



**REPORT ON THE SECOND PHASE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
NOMINATION TRAINING COURSE (Participant progress)**

26 November 2010 – April 2011

APRIL 19TH 2011

**REPORT PREPARED BY
DR. HERMAN KIRIAMA
IMMOVABLE HERITAGE COORDINATOR
CENTRE FOR HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA (CHDA)
P.O. BOX 90010
MOMBASA**

1- INTRODUCTION

The Nomination training course for selected countries in English Speaking Africa that was the second such training in nomination dossier development meant to increase the number and quality of Sites on the world heritage list from Africa as well as develop continental capacity in heritage management, especially in the preparation of nomination of sites from the continent to the World Heritage List took place in Etosha Namibia from 15th to 26th November 2011. This course was further meant to create capacity within the African continent that is aware of the rigorous needs and demands of heritage in general and world heritage in particular with a view to realizing good practice in heritage management. As part of the Global Strategy for a representative and credible List it was conceptualizes to complements other training exercises that have and some continue to take place within the continent in conservation and heritage management.

This training followed the first one that took place in Lesotho in 2008-2009, and is in response to among other things, the underrepresentation of African sites on the world heritage list in spite of its diverse heritage, (with barely 9% on its heritage on world heritage list), as well as to address the over representation of African sites on the world heritage list in danger. Thus participants are expected not only to be capable of carrying out successful nomination exercises but also ensuring the wellbeing and health of the heritage through good conservation practice.

The training is organized as a collaborative exercise between the African World Heritage Fund, UNESCO-WHC, CHDA, EPA, IUCN, ICCROM, ICOMOS and African Heritage Professionals. Both CHDA and EPA are the coordinating institutions while AWHF provides the funding for the exercise. UNESCO provides funding that goes to support the participation of UNESCO resource persons in the course. The Overall Coordinators are independent African heritage professionals assisted by other heritage professionals and together with the two heritage institutions, organize and run the course. CHDA coordinates the English speaking course with George Abungu as the Overall Course Coordinator assisted by Guy Palmer and Linda Kanyemba while, EPA coordinates the French speaking one with Alexis Adande as the Overall Coordinator assisted by Victoire Adegbidi.

The selection that is open to all sub Sahara African countries and participants states that participants must get endorsement from their respective directors of heritage. They must also have a site dedicated for the nomination process on which they are working and need to assure the coordination committee through written agreement that after the course, they will commit their time to the site nomination process until the exercise is completed.

While it is the responsibility of the states parties to ensure the process of nomination and sound management of their properties, as signatory to the 1972 convention, the states parties can apply for funding from the World Heritage Fund, the AWHF and, other multi lateral, bilateral and other funding sources to prepare their nomination dossiers, management plans, and to put in place proper mechanisms of good and sustainable management of their properties. Thus apart from funding the nomination training exercise

the AWHF provides funds on request for the preparation of nomination dossier and or management plans of sites of up to 15,000US\$. Countries are often encouraged to take advantage of this resource and apply for support and part of the training is also meant to prepare the participants on the process of fund raising in general and to the AWHF in particular.

The course has become quite popular as countries compete to have their heritage listed as well as well taken care of by qualified and knowledgeable staff. Thus for the 2010-2011 nomination course there were 40 plus candidates who applied and all were good, but only 16 from 8 countries could be taken due to space, logistics, finances and the need to maintain quality and deliver results. There are a number of factors taken into consideration while selecting the participant and in this instance included among these 1) demonstrated capacity of the site to be nominated 2) first opportunities to states parties that did not take part in the first course 3) first opportunities to states parties that do not have sites in the world heritage list 4) commitment from the states parties including completeness of the application forms 5) qualified applicants, among others.

After a rigorous process of consideration and debates on the application, 16 participants from 8 countries were selected that included countries of Eritrea, Mauritius, Namibia, Nigeria, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan and Uganda.

The participants from these countries were as follows in the same order of countries above: Hargos Futsum and Thomas Tesfaghioghis (Eritrea), Soobarath Gowoothum and Kevin Ruhomaun (Mauritius), Vincentius Munghongora and Sisco Anuala (Namibia), Aliyu Lasa Abdu and Suraj Wadil Yusuf (Nigeria), Cindy Georgette Onesime and Julienne Barra (Seychelles), Alitatta Musopyoe and Amos Mlaudi (Republic of South Africa), Rehab Khadir El Rashid and El Tehir Adan El Nour (Sudan), Sarah Musalizi and Jackline Nyiracyiza (Uganda).

The Nomination training course was held in Okashana in the Oshikoto Region of Northern Namibia near the famous Etosha wildlife park from the 15th -26th November 2010. The participants were then released to proceed to their various countries where they had to actualize the development of the nomination dossiers. The participants were to be assisted by their mentors as well as the coordination committee. Thus before leaving Namibia, the participants were provided with possible mentors that were to be officially recognized by the various states parties through mutual agreements including terms of mentorship.

