

The Contribution of World Heritage to Sustainable Development

Outside the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) N. 7, on environmental sustainability, which addresses in part the need to protect biodiversity and natural resources, the MDGs adopted by the international community in 2000 made no specific reference to heritage or even to culture in general. Yet, the contribution of heritage to a sustainable human development is major.

Certainly, the protection of exceptional heritage properties cherished by people all over the world – such as great natural sceneries and landmark monuments – can be considered as an intrinsic contribution to human wellbeing. It would be hard to imagine our countries, cities and landscapes without the familiar remnants of our past, a witness to continuity through the passing of time, and the presence of nature, to inspire us with a profound sense of wonder and joy. But in addition to its intrinsic value for present and future generations, World Heritage – and heritage in general – can make also an important instrumental contribution to sustainable development across its various dimensions.

Through a variety of goods and services and as a storehouse of knowledge, a well-protected World Heritage property may contribute directly to alleviating poverty and inequalities by providing basic goods and services, such as security and health, through shelter, access to clean air, water, food and other key resources.

Preserving natural resources, including outstanding sites containing some of the richest combinations of terrestrial and marine biodiversity, is obviously a fundamental contribution to environmental sustainability. Most of these sites, on the other hand, have developed over time through mutual adaptation between humans and the environment, and thus demonstrate how, rather than existing in separate and parallel realms, biological and cultural diversities interact with and affect one another in complex ways in a sort of co-evolutionary process.

Very often, World Heritage is also an important asset for economic development, by attracting investments and ensuring green, locally-based, stable and decent jobs, only some of which may be related to tourism. Activities associated to the stewardship of cultural and natural heritage, indeed, are local by definition (i.e. cannot be de-localised) and green “by design” since they embody an intrinsically more sustainable pattern of land use, consumption and production, developed over centuries if not millennia of slow adaptation between the communities and their environment. This is true for natural protected areas rich in biodiversity, of course, but also for cultural landscapes and historic cities.

Capacity constraints to manage international migration

In this context the definition of "capacity" should be understood to include all major factors that enable a state to manage international migration. This includes the vision, understanding and attitudes that are prevalent amongst leaders and the public; policy and regulatory frameworks; and the institutional and administrative resources required to implement the policies. It also includes capacity to secure and defend the people, systems and institutions involved in the management of international migration. Amongst other serious threats, the systems of the DHA are under continual attack by criminal syndicates. Critical to ensure both security and efficiency, and to protect human rights, are the quantum and quality of human resources that manage immigration systems.

The limited capacity of SA to manage international migration is due to a lack of appreciation of its positive role and strategic importance. Contributing to the situation described above has been a tendency to regard the DHA as the sole department responsible for the management of international migration. This has contributed to the lack in SA of approaches involving the whole of the state and civil society³, which is contrary to best practice globally. A strong international trend is for countries to move to an integrated approach, with departments working together and in harmony with civil society stakeholders in order to achieve common security and developmental objectives.

In SA, because there is little national consensus around the importance and goals of international migration, government and civil society often decide on matters in court and those decisions often drive policy. This can be disruptive and have unintended consequences, such as the 2004 Watchenuka judgement which entitles asylum seekers to work and study – a major pull factor that overwhelmed the asylum system. The Green Paper proposes that SA should adopt an approach to immigration that is strategically managed and which involves the whole of the state and civil society led by the elected government.

Motivation for a new White Paper on international migration

It has been over 17 years since the White Paper on International Migration approved by Cabinet in March 1999, became the basis of immigration legislation and regulations.

Although there have been significant economic, social, legislative and regulatory changes since then, there has not been a comprehensive review of policy. Essentially, the country's formal international migration policy has remained in place since 1999 despite significant changes in the country, region and world.

MOVING LITTLE EDEN SOCIETY TOWARDS IMPROVED SERVICE DELIVERY AND SUSTAINABILITY

Over the past year LITTLE EDEN began a process of internal and external review of its work from a programmatic, human resource, operational, income generation and systems point of view. The completion of the funded Strategic Business Review by external consultants gave LITTLE EDEN a high-level assessment of strengths and limitations; providing a strong foundation for the recommended strategies of ensuring a sustainable future. An integral component of the strategic plan going forward is a comprehensive upgrade and refurbishment of the current facilities, some of which are almost 50 years old. LITTLE EDEN subsequently approached an international funder for financial assistance to carry out the identified major refurbishments to its two Care Centres. With this goal in mind, LITTLE EDEN seeks to upgrade its functionality by providing for the continuity of critical programmes such as the nursing care and support programmes, and upgrading of the accommodation and facilities for the benefit of the changing needs of the residents. The phasing of the projects has been grouped to minimise the impact (both physically with the various temporary moves and the psycho/emotional impact of being relocated to a different area) on all residents. It is intended to commence the project and be able to continue up to completion of all the phases without building works interruption. This will result in economies of scale by not having to establish site and close out by moving off site for each phase. The Domitilla and Danny Hyams Home (DDHH) in Edenvale was established and the facilities built in the mid-1970s, utilising what was then a low-cost construction system. At that time the residents of LITTLE EDEN numbered approximately 100 and were mostly of young chronological age. Today, almost 50 years later, the average age has increased to 26 years and the resident numbers have also increased. The impact of these changes has been:

- The care regimes have changed significantly as there is now a greater need for frail care.
- The need for more physical space in the residential wings to accommodate the older residents and the increasing number of wheelchairs.
- The need to modify the bathing facilities to enable staff to assist the older and heavier residents. In this regard, and after reviewing the different commercial 'solutions' used in other care centres, LITTLE EDEN developed a unique ShowerBath which has been installed on a trial basis in the upgraded 'Boitumelo' residential wing. This new ShowerBath has proved a resounding success in the bathing experience for both the residents and the staff.