



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

37 COM

WHC-13/37.COM.INF.20

Original: English/French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-seventh session

**Phnom Penh, Kingdom of Cambodia
16 -27 June 2013**

SUMMARY RECORD

RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

Table of content

- 1. Opening of the session**
- 2. Requests for Observer status.**
- 3A. Provisional Agenda of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (Phnom Penh, 2013).**
- 3B. Provisional Timetable of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (Phnom Penh, 2013).**
- 4. Report of the Rapporteur**
- 5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's Decisions.**
- 5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies.**
- 5C. Summary and Follow-up of the Director General's meeting on "The World Heritage Convention: Thinking Ahead" (UNESCO HQs, 2-3 October 2012).**
- 5D. Revised PACT Initiative Strategy.**
- 5E. Report on the 40th anniversary celebrations.**
- 6. Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage related category 2 centres.**
- 7A. State of conservation reports of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**
- 7B. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.**
- 7C. Reflection on the trends of the state of conservation.**
- 8A. Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2013, in conformity with the Operational Guidelines.**
- 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List.**
- 8C. Update of the List of World Heritage in Danger.**
- 8D. Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory.**
- 9. Progress report on the upstream processes.**
- 10A. Final Report on the results of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Latin American and the Caribbean.**

- 10B. Progress report on the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for Europe and North America.**
- 10C. Progress report on Periodic Reporting in all other regions.**
- 11. Revision of the Rules of Procedure.**
- 12. Revision of the Operational Guidelines.**
- 13. Draft Policy Guidelines.**
- 14. Examination of International Assistance requests.**
- 15. Report on the execution of the 2012-2013 Budget and preparation of the 2014-2015 Budget.**
- 16. Other business.**
- 17. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (2014).**
- 18A. Provisional Agenda of the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (2014).**
- 18B. Feasibility study on an additional ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee.**
- 19. Provisional Agenda of the 19th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 2013).**

SUNDAY, 16 JUNE 2013
OPENING OF THE SESSION
7 p.m – 8 p.m
Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/INF.2

An Opening Ceremony of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee was organized at the Peace Palace on Sunday 16 June 2013 **in Phnom Penh**, Kingdom of Cambodia.

The **21 Members** of the World Heritage Committee were present:

Algeria, Cambodia, Colombia, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Qatar, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates.

The following **102 States Parties** to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Korea, Democratic People's Republic of , Korea, Republic of, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macao, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palestine, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tanzania, United Republic of , Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee, namely the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the session.

Speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

- H.E. Dr. Sok An, Deputy-Prime Minister and Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
- Mrs Emily K. Rafferty, President of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York City
- Mrs Katalin Bogay, President of the UNESCO General Conference
- Mrs Alissandra Cummins, Chairperson of the UNESCO Executive Board
- Mrs Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO
- H. E. Hun Sen, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Cambodia

All the interventions are annexed to the present Document.

The opening ceremony was marked by the restitution of two important Khmer statues of Pandava by the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New-York to the Kingdom of Cambodia in presence of the President of the Metropolitan Museum of New-York **Madame Emily K. Rafferty** and representatives of the American authorities.

A cultural performance and a reception followed.

FIRST DAY – Monday, 17 June 2013

FIRST MEETING

9.00 a.m. –12.30 p.m.

**Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia) and Mr. Francisco J.Gutierrez
(Colombia)**

ITEM 2 ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

*Document: WHC-13/37.COM.2
WHC-13/37.COM.INF.2*
Decision: 37 COM 2

The **Chairperson**, before presenting Item 2 of the agenda, announced that the session would be live streamed, as per **Decision 35 COM 12 B** and that the meeting would also be open to accredited journalists. The Chairperson thanked Qatar, Spain and the Russian Federation for the financial support provided for Arabic, Spanish and Russian interpretation. He pointed out that Arabic, Spanish and Russian speaking Delegations should express in their first intervention in which language (English or French) they would wish to be recorded.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 2** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 2 of the Agenda.

ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

- 3A. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
- 3B. ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE**

*Document: WHC-13/37.COM/3A
WHC-13/37.COM/INF.3A.Rev.2
WHC-13/37.COM/3B.Rev*

*Decisions: 37 COM 3A
37 COM 3B*

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to introduce documents **3A** and **3B.Rev** and mentioned that these documents should be read in conjunction with **Document INF.3A.Rev.2**, which is the Provisional list of documents of the session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the items 3A and 3B, as well as the relevant documents. He announced that the Bureau meeting would start the very next morning at 8.30 am; that the discussion on the State of Conservation (SOC) reports was foreseen until 20 June and that the discussion on nominations

would follow from 21 to 23 June. He indicated that no evening sessions were foreseen for this session.

The **Chairperson** announced that in accordance with Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure, the time limit for interventions of Committee members would be 3 minutes and for observers 2 minutes. He asked the Committee Members to hand in their amendments to Draft Decisions in writing to the Secretariat.

The Draft Decisions **37 COM 3A** and **37 COM 3B** were adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 3 of the Agenda.

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 36th SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (ST PETERSBURG, 2012)

Mrs Beatriz Hernández Narváez, Rapporteur of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, apologized for not being able to deliver personally her report. She indicated that she was not in a position to attend the 37th session of the Committee and that therefore she had to record her presentation.

She thanked all her colleagues and members of the Committee for having entrusted her with the great responsibility of being Rapporteur during the 36th session of the Committee in Saint Petersburg. She also paid tribute to the Chairperson of the 36th session, Ambassador Eleonora Mitrofanova, for her relentless work and ability to conduct the discussions of the Committee.

She underlined that, in addition the 21 members of the World Heritage Committee who were present in Saint Petersburg; 97 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, were represented as Observers, showing the great importance given to the 1972 Convention, one of the most universally ratified legal instruments which now accounts with 190 States Parties.

Ms Hernández Narváez indicated that, for the first time and as per the decision adopted by the General Assembly, the proceedings of the 36th session World Heritage Committee were made available through live streaming on the Internet, as per, enabling the stakeholders of the Convention to follow the debates and making the process more transparent.

She also indicated that two fora were held in conjunction with the 36th session: the Youth Model of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee in Kazan, capital of the Republic of Tatarstan and the International Forum “NGOs in Support of the World Heritage Properties”.