2- FIELD PROGRESS OF THE PARTICIPANTS WITHIN THE PARTICIPATING STATES PARTIES

The present report covers the second component of the training programme where the participants after the first two weeks training course are supposed to work on their selected sites together with their mentors and the institutions responsible. This is the period of the development of the action plan by all the participants, the application for funding, the confirmation of mentors as well as the commencement of the field work in the various sites

selected for the nomination dossier developments. This report therefore meets the condition of reportage on the in-country work by the participants on the development of their dossier as specified on the agreement between the Overall Coordinator and CHDA.

The following is the list of countries, participants and respective mentors as agreed in Namibia.

3- LIST OF MENTORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION FOR ENGLISH SPEAKING AFRICAN COUNTRIES AS AGREED IN NAMIBIA

STATE PARTY	PARTICIPANTS	SITE BEING NOMINATED	CATEGORY	MENTOR/RESOURCE PERSONS
Eritrea	Hagos Futsum	Qohaito Archaeological Site and Cultural Heritage Landscape	Cultural	George Abungu
	Thomas Tesfagioghis			
Mauritius	Soobarah Gowoothum	Black River Gorges National Park	Natural	Guy Palmer
	Kevin Ruhomaun			
Namibia	Vincentius Mughongora	Messum Welwitschia Plains	Natural	Eugene Marais
	Sisco Auala			
Nigeria	Aliyu Lass Abdu	Kano Walls and Associated Sites	Cultural	George Abungu
	Suraj Wudil Yusuf			
Seychelles	Cindy Georgette Onesime	Venns Town Mission Ruins Heritage Site	Cultural	Herman Kiriama
	Julienne Barra			
South Africa	Alitta Musopyoe	Liberation Heritage	Cultural	Dawson Munjeri/ George Abungu
	Amos Mulaudzi			
Sudan	Rehab Khidir El Rashid	Old Dongola	Cultural	Salah El Din Mohamed Ahmed
	El Tahir Adan El Nour			
Uganda	Sarah Musalizi	Nyeru Rock Art	Cultural	Janette Deacon
	Jackline Nyiracyiza			

Since the participants left Namibia many of the mentors' roles have been formalized and they have been working with the participants in various ways mostly through advice by email communication. Both CHDA through Dr. Kiriama as well as the Assistant Coordinator, Linda have been in constant touch with the participants. This has been mostly in relation to their progress in the field, the development and provision of the various country Action Plans and the reminder to apply where applicable for funding to the African World Heritage Fund and other relevant bodies.

The coordination team through Linda has also been in constant touch with the first group of participants of the nomination training course in Lesotho (representing states parties) that were not able to submit their nomination dossiers in 2009/2010 including Zambia, Lesotho, Swaziland, Ghana and Botswana to find out about their progress and to ensure there is support for finalization of their dossiers. Out of this group, Swaziland seems to have reached a dead end due to political and economic reasons seen to override heritage matters, Botswana is progressing well with the preparation of the Okavango Delta, Zambia is progressing with the preparation of the Lozi cultural landscape, albeit with difficulties, Lesotho and Ghana have resubmitted the nomination dossiers for their sites, although Ghana was late with a few hours. Hopefully their case will be given due consideration although this has not always been the case with the World Heritage Committee.

4- COUNTRY FEEDBACKS

Since the end of the training in Namibia and the return back of the participants, there have been difficulties getting quick responses from the various states parties on their progress. Despite this however, there has been quite a commendable effort on the part of CHDA and the Assistant Coordinator to even prod the participants for answers as to their progress. This is not anything new as the same problem was faced with the first course. At times this is as a result of participants being given other assignments by their superiors in addition to the nomination dossier development and as such being left with little time to spend in the dossier development; in some instances however, it is due to lack of supervision or support from the national authorities leaving the participants with nothing to report on as no work is done.

The choice of the mentors as well as the responsibilities assigned to them this time was supposed to address some of these challenges. It is important to note that nearly all the states parties have provided their work plan albeit late in some instances as well as many have applied for the funding from the AWHF. The only unfortunate situation is that the majority of the funding requests have come at the last minute and mostly through prodding by the coordination team. This is an unfortunate situation as it makes it impossible for the whole coordination team to make an informed decisions based on exhaustive discussions of the various requests. At the end, it becomes basically the responsibility of the overall coordinator to read, evaluate and comment on all these late requests.

