures are caused by development (polluting industrial activities, heavy industry, populations, tourism..) or those linked with the constraints of the environment and natural catastrophes.

The measures undertaken to prevent these risks and combat the dangers are differently appreciated from one site to another and the results are more or less tangible, ranging from the pure and simple increase of the negative tendencies, to the stationary state of conservation conditions.

Positive and negative tendencies can sometimes be combined in one site and create, on the one hand, favourable conservation conditions for certain values, and on the other, unfavourable conditions for other values and in extreme cases put the site in danger. Hence, the difficulties encountered during the close examination of the reports for evaluation of the situation in an objective and perceptive manner.

Recommendations

Consequently:

The identification of factors affecting the properties and the recognition of the tendencies which constitute the principal goals for the elaboration of the periodic reports, should be the constant and primordial concern of those responsible for the sites.

The persons responsible for the sites are therefore invited to take the maximum precautions at the time of the evaluation of the threats to their sites, so as to clearly identify the factors of degradation and to judge as closely as possible the risks of loss of value as well as the tendencies. Few reports have clearly recognized the irreversible loss of values since the inscription of their sites.

However, the Committee will no doubt be called upon, following the present report, to request the States Parties to be more severe and rigorous in their appreciation of the risks as well as in their evaluations of the tendencies, and to undertake all the necessary measures as required and if necessary the procedure for the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Goal III (continued) – Preventive Conservation and Monitoring

Conclusions

The **monitoring** goal is to ensure that the values which were at the origin of the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List have not, with time, been altered or quite simply eliminated under the effect of the natural elements or caused by development, whether physical or aesthetic and cultural.

Preventive conservation, more than any other kind of remedial intervention, such as restoration or rehabilitation, remains the most effective means for the long-term preservation of heritage values.

To attain its goals, the monitoring operation should dispose of tools which are **key indicators** and with which it is possible to measure the evolution of the transformations undergone by the site, and to know with precision if these alterations were sufficiently serious whereby the specific values of the site are in danger, and consequently the site itself.

The periodic reports for the Arab Region, do not report upon the existence of monitoring systems which link preventive conservation and key indicators such as defined above. Nor do they dispose of measuring equipment, laboratory analyses, statistics or other means of detection, be they physical or non-physical.

Recommendations

Consequently:

The Committee is called upon to contribute through the assistance and aid of the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICCROM, ICOMOS), to the preparation and establishment by the States Parties, of appropriate monitoring systems for the sites inscribed based upon preventive conservation methods and the definition of the key indicators.

Goal IV - Promotion of the Convention and the Inscribed Properties

Conclusions

Promotion of the Convention and the inscribed properties:

1. need for promotional activities
 - **educational activities** well targeted in the policies for education and awareness of the environment and national and world heritage.
 - **Actions for information and strengthening of public awareness** through:
 - + mass media: radio-T.V.- press...
 - + scientific publications and dissemination, exhibitions, conferences, films...
 - + visitor, information and communication structures, at site.
2. need of **actors and promoters**

Other official organisms, civil society and populations in general have a role to play.

Judging from the periodic reports for the Arab Region, rarely have the promotional activities and the role of society have rarely reached either the level or the scope that might have been expected.

Recommendations

Consequently:

1. the World Heritage Committee should take initiatives to assist States Parties who express the need, to elaborate promotional programmes for heritage in general, and for the Convention and the properties inscribed in particular (educational and awareness of the environment programmes and world heritage programmes).
2. the States Parties should encourage the participation of civil society (foundations, associations...) in national heritage promotional actions, the Convention and properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, so as to provide their support and assistance in the field of safeguarding and presentation of the monuments and sites. To this end, the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM) and the Committee itself, are called upon to play an effective role in inciting, advising and, as the case may be, in partnership.

Objectif V – Training and International Co-operation

Conclusions

In spite of the existence of potential training possibilities in the Arab region itself and abroad:

- long-term basic training
- short-term complementary and recycling training

The periodic reports, without exception, highlight increasing needs:

1. for training in the different fields:
 - high level technicians for the restoration of monuments and objects: stone and wooden structures, plaster decorations, mosaics, ceramics... conservators of monuments and sites.
 - Specialists in urban planning and site management in general.
 - Technicians for archaeological, land and underwater excavations.
 - Computer technicians
 - jurists, archivists, documentalists...
2. for scientific research activities that are more intense and more oriented towards conservation studies / presentation and integration of properties in the socio-economic and cultural fields.
3. for diversified co-operation, beyond the strict framework of archaeological missions, for the conservation / restoration and enhancement of the properties.