Ms Hernández Narváez mentioned that the 36th session witnessed numerous threats to World Heritage; notably the damages caused to the World Heritage sites in Mali. She underlined that the Committee strongly condemned these acts of destruction and decided to inscribe the sites of Mali in the List in danger and called upon the Director-General of UNESCO to create a special fund to help Mali in the conservation and restoration of its cultural heritage. She also recalled also that the Committee launched an appeal to the international community for the protection of this heritage.

She noted that these tragic events gave a wider dimension of the current and future challenges facing the 1972 Convention, particularly in terms of strengthening protection, conservation and rehabilitation of the heritage of humanity.

Ms Hernández Narváez recalled that the 36th session dealt with a very heavy agenda and that, to optimize its work, and following a previous practice, the Committee established two subsidiary bodies devoted to the Operational Guidelines, and to the Budget matters, the latter having raised concerns on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund.

As to the state of the World Heritage List, the Committee inscribed 26 properties, 5 natural, 1 mixed and 20 cultural. With these inscriptions, the List now totals 962 properties located in 157 States Parties. She recalled that five properties were added to the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the Committee also examined 141 state of conservation reports, including 35 properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In total, the Committee adopted 241 decisions.

Ms Hernández Narváez indicated that all this work would not have been possible without the professional assistance of the Secretariat. She finally made a special mention to the Advisory Bodies, members of the Committee, Member States, observers, NGOs and all those who contributed to the success of the 36th session.

She ended her presentation by congratulating her successor, Mrs. Jasna ZRNOVIC (Serbia) who accepted to take the role of Rapporteur for the 37th session.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur on behalf of all Committee members and closed item 4 of the Agenda.

ITEM 12 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES [CONSTITUTION OF CONSULTATIVE BODY]

Le Président rappelle que, en conformité avec la Décision 35 COM 13 point 8, le Comité a décidé “de créer un groupe de travail ouvert sur les Orientations à la 36e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en 2012”. Il souligne également qu’un tel groupe de travail avait déjà été établi par le Comité à sa 34ème session.

Il précise que ce groupe de travail pourrait être établi en tant qu’Organe consultatif, conformément à l’Article 20 du Règlement intérieur, ouvert à la participation des tous les Etats parties qui le souhaitent, y compris les Etats non membres du Comité ; ce groupe de travail sera établi pour la durée de la 37eme session et fera rapport au Comité lors de sa séance plénière. Il rappelle que les groupes de travail sont responsables, après consultations, de l’élection de leur Président.

A la suite des différentes propositions émanant de la salle, il a été décidé que des discussions seraient menées au sein du groupe de travail concernant les Orientations et que la Plénière en serait informée.

ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET AND PREPARATION OF THE 2014-2015 BUDGET [CONSTITUTION OF CONSULTATIVE BODY]

Le Président rappelle que le Comité a établi par sa décision **35 COM 12B**, paragraphe 13 un organe consultatif permanent pour l'examen du budget biennal du Comité, en conformité avec l'Article 20 du Règlement intérieur, ouvert à la participation des tous les Etats parties qui le souhaitent, y compris les Etats non membres du Comité. A l'instar du groupe de travail sur les Orientations, celui-ci sera établi pour la durée de la 37^{ème} session et fera rapport au Comité lors de sa séance plénière. Il rappelle que les groupes de travail sont responsables, après consultations, de l'élection de leur Président. Il a été décidé que des discussions seraient menées au sein du groupe de travail concernant les Orientations et que la Plénière en serait informée.

ITEM 5 REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5A. REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE DECISIONS

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/5A

Decisions: **37 COM 5A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the report of the World Heritage Centre in highlighting some activities: the report of the Decisions on the 36th session was released within one month after the session, an informal orientation session for Committee Members was organized on 31 January 2013 at the request of Committee Members which concentrated on rules and procedures. Furthermore, he recalled that a meeting of the Open-ended Working group on PACT was also held on 31 January 2013.

As usual, an information session on the 37th session of the Committee was organized after the first dispatch of document on 6 May 2013.

The Director of the Centre informed that Tentative lists from 172 States Parties were received and that, for the 37th session of the Committee, 36 nominations were received but 6 withdrawn. He underlined the cooperation with other Conventions in the framework of safeguarding of heritage but also other collaboration with eg the Biodiversity Liaison Group, SITES, the Council of Europe, the RAMSAR convention. He stressed that a Culture Convention Liaison Group and a common logistic unit were established to enhance the coordination between the Culture Conventions of UNESCO. In this framework, various thematic working groups analysed common processes and capacity building efforts.

The Director of the Centre informed that the World Heritage Centre moderated the e-discussion on the One UN Platform in preparation of the ECOSOC meeting in 2013 on the contribution of culture and natural heritage to sustainable development. He

underlined that UNESCO has launched advocacy efforts to include culture as a vector in the post 2015 agenda.

He informed about the holding of several meetings, international encounter as well as activities related to World Heritage such as the Hangzhou International Congress "Culture: Key to Sustainable Development" (China), a chapter on disaster risk preparedness concerning World Heritage sites on the Post Disaster Manual of the World Bank and EU, a conference on Indigenous Peoples and Climate Change in Copenhagen (Denmark) an expert meeting on visual impacts on integrity of WH sites in Agra (India).

The Director of the Centre highlighted that a large number of activities regarding the 40th anniversary of the Convention was coordinated by the Centre with the generous support of States Parties. Finally, the Director of the Centre appealed to the Committee to take into account the budgetary and staff constraints while adopting decisions.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 5A** was adopted.

5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/5B

Decision: **37 COM 5B**

IUCN highlighted the importance that it accords to the World Heritage. It informed that the past Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Zhang Xinsheng had been elected President of the IUCN. IUCN saw its contribution to be credible and relevant to the challenges facing conservation in the 21st century by upholding the standards of quality within World Heritage sites. Relevance would not be secured by high standards of protection and maintaining rigor in listing but by showing how protection and conservation of sites deliver solutions to the complex development needs of a modern society while retaining our precious heritage.

IUCN underlined its commitment to the upstream process for nominations and more proactive monitoring of sites. IUCN mentioned the Asia Parks Congress organized together with the government of Japan, the World Park Congress on inspiring solutions. Benefits to the World Heritage should reach all regions of the globe. IUCN provided advice and support.

