

## **Multilateral Cooperation in Heritage and Development** (including bilateral and Multi Bi Assistance, and funds and trust mechanisms, cost sharing, etc.)

### **1.1 The UN System and Specialized Agencies**

Multilateral aid has been provided by the UN system and in particular through/with the specialized agencies of the UN system. This has been the case since the inception of Technical Assistance programmes for Development after World War II. It would have to be noted that when it came down to sectorial work, e.g. agricultural development, industrial development, etc., it has been the Specialized Agency of the UN, FAO, UNIDO, etc. to put the substance and know-how and cooperate with governments in setting up and implementing Development projects primarily concerned with pre-investment type of activities ranging from **institution building** to **training**, expertise **advice** and **technology/equipment**.

Until the 1960's the Technical Assistance Board of the UN managed the aid programmes. There was at the time a certain harmonious network of UN-assisted projects in various parts of the world with Specialized Agencies playing a key role in substantive matters.

## 1.2 UNDP and its raison d'être (Past/Present/Future)

With a view to fund and adequately coordinate country-specific as well as regional or interregional projects across the globe, the TAB gradually became the UN Development Programme (UNDP). It is no coincidence that the first Administrator of UNDP was in person the Administrator of the Marshall Plan to Europe after World War II. Mr. Hoffman is the pioneer of making UNDP the world's largest multilateral grant **development assistance organization**, serving presently more than 180 developing countries and territories through a network of offices worldwide.

UNDP is the key instrument for technical cooperation of the United Nations. Its mandate is launched to promote conditions of economic and social progress, and what has become **Sustainable Human Development, Natural Resource Development**, and even the recently MDG's (Millennium Development Goals) launched by the UN General Assembly in 2000 and reviewed in 2005 in New York.

The goal of UNDP has been established, and is in constant evolution assisting the developing countries to build self-reliance and enhance their capacities for SHD, which not only generates economic growth but distributes its benefits equitably, **protects** and **regenerates** the **environment 'heritage'**, empowers people and enlarges their choices and opportunities.

If we were to look at the profile of the **funding mechanisms and resource trends** of the United Nations, we would see **four major organizations** involved in development and humanitarian assistance, which have been established to meet their specific tasks.

These are the '**UNDP**' and associated **funds**, the **UNICEF**, the **UNFPA**, and the World Food Programme (**WFP**). They all have in common that they are voluntarily funded, notwithstanding the fact that there is a considerable diversity by/in which these organizations mobilize resources. These differences are closely linked to their individual mandates and constituencies.

Since 1972, UNDP established a **country programme approach** (result of Jackson Capacity Study), and on the basis of a number of criteria

earmarking to every developing country a certain allocation of funds, which in turn were to be programmed in various sectors in collaboration with the Resident Representative of UNDP on site.

Until the late 1990's, this was called IPF (**Indicative Planning Figure**), which has now become the CCF (**Country Cooperation Framework**) and "funds" both core and otherwise. Funds were allocated for periods of five years, starting 1972 and excellent administrative **management** systems were put in place to **assess, evaluate** projects, follow-up etc., bearing in mind that UNDP funds were primarily for Technical Assistance in the form of grants, and were preparing **pre-investment projects** which could come from loans and other forms of investment funds from the public, and even the **private** sectors.

With the establishment of UNDP, **specialized Agencies** were brought into the picture, along with developing countries, to execute the projects established at the national, regional or interregional level, in accordance with the theme of the project, e.g. education - UNESCO, health - WHO, culture - UNESCO, cultural heritage - UNESCO, fisheries -FAO, etc.

In fact, Agencies were given the corresponding funds of IPF. They executed the projects with the Governments and the Ministries concerned and got an **overhead** for administrative costs. UNDP supervised/ administered "in situ" all projects with Governments concerned.

Under this scenario, UNDP was able to increase its voluntary contributions to about 1 billion a year by the late 1980's. The 1990's showed constant reductions. The shortfall, for example 1993, and the multiplying effect on the following years, had forced then UNDP management to restrict commitments and expenditures to 70% of the initial IPFs.