Recommendations

1. *The Committee is invited to give greater attention to training matters and to strengthening co-operation in the particular fields of conservation / restoration / management and presentation, which are major concerns of those responsible for properties and on which will depend, to a great extent, the future of the Arab properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The definition of a global strategy for training and professional capacity building must be a priority objective in this regard.*
2. *In this framework, the Committee and ICCROM will certainly have a role to play with the States Parties in order to help them define national strategies and /or a regional strategy for training and promotion in the fields of sciences and technology, as well as those of the heritage professions.*

The conclusions and recommendations for the above goals could be the subject of a long-term action plan aiming to improve the conservation conditions of the Arab Heritage, through better integration in the development process, more precisely sustainable development.

In a general manner, this action plan is a logical follow up to the periodic reports. Therefore, it is necessary to pursue the action and meet the expectations of the countries through a coherent and concrete response.

This action plan would be conceived as a pilot operation that should be developed and followed up in order to cover all the activities relating to the other regions of the world in the following years, and its implementation will fall upon the World Heritage Centre in the framework of its policy and strategies for the next decade. As immediate action, this action plan could launch the procedure of annual forms for updating data gathered from periodic reports; this could be the first phase of the programme for archiving data and documentation foreseen in the framework of the priority actions below.

This action plan could be implemented over a period of five to ten years, in accordance with the financial and human resources available. Already, several priority actions that could be carried out on short term, and implemented in close co-ordination and co-operation with the advisory bodies, ICOMOS and IUCN in particular, can be defined:

1. Mandate the World Heritage Centre to implement a study on the development of this action plan, according to the above goals, as well as the budget necessary to this effect (including the identification of partners and budgetary and/or extra-budgetary resources). And, finally, to submit it to the Bureau that should meet in June 2001, and which could have the mandate to approve and decide its modalities of immediate implementation. This action plan could include, in particular:
 - define and implement a global strategy for **training and professional capacity building** in collaboration with ICCROM.
 - conceive and encourage the implementation by the States Parties of **promotional programmes for the Convention and the inscribed Properties** (educational and awareness-raising programmes focusing on the environment and the heritage).

The budget necessary to carry out the study of this plan to be submitted to the Bureau in June 2001, is \$US35,000. The Committee could decide to allocate this amount in the framework of budgetary revisions or reallocations, depending upon the priority given to the elaboration of such a plan.

2. Create within the World Heritage Centre a **Monitoring Service** that would be charged with:
 - maintaining contact with the States of the Arab Region (then with the other regions of the world), with a view to informing them of the follow up to the periodic reports, and discussing with them the different options resulting from this exercise.
 - beginning the procedure for the annual updating forms on information on the sites figuring in the periodic reports.
 - organising immediately at the World Heritage Centre the methodological archiving of all the documentation concerning the properties and

assisting the States Parties to update their own documentation as well as the old nomination dossiers.

- insuring the implementation, in close co-ordination with the advisory bodies, of the present Action Plan or any other programme adopted by the Committee and intended to follow up the periodic reports of the Arab Region.

In the light of the present periodic reports, which are the first since the implementation, twenty-eight years ago, of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the Committee's attention will certainly be drawn to **the deficiencies and difficulties of all kinds**, which the writers have indicated in all honesty and transparency. This is the case for a great number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and clearly shows **the credibility of the majority of these reports**. However, several doubts, legitimate or not, are raised on the properties that were not reported on or that were sent very late (in Algeria: the Kasbah of Algiers, the M'Zab Valley and Tassili N'Ajjer; in Tunisia: the Medina of Sousse and Lake Ichkeul; in the Sultanate of Oman: Bat, Al Khutm and Al-Ayn (three sites for a single inscription) and in Mauritania: the Banc d'Arguin). These are eight sites out of forty-four inscribed before 1993.

Under these conditions, it is obvious that in the future, priority should be given to the **continuous and attentive examination of situations which prevail at the sites that are already inscribed** and of which the precariousness of a good number of them (which the writers of their reports admit to), is without doubt. The Committee would probably be led to **revise its policy**, in order to take account both of the urgent need to intervene in view to incite to indispensable corrections and to respond to the expectations of those responsible for these properties.

A revision that could encourage the programmes and budgets destined to promote better targeted and more diversified Training, better comprehension of the conditions of the Properties and their needs, more thorough planning, better integration in the regional development policies, more effective preventive and on-going conservation and finally, a better knowledge of the Convention and its effects. For this, the Committee will probably have no other choice than to encourage the States Parties to **increasingly limit the already considerable number of new properties to be inscribed**, in order to devote the greater part of its efforts and means to the preservation and promotion of sites which have been inscribed of long date and which demand more attention and care.