ICOMOS indicated that it had endeavoured to use the totality of the resources to provide the Committee with the most professional advice on new nominations as well as all other issues concerning the conservation and protection of sites. ICOMOS used the expertise of all regions and areas.

ICOMOS underlined the drain of resources and thanked Switzerland, Bahrain and Japan for their generosity and exploration of the deeper meanings of the NARA document. Finally, it reiterated its commitment to work in open cooperation with States Parties. ICOMOS and IUCN believed that new mechanism were needed to better operationalize upstream approaches and to build capacities to face together the many challenges of inscribing and protecting properties in the World Heritage list.

ICOMOS noted that the Committee would, in the next days, not always agree with its advice. ICOMOS welcomed this as a normal aspect of the professional process as long as this was done with mutual respect and professionalism.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite avoir une précision concernant les Etats parties avec qui l'ICOMOS a eu des contacts : sont-ils des Etats parties membres du Comité ou des Etats parties ayant un dossier de proposition d'inscription en cours ?

The Representative of **ICOMOS** indicated that those States Parties were the ones selected as part of the process of analysis. He indicated that he will come back to the Delegation of Mali with a more detailed indication regarding those States parties.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie le Cambodge de son accueil à la 37eme session du Comité. La délégation reconnaît et se félicite de la coopération avec l'ICOMOS notamment en ce qui concerne l'Etat de conservation des sites inscrits sur la Liste ainsi que dans le cadre des déclarations rétrospectives de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Il encourage une meilleure participation des experts de l'ICOMOS aux réunions organisées par le Mexique et dans la région Amérique Latine et Caraïbes en général. La délégation se félicite également de la participation des Organisations consultatives à la réunion organisée par la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO avec les Etats parties en Octobre dernier au Siège de l'UNESCO.

ICCROM underlined the strong collaboration with the Kingdom of Cambodia that should be strengthened in the future. ICCROM lined out the activities of the last months in favour of the World Heritage Convention. ICCROM participated in periodic reporting, reactive monitoring, the evaluation of international assistance, and the scientific and technical development of the Convention. ICCROM reiterated its role for capacity-building. With the approval of the Capacity building strategy by the Committee in 2011, work had been undertaken on the development and the implementation of programmes at the international and regional level. ICCROM thanked the government of Switzerland for its efforts for capacity building today and appealed to other States Parties to contribute to capacity-building activities.

The ICCROM programme called "Improving conservation and management practices through the World Heritage Convention" was outlined. It was adopted by the General Assembly from ICCROM in its regular programme and budget. ICCROM also mentioned the activities on disaster and risk management. ICCROM hosted the head of the cultural mission of Timbuktu on its course on first aid to culture in case of conflict and cooperated with ICOMOS on an e-learning course for Syrian cultural professionals on the protection of heritage in times of armed conflict. ICCROM's programmes on science and conservation as well as living heritage were of relevance to World Heritage properties. ICCROM was committed to ensure the highest level of advice to the Committee to ensure the credibility of the Convention.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie et félicite le Cambodge pour l'organisation exceptionnelle de la session. Elle remercie également le Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents et les Organes consultatifs. La Délégation attire l'attention sur l'importance de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle et notamment des déclarations rétrospectives de cette valeur. La Délégation insiste sur le fait qu'il est temps de regarder de l'avant et réfléchir sur la question de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle prospective, notamment en tenant compte des « aménagements » qui auront lieu

dans des pays en voie de développement et qui ne manqueront pas d'entrer en conflit avec des sites inscrits sur la Liste.

La Délégation du **Mali** remercie l'ICOMOS de sa présentation et insiste sur l'utilité des sessions d'information organisées par l'ICCROM qui sont un véritable renforcement des capacités des membres du Comité. La Délégation insiste également sur l'importance de la publication des manuels de référence notamment pour ce qui concerne la gestion des risques et la gestion du patrimoine en temps de conflit.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** underlined the valuable work of the Advisory Bodies that was highly appreciated. The importance of strengthening the contacts between Advisory Bodies and States Parties and to move to a genuine cooperation was underlined. There was an ambiguity in the past when the Advisory Bodies were content with examining, accepting and rejecting nominations. The Delegation stated that since the last session improvements had been done and that they should go on in order to conserve the World Heritage.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, félicitant les Organisations consultatives de leur Rapport, propose un amendement linguistique au Projet de décision.

La Délégation de la **France** félicite et remercie les autorités cambodgiennes pour leur accueil et propose également un amendement linguistique au Projet de décision.

Le Projet de décision **37 COM 5B** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

5C. SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S MEETING ON "THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: THINKING AHEAD" (UNESCO HQS, 2-3 OCTOBER 2012)

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/5C

Decision: **37 COM 5C**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to the meeting on 1- 2 October 2012 in the framework of 40th anniversary of the Convention and on the request of States Parties to have a free exchange on the processes of the Convention affecting all three pillars – the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat. Main themes were on the tentative lists, nominations, conservation of properties, capacity building, roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat and governing bodies, and on the resource constraints and challenges facing the effective implementation of the convention.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre lined out the actions that had been implemented in line with the agreement reached on the meeting in October: The centre revised, reviewed and established tentative lists, mentoring States Parties in the development of credible nominations. The experience in the African region on this issue had been extended to the Caribbean region and SIDS. The upstream approach was extended to more States Parties concerned with the Silk Route nomination as well as the Qhapaq Ñan nomination in 2014. The centre enhanced cooperation not only by the biennial meetings with the Advisory Bodies but also more

open discussions involving the States Parties in various aspects of implementing the convention. The Centre enhanced capacities of States Parties in conservation issues. The roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat were constantly reviewed in order to improve efficiency and to avoid duplication.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre mentioned the follow up on the agreement reached in October through the implementation plan and the recommendation of the UNESCO external auditor both on the Global Strategy as well as on the Partnership Initiative. He informed that the General Assembly would look at the implementation plans later in 2013 and consider the Global Strategic Action Plan 2012-2022.

The Observer from the **WWF** thanked the Committee and made reference to the contacts the organisation has kept with several Delegations in order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value and called on the Committee to stay resolute in their work. It appealed the Committee to provide better guidance on the social and economic benefits of World Heritage sites in order to more easily demonstrate these benefits and recommended earlier advice to individual State Parties regarding conservation needs. It emphasized transboundary cooperation, including the use of buffer zones for the mitigation of threats, and suggested looking at the value of areas beyond national jurisdiction as possible World Heritage. It stated the usefulness of having implementation and guidance on conservation and management obligations and suggested that links be established with other multilateral environmental agreements and stressed the need for means of implementation.