As much as there is a need to put deadlines to the receipt of the funding request forms by the AWHF, there is also need to put deadlines of receipt of the same by the coordination team for comments. However if the later If this was the case though, then non out of all the states parties could have qualified for funding, a scenario that does not auger well for the continent especially with the development partners whose assistance in the exercise have been valuable. This is an area that the training will have to address and where the sates parties, commitments will have to be sort. Irrespective of the above however a lot has taken

place in some of the countries with support from the coordination institution, the mentors and the coordination team.

4.1- Eritrea

The state party has developed and provided to the management team an Action Plan for their site. This involves all the required actions including, research work, identification and engagement of stakeholders, the development of a nomination dossier together with a management plan that involves community participation.

The state party has been in constant contact with the coordination team through CHDA and the Assistant to the Overall Coordinator. The mentor was confirmed and has been kept in touch with the work going on in the site and since the first training course he has met both the secretary as well as the chairman of the Eritrean World Heritage Committee to discuss the progress of the nomination dossier development. It is commendable how the state party has always sort assistance when required.

The state party has had the participants carry out fieldwork on the site, a process that is still ongoing. The State party was also one of the first to put a complete application for support to the AWHF and the World Heritage Fund. The mentor who is also the Overall Coordinator and the Director of CHDA were involved in advising the state party in the development of the funding proposals. The AWHF funding request was looked at favourably and State Party has been given USD 11,000 to assist in the process. The State Party has now updated their Tentative List with UNESCO. The progress of the state party is commendable and has taken a realistic date of 2013 as the date for submission. The mentor is scheduled to visit the site in June 2011, with a view to advising further on the process of dossier and management plan development.

4.2- Mauritius

Mauritius working on the nature site of Black Rivers is progressing on well. The team developed and provided an Action Plan to the Coordination Team and are working according to it. The state party approved the appointment of the Mentor, Guy Palmer who is also the Coordinator for Nature for the nomination training course. The mentor is scheduled to visit the country at the beginning of April for one week.

The state party has submitted its funding application form to the AWHF; this funding has been worked on and amount of USD 6,000 has been given to the State Party. The state party has also agreed with the mentor to visit the site in early April to engage with the professional as well as other stakeholders in the process of the development of the nomination dossier as well as the site's management plan. From the activities reported and those planned, the Mauritian team are on the right track and should be able to complete the dossier on time.

4.3- Namibia

Namibia is the state party that is hosting the second nomination training course. It has fantastic site that is under preparation. The mentor for Namibia is also the host of the training course Eugene Morais. Namibia was a wonderful host and all look forward to going back for the second meeting. The Coordination team had not heard much from Namibia in terms of their action plan and their progress but the participants were able to send a well developed funding proposal for the African World Heritage Fund that also within it clearly stated what requires to be done to move the process forward. The form has been reviewed and recommendations made appropriately. A decision on the funding has not been reached as the fund needs to consult the Namibian Heritage Department before proceeding. It is hoped that the Namibian team will keep the coordination team briefed accordingly on the progress of their nomination dossier development.

4.4- Nigeria

Nigeria participants are working on the site of Old Kano. After participating in the training course in Namibia of which they arrived late due to visa problems but still showed great commitment by ensuring they attended, the team has continued to build on their experience by working with the community of Old Kano as well as putting in place systems for management.

The state party agreed on the mentor and has since developed an Action Plan that envisages the completion of the dossier by 2012. The Mentor is in consultation with the team and has asked them to revisit the date of the nomination dossier submission based on the many challenges facing the site. Thus the 2013 date may be more realistic according to the mentor for the submission a fact that has been expressed to the state party.

The state party has been working on the site especially in correcting some of the conservation challenges according to their report to the Coordination Committee. To this end the state party has sourced funding from development partners such as the Ford Foundation to carry out some repair works on the old town wall of Kano as well as mount an exhibition to sensitize the community on the importance of the heritage and the need for its conservation as well as the need to list it on the World Heritage List. In all these, both the mentor as well as the Coordination team through CHDA, have been kept informed. Thus the CHDA Director, the Overall Coordinator as well as the CHDA Coordinator for Immovable Heritage had a fruitful discussion with the state party's Director of Sites and Monuments in February on the way forward. The mentor is scheduled to visit the site sometimes in June.

The state party has submitted its application request for funding to the AWHF for the nomination dossier development. The request for funding has however been differed to a later date. The site however indeed faces many challenges that arise out of the fact that it is a living and working site. Thus the state party in collaboration with all the stakeholders including the Sultanate, the local authority, the local inhabitants have to develop and put in place a working management system for the site.

4.5- Seychelles

Seychelles sent two participants working on their cultural heritage site of Venns Town Mission Ruin Heritage Site. Thus the remaining components of the site compared to some cultural heritage sites in the continent, is relatively small. However it is an important site of memory as it represents the beginning of emancipation of slave children and their introduction to formal western education.