Gradually, UNDP had to look into **non-core contributions**. These have been through four main sources of non-core funding:

- a. Third-party cost sharing (bilateral programmes of some donor countries)
- b. Government cost sharing (programme countries mostly third world and recently E/C/Europe)
- c. Trust funds (Donor Governments)

d. Resource Mobilization from various sources, including Private, Special Events etc.

This note **does not detail** UNDP's own development and priority areas, which it has established over the years for its world Development Assistance programmes. UNDP's major areas of collaboration have responded to world development conditions. (See www.....)

### **As to Cultural Heritage**

It must be stated that in the field of **cultural heritage**, UNDP has been one of the major donors through UNESCO to governments, for UNESCO to be able to execute projects in fields of its competence e.g. Cultural Heritage and Historic Sites, resource archaeology, museums, archaeological site protection, monuments, post disaster, mitigation in historic areas etc. Facts and figures are available. The CTA in Latin America made a summary of 25 years UNDP assistance in Cultural Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean, with facts and figures and results.

Presently, there are more and more non-core funded projects. There are less and less projects with Agencies. There is more and more direct Government execution. An Agency set up by the UN in New York, OPS, particularly for inter-sectorial projects, has now become the major Executing Agency of UN, which includes UNDP. It is for Technical Assistance, **procurement** services, etc. UNDESA is also a sort of Agency in social development in New York along with specialized Agencies. It does not have an executive role.

UNDP's present priorities are in governance, advocacy, poverty, information technology, energy and AIDS (UNDP 2003-2007 cycle).(See next cycle at www....)

The underlying element of UNDP today is in its capacity to manage its own programmes and coordinate others with the structures it possesses in the field, through the UNDP Resident Representative and UN Coordinator-led UNDP Field Offices. It has recently undergone some restructuring and is in constant progress and adaptation to local conditions.

In matters of **our** concern, UNDP's position has always been that '**Culture and Cultural Heritage could be an element strengthening Sustainable Human Development**'.

**Given the above six areas of priority, and given the fact that UNDP is presently much more an initiator of projects and a mobilizer of funds, Historic City preservation from the angles of Municipal Governance, Inner City Poverty Alleviation, Sustainable Human Development, could be of interest to UNDP's country agendas in collaboration with Governments concerned.**

**Heritage and cultural projects will not be financed, in my humble opinion, if they are not a part of major Inner City rehabilitation.**

**Archaeological Conservation, museum development, linked with poverty eradication, Urban SHD.**

**I foresee that the question will be how can Cultural Heritage Assets, physical and non-material, contribute to the improvement of living conditions and alleviate issues of dramatic proportions stemming from poverty in urban areas when it comes to preserving historical sites.**

Still it can be said therefore that the **future**, pending on cases, UNDP could play a crucial and initial role in setting up, with Local and Central Governments, and to that matter, with the private sector, of comprehensive and integral conservation and rehabilitation projects in Historic Cities/Centers and elsewhere where Cultural Heritage is at stake.

It has done so already through various funding mechanisms, in Samarkand, Fez, Havana, Quito, Sana'a, Vilnius, Cairo, among others, and is still initiating and was until recently collaborating in projects of Culture with UNESCO under different mechanisms of funding, including the STS and SPPD whereby UNESCO funded to deliver technical services in Heritage matters. (This is now not any more the case for UNESCO and other agencies. These STS, SPPD have been suspended since some years now 2004. )

**The immediate future on UNDP's involvement in cultural heritage and Historic City preservation will highly depend on availability of funds, priorities established by Governments, and the role of UNESCO, the World Heritage Center and advisory bodies such as ICCROM, ICOMOS, as specialized NGO's to collaborate effectively with a well-managed strategy and programme, and their follow-up on site.**

As to the work of NGO's and advisory bodies of the World Heritage Center of UNESCO, it could be interesting if those would revise their modus operandi.