The Delegation of **Germany** emphasized the work done by NGOs and affirmed that benefits derived from World Heritage sites should be presented to a wider audience. It offered its support for a IUCN project which focuses on the topic.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** thanked the Cambodian authorities and referred back to a remark mentioned in the framework of the meeting concerning the positive nature of the involvement of Advisory Bodies in the creation of Tentative Lists. It reminded that the competence of writing these Lists belongs to State Parties, who should continue to be involved, and considered the conclusions submitted in the Annex as one solution. The Delegation suggested assessing the potential future of the procedure to write Tentative Lists and that the State Parties' power should be strengthened under the World Heritage Convention.

The **Representative of the Director-General** confirmed the importance of the discussed item and stressed that the implementation of all agreements of the meeting should be closely monitored. He commented the involvement of State Parties and, while acknowledging the importance of such participation, added that it was a working meeting and would not be the appropriate setting. He gave the example of issue-based interactions, such as thematic meetings, as open events for State Parties to participate in and further enhance dialogue. The Assistant Director-General further commented on the difficulty of understanding the often-used terminology of transparency, lack of transparency and accountability given that the World Heritage Secretariat is an open entity that follows and implements the regulations, Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedure established by the Committee. He also stated that if changes are to be made and implemented, they should be done so by the State Parties and added to the Rules of Procedure or Operational Guidelines. Furthermore, the Assistant Director-General commented on

the intervention from the Observer for Peru by mentioning that Advisory Bodies are available to contribute to the writing of Tentative Lists but their involvement is not mandatory. Finally, he observed that more studies showing the economic and social benefits brought by World Heritage sites could be carried out.

The Delegation of **India** requested the Advisory Bodies' reply on the issue, reaffirming the importance of participation of the State Parties in meetings and the issue of transparency. It suggested that the World Heritage Centre should file an independent report of meetings.

IUCN responded that the process of dialogue has started but that the ways as how to proceed need to be found. While it affirmed the importance of the October meeting and added that recommendations deriving from it are being written, IUCN commented that it is the State Parties who should organize meetings to which the Advisory Bodies can be invited and contribute to. It added that operational ways to support the State Parties in writing Tentative Lists are being created and exemplified with the thematic studies, acknowledging the support from Germany, Australia and Switzerland. It reiterated the importance of carrying out studies about the contribution of World Heritage sites for communities and the need for these studies to be broadened.

ICOMOS agreed with **IUCN** and referred to the unnecessary expense of resources and to the experiences and feelings of communities regarding non-inscriptions. It underlined the Committee's freedom to work as being different from the Advisory Bodies' position, in which they are bound to the Operational Guidelines, repeating what was said in Paris. It suggested an open dialogue as to how the World Heritage Convention can be less confrontational and can achieve the wanted goal to conserve the Outstanding Universal Value and the World Heritage properties.

ICCROM agreed with **IUCN** and **ICOMOS** and pointed out the importance of opening dialogue with State Parties. It underlined that the January Advisory Bodies' meeting in Paris is a good timing for the organization of side meetings in which specific themes could be debated. Regarding the issue of Tentative Lists and Nominations, ICCROM referred to the African World Heritage Fund Model to affirm that the World Heritage Convention is an ongoing process of international cooperation and continue dialogue of State Parties.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** affirmed the intention of the Director-General and of the Centre to create the appropriate conditions for the advancement of the Convention. He agreed that there is an on-going discussion regarding the complexities of the processes and noted that it is in the context of the *Operational Guidelines* Working Group that such matters should be discussed.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that the amendment requests the Centre to prepare and implement during the following year a plan to enhance and encourage dialogue. It added that after preparing and implementing such a plan, the Centre should report to the next Committee Meeting on what has been done, on the way it implemented such plan and on the results.

The Delegation of **Germany** raised concerns as to how the Centre should implement and plan such a matter between the Advisory Bodies and the Member States not only within one year but also questioned the role of the Advisory Bodies and Member States. It requested a comment from the Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** mentioned that transparency and the World Heritage Centre are main components in the process between Member States and Advisory Bodies. It suggested that the World Heritage Centre should propose ways in which consultations could be taken forward.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that there are difficulties in the one-year time frame but that this reinforces dialogue as an on-going process.

La délégation de la **France** indique qu'elle est à la disposition du Secrétariat pour améliorer la forme des recommandations en langue française.

The Delegation of **Estonia** acknowledged that the key issue was about dialogue.

La délégation de la **Suisse** remercie les autorités cambodgiennes et souligne l'interaction générale qui existe entre tous les états parties.

The Delegation of **Qatar** recognized the consensus regarding dialogue and supported the proposal from the Delegation of **India**.

La délégation du **Sénégal** pense que le Centre du patrimoine mondial est l'opérateur stratégique du système existant. Elle estime que le Centre du patrimoine mondial doit être l'interface, le point où les synergies se rencontrent et qu'il serait à cet égard intéressant d'expérimenter la proposition faite par la délégation de l'Inde.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Centre regarding the ambiguity in relation to transparency and added that to improve this it would be important to determine how transparent the Centre is in the work that it carries out.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** souhaite parler du fond plutôt que de la forme. Elle précise que le Centre du patrimoine mondial a des attributions et des prérogatives et qu'il pratique la transparence mais que les organes consultatifs sont libres. Elle pense que c'est à l'intérieur du Centre du patrimoine mondial qu'il faut trouver une solution qui permettra aux Etats de dialoguer lorsqu'ils le veulent, soulignant que si les Groupes de Travail existent, ils se rencontrent une ou deux fois par an et font face à des problèmes de ressources. La délégation de l'Algérie indique être d'accord avec la délégation de l'Inde et estime que la nouvelle proposition est concrète. Elle propose de mettre en place un espace de dialogue entre les Organisations consultatives mais par le biais du Centre du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** considered the difference between the initial proposal and the suggestions from the Delegation of India is small. It added that both proposals could be kept given that the amendments made by the Delegations of **Switzerland** and **Estonia** are more general and emphasize on dialogue as a whole and that the second proposal outlined more specific measures.

