I. Title of Workshop

World Heritage Status Appeal to Donors: A Tool to Strengthen Sustainable Financing Mechanisms.

II. Overview and Objectives

A protected area with World Heritage status has the benefit of being internationally recognized for its outstanding global value through the screening process of UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention. Such sites “constitute a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate.” 176 nations have signed this document (out of a potential 192) and by doing so, have formally undertaken to uphold it. Strictly speaking, this “duty” has been carried out largely through the creation of the World Heritage Fund – which is replenished annually by the transfer of 1% of national annual UNESCO membership dues. The fund is used to finance many site and system related World Heritage Centre activities. However, only a small fraction of real needs can be satisfied with this fund.  

Through alternative means, UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre is seeking to renew global commitment to under financed World Heritage Sites. With the support of private foundations such as Ted Turner’s United Nations Foundation, over $20M have been channeled to 15 sites in the past 5 years, and an additional $30M are expected to be channeled in the next 5 years. This effort has also enlisted the support of large conservation organizations such as the WWF, CI and FFI. Most of these projects include dedicated sustainable financing objectives, including the establishment of endowment funds and the participation of the tourism sector. The WHC is also seeking to have natural World Heritage sites (category iv – of global value for their biodiversity) recognized by the Convention on Biological Diversity as a means through which biodiversity can be conserved. A memorandum of cooperation was recently signed and further progress is expected to take place in the COP VII meetings next year.

Despite these efforts, there is still a long road ahead, even for the “jewels of the crown” of global protected areas. Of the 137 natural heritage properties currently listed for “biological processes / biodiversity” values (criteria ii and iv), 62 are located in lower income countries. There is reason to believe that most are chronically under funded – this assumption is supported by the fact that 16 of the 17 World Heritage sites in Danger are located in these countries.

Preparatory activities leading to this workshop identified several initiatives currently being carried out by World Heritage Site managers and participating NGO’s. Though they provided good insights as to how various sites were trying to deal with sustainable financing, workshop organizers concluded that these initiatives were not directly related to the World Heritage status of the protected area in question – the

---

1 Paragraph 44 of the “Operational Guidelines for the Implementation fo the World Heritage Convention”.
2 “Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage”. Article 6.1
3 apx. $3.5M per year for 765 World Heritage Site, only 16% of which are natural sites. Funds available have been decreasing in the past 2 years.
initiatives could just as well be implemented in other protected areas. In an effort to clearly define the focus of the workshop, organizers have focused discussion to those aspects of financing that relate as much as possible to the World Heritage Status of a site.

Of particular relevance, World Heritage status automatically places a protected area within a limited network of protected areas that are legally and internationally recognized for their universal conservation values. When a site is - and stays - on the World Heritage list, stakeholders can be assured that the site is maintaining those qualities for which it was nominated at the outset, thanks to the constant monitoring of site integrity and management by the World Heritage Centre, the network’s official secretariat. This dedicated secretariat provides a unique value added to the network of World Heritage Sites in its ability to coordinate network activities and engage external stakeholders on the international stage.

Given this special status, how are World Heritage Sites uniquely positioned to pursue sustainable financing strategies? One key approach has been to act as the target for directed conservation initiatives. Regional and international conservation organizations, those organizations that are often better positioned to access international conservation financing networks, may find it easier to raise political and financial interest for World Heritage Sites. We call such organizations “intermediaries”, in that they can play the role of “funding broker” between site level managers and NGO’s, and the international supporters of conservation activities.

This workshop will explore the role of the intermediary, or “funding broker”, in connecting interested donors to World Heritage Sites in need of financial support. The workshop will also identify what site managers and associated site NGO’s can do to identify and develop good working relationships with such intermediaries.

The workshop will be of particular interest to donors and funding agencies, large NGO’s, conservation policy analysts, UN agency representatives, site level managers and stakeholders.

III. Content and Structure of Workshop

1. Commentary on World Heritage Site Financing (10 minutes – no discussion).
Sites of supposed global value and how they are faring in regards to financing their baseline activities – Natarajan Ishwaran, UNESCO World Heritage Centre. The commentary is expected to have participants conclude that even among sites that are internationally recognized as being of outstanding global value, there are serious financing constraints, jeopardizing their integrity.

2. Three Case Studies (1 hr)
Three case studies will illustrate how World Heritage status has helped intermediaries attract outside funding for specific sites. The case studies will also attempt to identify how local site managers and involved NGO’s can position themselves to make their sites more attractive to outside financing. The role of the World Heritage Centre in coordinating efforts will also be analyzed.
Case studies will have 12 minutes to present, followed by 2 questions. After all three have presented, an additional 15 minute questions period will follow.

**Case Study #1:** Bringing the Private Sector in Touch with Specific World Heritage Sites – Martin Hollands, Fauna and Flora International

**Case Study #2:** The Appeal of a Network of Globally Recognized Protected Areas to Large Foundations – Seema Paul, United Nations Foundation

**Case Study #3:** The Intermediary – Connecting Interested Donors to Priority Sites – Javier Corcuera, Fundación Vida Silvestre, Argentina.

3. **Moderated Panel Discussion** (1 hr)

Three World Heritage site managers will have been invited to receive and review the case studies prior to the workshop. Following the question period, they will have 10 minutes each to comment on the case studies, providing their particular perspectives on options available, including the exploration of how they could best develop productive relationships with intermediaries.

Panelists:
- Alfredo Arellano, Sian Ka’an Biosphere Reserve;
- Angelique Songco, Tubbataha Reef Marine Reserve Philippines, and
- Terri Castis, St. Lucia Wetlands, South Africa.

4. **Conclusions** (20 minutes)

A rapporteur will present a summary of the workshop’s most interesting aspects and the panel moderator will invite participants to comment and contest.

**IV. Outputs**

Participants will:

- Develop a renewed sense of World Heritage Sites as a logical focus for conservation priorities.
- See World Heritage Sites as a reasonable focus around which to rally international interest and non-traditional donors in protected areas conservation
- Have identified ways in which they can promote this vision through their own professional activities

A publication containing results of congress preparatory activities and of the congress workshop will be produced in coordination with other WHC congress outputs.