As to bilateral and Multi Bi Assistance, it is also worthwhile seeing that in the last years some donor governments give **National** Third World Countries and/or cities and/or sites the responsibility to carry out projects in Heritage. Also the site-to-site programme horizontal, city to city projects of UNDP with the Decentralized Technical Cooperation Schemes (city to city – now mainly from European cities, to cities in developing countries) is catching momentum and is an innovative way of financing a local-to-local decentralized cooperation. And TCDC is a very new innovative programme of UNDP.

### 1.3 World Bank and Regional Development Banks.

In the field of **cultural heritage**, it has always been considered that optimal results would be obtained as follow-up of technical assistance projects if later investments would be forthcoming from the World Bank, Regional Development Banks, to assess and execute projects of **Cultural Heritage** with mechanisms and institutions put in place.

With the same token, until the 1980's, with the exception of tourism, Heritage and Cultural Projects were considered non-fundable and not at all related to investment objectives and priorities of the World Bank and Regional Development Banks in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

The investment in environment started to become a certain priority for the banks in the 1980's and 1990's and early 2000's. New mechanisms were devised (GEF) in the World Bank/UNDP.

On Heritage matters, things started changing dramatically with the attitude expressed by the banks over the last fifteen years. There is no doubt that the **transition economies** after the decline of the Soviet Union have been a triggering point of departure. So have been the ever more deteriorating conditions of poverty in the world. So have been the lessons learned of failures in large-scale infrastructure investment projects. The list can go on and on and on. Thus Cultural Heritage obtained a de-facto space.

**Today ± 240 projects related to Cultural Heritage are found in the World Bank's projects database on the Internet.**

The recent-past President of the World Bank, James D. Wolfensohn, is quoted to say:

***"We must respect the rootedness of people in their own societal context. We must protect the heritage of the past. But we must also foster and promote living culture in all its many forms. As recent economic analyses have consistently shown, this also makes sound business sense. From tourism to restoration, investments in cultural heritage and related industries promote labor-intensive economic activities that generate wealth and income."***

- The World Bank, through its **environmentally sustainable programmes** and various other sectorial projects is addressing itself to cultural heritage and Historic City rehabilitation and/or historic cultural assets.
- The World Bank has taken the initiative of bringing together UNESCO, some major foundations, specialized Agencies, with the purpose to exchange views on the Bank's involvement in Heritage and Historic City preservation. Projects can be seen in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Vietnam, Indonesia, China, India, Morocco, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, Tunisia, Yemen, Russian Federation, among others.
- A number of Working Groups have been set up with organizations such as UNESCO and WHC, Aga Khan Trust for Culture, ICCROM, ICOMOS, Getty Conservation Institute, the Council of Europe, Rockefeller Foundation, the World Monuments Fund.
- Already in 1996, a first list of cities was agreed upon for joint cooperation. It included: Fez, Hue, Samarkand, St. Petersburg and Vilnius. New projects are in the making in various places in the 2006-2008 triennium.
- Other countries and/or cities are being added or deleted from the list as time goes by. Most Heritage projects are **components** of existing major projects of **Sectorial** order, or **simply Heritage projects per se**. There are hardly any integrated inter-disciplinary projects launched and executed with WB cooperation. All these issues need further analysis.
- Some years ago, with funds provided by Italy, the World Bank organized a conference in Florence, entitled **Culture Counts: Financing, Resources, and Economics of Culture in Sustainable Development**.
- The premise of the conference was that **culture is crucial to advancing sustainable development**. The objectives were:

- a) to promote the expansion of economic analysis in, and resources available for, culture in sustainable development programmes;
- b) to expand the range of institutions and actors involved in culture with a development perspective;
- c) to increase the instruments to be used for these programmes.

The conference provided an important forum for experts and key decision-makers to discuss the full range of economic and financial issues linked to the cultural dimensions of poverty alleviation in development countries.