La délégation du **Sénégal** pense que le dialogue existe déjà entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les Etats Parties et les Organisations consultatives mais qu'il

faut l'améliorer. Elle précise que le Centre du patrimoine mondial est l'aile politique de la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* et qu'il s'inspire pour cela d'outils pratiques qu'il faut maîtriser, telles que les *Orientations*, soulignant l'importance du renforcement des capacités. La Délégation déclare que le Centre du patrimoine mondial joue un rôle d'interface dans le dialogue qu'il faut essayer d'approfondir.

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported the Delegation of **India** concerning the need to have a transparent procedure.

The Delegation of **Estonia** considered that one solution could be reached but disagreed with the proposal presented by the Delegation of India and stated that such proposal could lead to disagreements for being too specific.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** remarked that paragraph 5 should be kept, yet modified based on all the previous suggestions.

The Delegation of **India** emphasized that a report should be made by the World Heritage Centre and urged for action. It agreed with the point made by the Delegation of **Estonia**.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the suggestion from the Delegation of Malaysia

The Delegation of **South Africa** agreed with the Delegation of India and added that suggestions should be combined while maintaining paragraph 5 and paragraph 6.

La délégation des **Emirats** soutient la proposition de l'Inde ainsi que les déclarations de la Malaisie et de la Russie. Elle souhaite que l'on maintienne les points 5 et 6 tout en prenant en compte les propositions des différentes Délégations. Elle précise que l'objectif serait de favoriser les activités des Organisations consultatives et des Etats Parties, dans un contexte de partenariat avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

La délégation de la **Suisse** demande que la proposition de la Malaisie soit affichée sur l'écran.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** repeated its drafting suggestion.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose la rédaction suivante : « demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'engager au cours de l'année une démarche favorisant le dialogue et la communication dans le cadre des mécanismes de la *Convention* ». La délégation de l'Algérie considère que le dialogue et la communication sont les fondements de la transparence.

La délégation de la **Suisse** souscrit à la proposition de l'Algérie et rappelle que représentant de l'Inde avait fait savoir que la formulation n'était pas un problème.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** urged Member States to decide and asked for the Centre's perspective on the issue under discussion. It commented that State Parties regard the Centre as a key organisation and main interlocutor to run the dialogue with the Advisory Bodies.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** understood the need for a plan to be presented and considered the possibility of putting one together concerning

opportunities for dialogue during meetings or visits of Advisory Bodies. He agreed that dialogues lead to opportunities, but pointed out the need to consider financial and time constraints. The Assistant Director-General added that the dialogue with the State Parties can begin after adopting the decision.

The **Rapporteur** read the submitted amendments.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** « demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'engager au cours de l'année une démarche favorisant le dialogue et la communication dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre des mécanismes de la *Convention*. »

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted that the amendments requesting the Centre to prepare a plan for dialogue and to present it in the following Session were not included.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the amendments presented by the Delegation of Malaysia.

The **Rapporteur** requested for more time.

The **Chairperson** proposed to continue discussing this matter when resuming the session at the beginning of the afternoon.

The meeting rose at 12.30 am

FIRST DAY – Monday, 17 June 2013

SECOND MEETING

2.30 p.m. –7 p.m.

**Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia) and Mr. Francisco J.Gutierrez
(Colombia)**

**5C. SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S MEETING
ON "THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: THINKING AHEAD" (UNESCO
HQS, 2-3 OCTOBER 2012) (*continuation*)**

The **Chairperson** resumed the discussion of the Draft Decision **37 COM. 5C**.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments submitted and proposed to merge paragraphs 5 and 6 concerning the plan and progress report on improvement of dialogue and communication.

The Draft Decision **37.COM 5C** was adopted as amended.

5D. REVISED PACT INITIATIVE STRATEGY

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/5D
WHC-13/37.COM/INF.5D

Decision: **37 COM 5D**

The **Secretariat** presented the item regarding the revised PACT Initiative Strategy which was prepared taking into account the audit, the outcomes of the open ended working group, 190th and 191th Executive Board session, 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, as well as lessons learned from 10 years of PACT activities.

The Secretariat also presented the Information Document INF.5D which provided the full report of the second meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group on the implementation of the Auditor's recommendations regarding the PACT initiative. The Secretariat continued with the presentation of the main elements of the revised PACT Strategy which is guided by the 5Cs and the goal of the Strategic Action Plan for the implementation of the Convention (2012-2022).

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to comment on the document, no comments were put forward.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 5D** was adopted.

5E. REPORT ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/5E

Decision: **37 COM 5E**

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the 40th anniversary celebration on the theme “World Heritage and Sustainable Development: the Role of Local Communities” and reported that throughout 2012, 122 events took place in 47 countries. Moreover, 50 World Heritage young volunteers’ work camps in 25 countries were organized in the framework of the anniversary year. The Secretariat further reported on the publishing activity during this year including the publication of the World Heritage Review with special focuses on the anniversary, with the November issue dedicated to Sustainable Development at World Heritage sites and the co-publication, in collaboration with Cambridge University Press, of “World Heritage: Benefits Beyond Borders”. The Secretariat also mentioned the One-off initiative for recognizing and rewarding best practice for successful and sustainable management recognizing the Historic Town of Vigan (Philippines) for its successful and sustainable management, achieved with relatively limited resources. The Secretariat noted the outcome document of the final anniversary meeting in Kyoto, the Kyoto Vision, which stressed among other the importance of people-centred conservation and concludes with a call for action, appealing to the international community to, among other points; ensure “effective involvement of local communities, indigenous peoples, experts and youth” in all aspects of World Heritage conservation.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to add a comment on this item.

IUCN thanked Japan and other States Parties for the organization of the activities for the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention. IUCN especially highlighted paragraph 27 referencing the possibility of recognizing best-practices and excellence in management of World Heritage Sites on a regular basis. IUCN noted that it is currently developing and piloting a “Green List” for well-managed protected areas, which will include World Heritage sites and is due to be launched at the World Parks Congress in Sydney in 2014. IUCN also referred to paragraphs 29 and 30 and noted that establishing a site-managers network for natural and mixed sites could be done via IUCN’s World Commission on Protected Areas. IUCN mentioned that the World Parks Congress would be an excellent venue for launching such a network.

