

USEFUL QUESTIONS TO ASK

- ▶ Is the institutional framework clearly documented, transparent and accessible? This is vital to favour accountability and staff motivation and to facilitate participatory approaches, amongst other things.
- ▶ Having identified values in a participatory way (see Appendix A), is the adequacy of the institutional framework to protect them also reviewed?
- ▶ Is the capacity (autonomy, size, efficiency, responsiveness, etc.) of the institutional framework adequate for the needs of the specific cultural properties for which it is responsible? Also for their wider setting (the buffer zone and beyond), and the social, economic and environmental implications?
- ▶ Has the ability of the institution(s) to attract resources, not only financial, from a diversity of sources been assessed?
- ▶ Is there the organizational capacity in the institutional framework to be accountable to funders, superior governing bodies, staff and target groups (and future generations)?
- ▶ Check the 'authority' of the institution in charge. It should have the authority to ensure that the World Heritage Convention commitment is maintained for the property, and cannot be sidelined by lesser commitments. This is critical.
- ▶ Is there the internal capacity to improve institutions using new and innovative tools?

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS FOR WORLD HERITAGE

Key considerations

The 1972 Convention refers to the need for administrative provisions but does not define specific requirements or characteristics of the institutional framework (perhaps because they vary so much from country to country).

A State Party must identify a single institution to act as the nodal point for all World Heritage matters and for communication with the World Heritage Centre. For Periodic Reporting, in particular, a 'focal point' is appointed from an institution with a primary management role for all the World Heritage of a particular State Party (see Part 3.5).

In reality, in all World Heritage processes institutions play a primary role, from the preparation of a Tentative List through to the day-to-day management of a World Heritage property. Indeed, effective management of World Heritage properties depends on the extent to which the institutions embrace the Convention and *Operational Guidelines* at every level of management.

Effective management of World Heritage also depends on institutions being flexible enough to:

- work with a range of institutions linked to a particular property, from the time of preparing the nomination to management after inscription
- respect requirements (e.g. monitoring responsibilities, following up 'State of Conservation' requests, facilitating missions, Periodic Reporting, OG requirements and the need to protect OUV as the baseline for management), and
- accommodate new and emerging concepts in the World Heritage system (e.g. improving approaches to capacity-building, risk management and sustainable development and the impact of climate change).