- The World Bank has also convened international meetings in Washington **on sacred places and cities which have a built heritage component**. The world of NGO's, academic institutions, foundations and UNESCO were invited to present their knowledge and experience on this matter to guide the Bank's involvement in the protection and enhancement of such sites.
- The comprehensive development framework of the WB as discussed internally early in 2000 gives particular attention to cultural issues alongside SHD and refers to it as: **Sustainable Development, Environmental and Cultural Issues**.
- All in all, there is a genuine interest of the WB to be a major actor in heritage matters in general and historic city preservation. (See website.)
- The questions as to how, with whom and the position of various stakeholders, **especially that of UNESCO or ICCROM to that matter**, have to be looked into.
- As to Latin America and the Caribbean, the **Inter-American Development Bank** is the pioneer of Heritage support activities. Its first project was in response to a request from Peru and UNESCO in

the early 1970's in what was going to be a Cultural Tourism project, enhancing historic sites in southern Peru from Cuzco to the Bolivian border (Copesco project). IDB's loan was supplemented by **technical assistance provided by UNESCO with UNDP funding**. This was the perfect match then. **Training** was a component.

Regional training courses organized in Cuzco profited from in-situ projects being developed and executed with IDB funding. It improved roads, tourism infrastructure, established craft centres, training and marketing, and did some considerable work in adaptive re-use and promoted non-physical heritage.

- Gradually over the years there was a shift from exclusive tourism in reference to heritage, and presently, IDB through its **Sustainable Social Development** sector, is collaborating in major projects of Historic Cities in Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Paraguay, and an interdisciplinary project of city revitalization in Quito, Ecuador. Also there is emphasis on the Maya World and the archaeological sites therein. New projects are now in 2008 developed in the area. (See website [www....](#))
- IDB's work is serious. Its annual Board of Governors' meetings have had over the years special workshops on the matter of heritage and Historic Cities to promote ideas and guidelines for the Bank's clients and the Bank's own planning strategy. It has published a series of articles on the subject and its involvement in Culture and Development.
- While extensive material is available, and we have gathered practically everything, it would be propitious in 2008 to compile the work of IDB, alongside with WB, and **ascertain UNESCO's role in this challenging and positive enterprise**, obviously, along member states and local governments.
- As to the **Asian Development Bank**, whereas its initial investments in the 1960's and 1970's focused on **physical** infrastructure in support of economic growth and culture development, the Bank

made its first analytical effort to link culture and economic development in the 1990's by commissioning a regional study on growth and **traditional cultural systems**. ADB considers that development is multi-dimensional; that socio-cultural issues are a key concern to beneficiaries, and the socio-cultural factors can critically influence the success or failure prospects.

- In addition to designing culturally sensitive projects, direct support is being given to the cultural role in development investments, including **redevelopment of historic sites in urban and rural areas**, development and protection of heritage and eco-tourism sites, and cultural empowerment of indigenous communities as a prerequisite to their economic empowerment.

There is a large and rich variety of programmes supported by ADB in the field of culture.

Evaluation methodologies are in the process of being developed to help capture the social benefits and costs of cultural programmes.

ADB has come a long way in recognizing the importance of culture and its activities. A lot has to be done. It would be propitious to look into ADB's participation in Historic City rehabilitation in Asia as we move to 2008.

- As to the **African Development Bank**, it has recently adopted a Vision which states Human Resource Development among focal areas of its interventions. The African Bank is not directly involved in any Inner Historic City Rehabilitation or Cultural Heritage projects.
- As to **EBRD**, the bank began operations less than 15 years ago, in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union and its satellites in Europe.

It is a transition bank and not a development bank. The promotion of culture is not part of the Bank's mandate. However, it is heavily involved in institution building, thus offering people a chance to defend and promote their way of life and building the future in countries which have deep-rooted civilizations going back thousands of years. As EBRD embarks on investment projects, it

makes sure that every project has built-in measures to **mitigate** existing **environmental damage** and to prevent its re-occurring. It is hoped that while the bank has taken as a priority the 'transition impact', namely, the benefit expected to the recipients to help them prosper and preserve their integrity, it will gradually consider that there are a number of dilemmas on culture and development in its area of influence. Historic Cities are undergoing change with investments. What is the impact of this change for the sustainability of conservation of built heritage, and the sustainability of the social aspects of new economic scenarios and global economic development?

What is the role of UNESCO in Culture and Development?

#### **1.4 NGO's, Foundations (see separate paper)**