ICOMOS underlined the immense program and reflection on the 40th anniversary, International Day for Monuments and Sites of ICOMOS under the slogan of Heritage-a driver for development. ICOMOS congratulated Japan for its great contribution to the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the Convention and noted the importance of the Kyoto vision, linking heritage and socio-economic development. ICOMOS mentioned the follow-up of Nara document and was looking forward to celebrate the Nara’s document 20th anniversary and Venice charter’s 50th anniversary by expanding knowledge and making World Heritage’s principles more universally acceptable.

ICCROM welcomed the report and noted the link with capacity-building for States Parties and local communities. ICCROM also thanked the States Parties of Norway and Korea for the activities organized in the framework of the anniversary. ICCROM stated that it had developed a special training module on heritage and sustainable development. ICCROM noted that the network of networks of site managers would have financial implications but looked forward to lend full support to this activity.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its gratitude to all the participants of the November 2012 Kyoto event in which the Kyoto vision was successfully finalized. The Delegation wished for the vision to become a meaningful document for the future of the Convention.

The Delegation of **South Africa** reminded that the activities in the framework of the anniversary took place to the backdrop of the Rio+20 meeting. It reminded that due to the richness of natural resources in the Africa region, there might be an impact from development in this region. For this reason capacity-building and awareness raising activities have recently been carried out in South Africa, including in cooperation with the African World Heritage Foundation and the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation also reported on the preparation of mining and biodiversity guidelines which have been signed by South Africa in June 2013. The Delegation made an appeal to the States Parties of the Convention to support capacity-building activities to help States Parties to enhance the conservation of World Heritage properties.

The **Observer NGO** representing indigenous village leaders of Surinam voiced the concern that World Heritage inscriptions can have an impact on the right of indigenous people. The Observer called for rendering World Heritage procedures compatible with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Observer underlined that the workshop in Copenhagen called for seeking a form of consent from the indigenous people prior to the inscription of the World Heritage properties as well as a direct participation by indigenous peoples in the management of World Heritage properties.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted paragraph 3 and 4 concerning the desirability to seek more extra-budgetary funding in view of the shortage of staff at the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation asked if these paragraphs did not imply extra workload and encouraged the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to continue fulfilling their duties.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique son intention de proposer un amendement au document 5E pour capitaliser les résultats des célébrations du 40e anniversaire de la *Convention* pour les générations futures.

Le **Rapporteur** intervient pour rappeler que les membres du Comité doivent soumettre leurs amendements à l'avance.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 5E** was adopted as amended

The **Chairperson** closed Item 5 of the Agenda.

ITEM 6. FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY AND PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE RELATED CATEGORY 2 CENTRES

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/6

Decision: 37 COM 6

Le **Président** introduit le point 6 de l'ordre du jour concernant le renforcement des capacités et les Centre de catégorie 2.

ICCROM made a presentation on behalf of the Advisory Bodies and explained to the Committee that capacity building and category 2 centres have been combined into a single report this year, given their very strong connection. ICCROM reported on the main activities carried out since the last Committee session such as the training of experts in different regions and the capacity-building programme being implemented with the financial support of Switzerland. Training courses on heritage impact assessments took place in various countries in collaboration with WHITR-AP and ICOMOS. ICCROM reminded about the training database available at ICCROM recently updated including the events section. It also announced the new Resource Manual on Managing the Cultural World Heritage properties and the project to gather a number of case studies on management of WH properties. ICCROM mentioned the various regional capacity-building strategies currently underway and highlighted the need for further contributions both in terms of finances and human resources to the International programme on capacity building.

The **Secretariat** reported on the category 2 centres and the main developments since the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee including their integration into the UNESCO reporting system SISTER and the availability of the annual reports of the centres online. The Secretariat also reported on the 3rd coordination meeting in March 2013 hosted by the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF), with financial support from Norway. The aim of the meeting was to mainstream a result-based management approach into planning and reporting, the review and revision of individual work-plans and the strengthening of regional cooperation among category 2 centres as well as between them and other international partners.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any comments on the reports presented by ICCROM and the Secretariat on capacity-building and the category 2 centres.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie les Organisations consultatives pour le travail accompli. La Délégation souligne le besoin critique d'un soutien financier pour garantir la qualité de la gestion des biens et la crédibilité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation ajoute que le gouvernement suisse a soutenu et va continuer à soutenir ce programme de renforcement des capacités et appelle les autres Etats parties à participer à cet effort.

Le **Président** demande si d'autres observateurs souhaitent faire des commentaires.

The Delegation of **Colombia** welcomed the activities that had been carried out in the framework of the capacity-building program and fully supported the work of the category 2 centres.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** thanked Norway for hosting the March 2013 Category 2 Centre meeting and announced that the next meeting will be hosted at the Lucio Costa Centre in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 6** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7C. REFLECTION ON THE TRENDS OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/7C

Decision: **37 COM 7C**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider item 7C.

The **Secretariat** presented the item on the reflection on the trend of the state of conservation and reported that the new SOC information system was available for the public with an advanced search facility and in the two official languages of the Convention and contributed to the institutional memory of the World Heritage Convention also providing statistical and graphic information. The project was supported by the Flemish-Funds-in-Trust and is to be completed in September 2013. The project was set within a wider Information and Knowledge Management initiative and can link with other multilateral international programs.

La Délégation de la **France** propose un amendement soulignant qu'il est souhaitable de rendre publics les rapports des Etats parties sur l'état de conservation mais que cela ne peut constituer une obligation, qui pourrait avoir pour conséquence de restreindre les informations qui sont communiquées au Centre du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation ajoute que selon la législation des Etats membres, certaines informations ne peuvent être rendues publiques.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its thanks to the Flemish government for its contribution to the project thereby enhancing the strengthening of the memory of this international instruments and stressed the importance of links with other international programs such as Ramsar Convention.

The Delegation of **Estonia** welcomed the SOC database to help to make informed decision and recommended the addition of the topic of high-rise building in the section on threats. It further stressed that the process of reporting is an important tool to involve local communities and create a dialogue with the Advisory Bodies on the conservation of the World Heritage properties and noted with regret that 12 % of the State Party reports are missing including 6 from a Committee Member.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie l'amendement proposé par la France. La Délégation estime que les rapports des Etats parties sur l'état de conservation peuvent uniquement être rendus publics au cas par cas, après consultation avec les Etats parties concernés.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** salue la mise en place du système d'information sur l'état de conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial et remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les Organisations consultatives et le gouvernement flamand pour leur contribution à ce projet. La Délégation soutient l'amendement proposé par la France.