The state party has confirmed their mentor, Dr. Herman Kiriama an archaeologist and in charge of immovable heritage at CHDA. He has been in constant touch with them and has advised the team that in order to develop and demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value of the site, then they may need to consider carrying out archaeological excavations. The mentor has even accepted to help with directing this.

The Seychelles team although were one of the first to send their application for consideration for the AWHF funding, this was found wanting as the archaeological investigation was still missing. They were asked to rectify but even then there is still under budgeting, a fact that could be because of the very little the state party is pledging to put. This need to be addressed if there is going to be any progress in this work. Funding has however, not granted as it was felt that there is yet no much information regarding the site.

4.6- South Africa

The Republic of South Africa is working on a unique heritage namely the Liberation Heritage Route. This recognizes the role of liberation struggle in the freedom of the continent and goes beyond the borders of the Republic of South Africa to the other African countries. Due to its complex nature, bringing many countries and interests together, it may take more than a year in the preparation. Spearheaded by the National Heritage Council (NHC) of the Republic of South Africa, it has a good adviser in who is also the ICOMOS representative within the training programme.

The work continue to progress in South Africa and according to the adviser, the NHC is planning a regional meeting to bring wider participation within the region and get a buy in of all concerned. The mentors are Dawson Munjeri from Zimbabwe and George Abungu from Kenya who, have been kept on the progress of the works involved. This project may however be a long term project due to its complexity and extent.

4.7- Sudan

Sudan as a state party is working on the site of Old Dongola on the Nile. This interesting site represents various culture as well as religions including Christianity and Islam. The team from Sudan have been quiet for sometime a fact that may have been due to the transformation going on the country that involve election leading to the separation of the North and the South. Under such circumstances, the heritage sector may find itself on the waiting list and this could have been with the case of Sudan.

Sudan was also the last to submit its Action Plan and request for funding from AWHF late. The request for funding has also not been granted awaiting provision of further details on the site. This is a worrying but understandable omission and that will need all the assistance that can be provided to them. So far a mentor based in the country was proposed and though the mentor has accepted the role, there is however, no confirmation whether the state party has approved this and the mentor confirmed. This is an issue that the Coordination Team will have to follow up with all the urgency required.

4.8- Uganda

The state party of Uganda has continued to work on its heritage site for listing in consultation with the mentor. The site chosen and being worked by the two participants is the Nyero Rock Art Site in Teso land of Eastern Uganda. However after the training of the participants in Namibia and the choice and confirmation of the mentor, Dr. Jannette Deacon the state party was advised to expand the heritage for nomination to include other central Africa African rock art sites.

Since the training course the Uganda team of Jackline and Sarah have been working on their sites in different ways. The state party together with TARA applied and got funding from the American Embassy in Kampala to develop a management plan for the Nyero site. The team has since organized research work, organized and managed meetings bringing together stakeholder, one of which was attended by the Overall Coordinator of the programme and put in place an action plan that will guide the development of the nomination dossier as well as the accompanying management plan.

Working with TARA the Uganda team has not only organized meetings and carried out research work but have also visited other similar rock art sites in the region such as in Kenya for comparative analysis purposes. The team has already applied to the AWHF for further funding to assist in the process of dossier development. The funding request has been granted and the State Party has been given USD 10,000. The team has done commendable work and continues on the right track. Their action plan include more stakeholder meetings to discuss issues like land and community, the destruction of sites and the involvement of local community in the management and use of the heritage.

5- CONCLUSION

The nomination dossier development processes in the various countries are progressing at different pace. Since the training course ended, all the mentors except for Sudan have been confirmed and are working with the participants. All the state parties have prepared and presented their Action Plans and are using them in various degrees. All the States Parties except South Africa and Sudan have applied for funding support from the AWHF. The Republic South Africa state party probably has a budget already while Sudan's performance

could have understandably been hindered by what is happening in the country, including the political developments. They will need more support than other states parties.

There is, good working relations between the Coordination team as well as with CHDA and AWHF. This has ensured follow ups with the participants although the response from the states parties is still inadequate and require improvements. As we move to the research work and the write up stage of the dossier, there is need for mentors to closely follow up with their participants on their progress. It is also important to note that the process is not just about nomination dossier development but also the need for putting in place proper managements systems to ensure the health of the properties whether listed or not.

There is need now for a review by the coordination team of the various progress stages of the state parties looking at the action plans from the various state parties and what each team has done. Through this it will be clear where to put more effort to ensure all the participating states parties are carried along.

Lastly, the coordinating are also following up the pending nominations of sites carried forward from 2008/2009 and this should also be treated as a priority so that where possible the pending dossiers are successfully finalized and deposited with the World Heritage Centre.