The **Secretariat**, answering the question from the Delegation of Estonia, commented that the threats identified in the SOC project are the same as in the Periodic Reporting questionnaire of the second cycle in an effort to align the Reactive Monitoring and the Periodic Reporting as requested by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the amendments submitted by France.

The Decision **37.COM 7C** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7A. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Documents WHC-13/37.COM/7A
WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add
WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add.2
WHC-13/37.COM/INF.7A

Decision: **37 COM 7A.1 to 7A.23**

The **Chairperson** recalled to the Committee that, as per paragraphs 190 and 191 of the *Operational Guidelines*, properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger are reported upon annually.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded that the Committee had taken the decision that the properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be on a two-year basis except for exceptional cases. The Director reminded the Committee about the information document INF.7.Rev which included a list of all state of conservation cases open for discussion and reminded the Committee that the Committee Member who proposed an item for discussion should clearly state why it was opened. The Director further reported that 45 % of the State Party reports were received after the statutory deadline of 1 February, rendering difficult the preparation of the reports for the deadline for the document publication six weeks ahead of the session of the World Heritage Committee. The Director of the World Heritage Centre reminded the Committee about paragraphs 22.5, 22.6 and 22.7 concerning the order of speakers and about the decision taken at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee concerning the difficulties to assess information received after the statutory deadline for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND PACIFIC

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) – 37 COM 7A.14

The Draft Decision related to the property mentioned above was adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76) - 37 COM 7A.15

The Draft Decision related to the property mentioned above was adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764) - 37 COM 7A.16

The **Secretariat** presented the results of the mission.

IUCN commended the State Party for the progress achieved in the implementation of the corrective measures but underlined that the State Party needs to continue its efforts in order to enable the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN related that the updated list of corrective measures was developed during the reactive monitoring mission and is presented in the Draft Decision. It was considered during the mission that more time is required to draft the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the Property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN invited the State Party to develop a draft proposal for the Desired State of Conservation in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN following the adoption of the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the updated list of corrective measures by the Committee, and to submit it for consideration by the Committee at its 38th Session in 2014. IUCN added that following the reactive monitoring mission, the State Party informed IUCN about its intention to develop a new oil exploration and exploitation policy which would ensure that the conservation objectives for the World Heritage site are not compromised and requested IUCN's advice on this matter. Shortly after that, in April 2013 the Supreme Court of Belize declared all off-shore oil drilling contracts void. IUCN considered that it would nonetheless be beneficial for the State Party to develop the oil policy to ensure long-term protection of the property.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.16** was adopted.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711) – 37 COM 7A.17

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196) – 37 COM 7A.18

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

AFRICA

Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475) - 37 COM 7A.1

The **Secretariat** and **IUCN** expressed serious concern that the situation on this property remains critical. Almost all large mammals have been lost from the property due to poaching. Based on the results of the 2010 inventory, the outstanding universal value of the site has been lost. There is small potential to regain the outstanding value, but this potential is vulnerable. The expert meeting which was planned to develop an emergency action plan was postponed as a result of the political situation. It was recommended that the meeting take place in a neighboring country. The WHC and the IUCN recommended that the site remain on the list of properties in danger and be subject to reinforced monitoring; further, the WHC and IUCN cautioned that if these trends are not reversed, the Committee might have to consider removal of the property from the list of World Heritage Sites.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that security, poaching and resource exploitation are not only interconnected but are also influenced by exogenous factors such as the global economy; as such, they are problems of the international community requiring international cooperation. The Delegation mentioned the example of elephant poaching which is linked to the illegal ivory trading.

La Délégation du **Mali** appuie la déclaration de la Délégation d'Estonie. Il faut en effet prendre en compte le cas des biens culturels situés dans des territoires en conflit dont l'Etat partie n'est pas responsable. L'Etat partie a certes la responsabilité de la protection de ses sites mais il ne peut être seul responsable lorsque les destructions sont liées à des facteurs exogènes.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.1** was adopted.

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227) - 37 COM 7A.2

The **Secretariat** presented the information regarding Comoé National Park.

IUCN recommended that an inventory of key species should be taken in order to define population growth and the indicators of the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List in Danger and recommended that the Committee retain the property on the list of properties in danger.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.2** was adopted.

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155 bis) - 37 COM 7A.3

The **Secretariat** and **IUCN** presented information regarding Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve, noting that it remains threatened by fires, poaching, destruction of habitat, agriculture and resource extraction. It was noted that new permits have been extended for resource extraction. It was recommended that the property should remain on the list of World Heritage Properties in Danger and that the committee should adopt the measures recommended in the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.3** was adopted.

General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo - 37 COM 7A.9

The **Secretariat** presented information regarding a number of World Heritage Sites in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), noting that the security situation in Eastern DRC has deteriorated affecting all sites with the exception of Salonga National Park. The Secretariat expressed particular concern over the decimation of the elephant population and continued oil exploitation on World Heritage Properties.

The **IUCN** expressed concern over the resurgence of poaching, noting that some 90% of species depletion was as a result of poaching.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.9** was adopted.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) - 37 COM 7A.4

The **Secretariat** presented information on Virunga National Park, and recommended that the World Heritage Committee express its deep concern regarding the degradation of the security situation, the loss of control, increasing of the poaching, illegal occupation by the armed militia.

The **IUCN** expressed concern that the current state of oil exploration was not in keeping with existing standards, and urged that the Committee all on the State Party and companies involved to adopt the No go commitment.

La Délégation de la **France** a pris note lors de la 36eme session de l'engagement oral de Total de ne pas intervenir dans le périmètre du site. Elle ajoute que lors de l'Assemblée générale de Total, les actionnaires ont confirmé qu'ils respecteraient l'intégrité du parc ainsi que toutes les Conventions internationales qui protègent le site. La France appuie le besoin d'un engagement écrit de la part de Total.

La Délégation du **Mali** note qu'il s'agit d'un problème récurrent lié à la question fondamentale du développement. Elle souligne que l'Etat partie n'a pas les moyens de trouver seule la solution au problème ; il faut donc envisager la question sous l'angle du développement, qui en Afrique est différent de celui des autres pays développés. En Afrique représente 9% des sites inscrits mais 50% des sites en périls.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted its role as a donor of development aid to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and expressed serious concern with the situation in Virunga National Park. The German Parliament has adopted a resolution requesting the government to follow closely the situation, and has formally requested the Congolese government to abide by these recommendations of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** pose la question du droit fondamental de chaque Etat partie de faire l'inventaire et l'exploration des ressources de son sol et de son sous-sol et encourage l'adoption d'une procédure proactive et non conservatrice à cet égard afin d'encadrer ces activités.

The Delegation of **Germany** invited the World Wildlife Fund to provide additional information.

WWF qui s'exprime en tant que coordonnateur des programmes des industries extractives en RDC et en tant que témoin de la valeur écologique et économique de la région, source de revenus touristiques potentiels et d'exploitation du poisson du lac, véritable poumon de la région. Il exprime la vive inquiétude des populations locales face aux perturbations engendrées par l'exploitation pétrolière. L'exploitation représenterait un précédent pour la RDC dont tous les sites seraient potentiellement menacés mais également pour tous les pays. L'entreprise exploitante est européenne, et à sa connaissance, elle ne pourrait pas faire ce genre d'exploitation sur un site européen.

The **IUCN** responded to the question from Senegal, noting that the strategic approach will be dealt with later in the meeting, but supported the idea of a framework to approach the issue of extractives in relation to WH properties. The representative agreed with Mali that there is a shared responsibility between states and companies. Finally, the representative supported France's comments regarding Total verbal commitment not to operate on World Heritage sites, and echoed the hope that this commitment would be given in writing.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.4** was adopted.

Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 718)

The **Secretariat** presented information regarding the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, noting the impact of armed attacks. While a mobile brigade was deployed to prevent future attacks, the South part of the park remains inaccessible to park staff. Species depletion has continued. The Secretariat recommended that the property remain on the list of properties in danger and that active monitoring be re-instated.

The **Secretariat** and **IUCN** reported that they could not carry out the reactive monitoring mission requested by the 36th session of the Committee under the current state of insecurity.

La Délégation du **Mali** note qu'il s'agit du même cycle de conflit qui explique la disparition des espèces et des biens. Elle se demande s'il ne faudrait pas sortir de la Convention de 1972 et explorer ce que d'autres Conventions offrent en matière de protection des biens et des individus. Ces différentes Conventions sont,, selon elle, complémentaires.

The **Secretariat** supported attempts to enhance the engagement of peacekeeping missions to include Site protection as part of their activities.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.8** was adopted.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137) - 37 COM 7A.5

Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136) - 37 COM 7A.6

Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280) - 37 COM 7A.7

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9) - 37 COM 7A.10

Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257) - 37 COM 7A.11

Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573) - 37 COM 7A.12

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153) - 37 COM 7A.13

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1208 bis) - 37 COM 7A.31

The **Secretariat** presented information regarding Bam and its Cultural Landscape, recalling the corrective measures adopted by the Committee and remaining action recommended by the 2011 mission that have been implemented. The Secretariat commended the state party for conservation activities undertaken and noted that the required steps have been taken. The Secretariat *recommended* that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, noting however that the property remained vulnerable in particular to the control of illegal constructions and effective protection of the buffer zone. The Secretariat recommended that the State Party should continue to implement a conservation management plan.

ICOMOS commended the efforts made by the State Party, which prioritized the conservation of the property, and can be used as a model case for how to sustain OUV in post-disaster reconstruction.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Committee Members:

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Iranian Government on the successful removal of this site from the endangered list.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.31** was adopted.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev) -37COM 7A.29

Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev) - 37COM 7A.30.

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis) – 37 COM 7A.34

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recommended postponing the discussion to the next session.

The Delegations of **India, Germany, France, Algeria and UAE** supported this proposal.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.34** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710) - 37 COM 7A.32

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708) - 37 COM 7A.33

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1150) - 37 COM 7A.35

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135) - 37 COM 7A.36

Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178) - 37 COM 7A.37

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366) - 37 COM 7A.38

Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (C 658) - 37 COM 7A.39

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

AFRICA

Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev) – 37 COM 7A.19

Le **Secrétariat** présente la situation sur le site de Tombouctou suite aux premières destructions qui ont eu lieu l'an dernier, lors de la 36^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et suite à la mission conjointe d'experts internationaux qui s'est déroulée du 3 au 8 juin 2012. Il rappelle les nombreuses mesures spéciales qui ont été prises et mises en œuvre en faveur de l'aide au Mali, tels que le fonds spécial créé par la Directrice générale, la réalisation d'un passeport sur les biens maliens, etc. La mission récente comprenait des experts des gouvernements maliens et français, de l'UNESCO, l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM, de la Fondation Aga Khan, de l'Ecole du patrimoine africain, de l'Union européenne, le AFHF ; le CRAterre (le Centre international pour l'architecture en terre), le BNF. La mission a constaté que 14 mausolées ont été détruits, 3 mosquées ont souffert par manque d'entretien, la vieille ville est très dégradée, 4203 manuscrits sont définitivement perdus, 300000 ont été déplacés à Bamako mais nécessitent des mesures de conservation urgente. Le patrimoine immatériel est également affecté par l'interdiction des pratiques traditionnelles ce qui plonge la population dans la peine et la peur. L'autorité de gestion n'est pas encore opérationnelles. Les résultats de cette mission seront présentés au cours d'un atelier (...)

ICOMOS noted that the devastation to Timbuktu is multi-faceted, and drew attention to the importance of the interaction between people and buildings, through restoration projects and management. ICOMOS noted that the community is anxious to engage and suggested that the remains of tombs should be documented in dialogue with the families. ICOMOS noted that they are available to support this process.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle son triple engagement : politique, militaire et culturel. Elle souligne la nécessité de la rédaction d'un plan d'action et confirme la présence de 2 experts français lors de la mission. Elle annonce son appui à toute disposition permettant d'accompagner les décisions prises suite à la récente mission.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie la communauté internationale. Elle exprime une sensibilité particulière pour Tombouctou qui est la preuve que la culture africaine n'est pas qu'orale. Son histoire écrite est en danger et les événements actuels devraient rendre la communauté internationale attentive et sensible à la nécessité d'étudier les manuscrits, de les traduire et de les conserver.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the efforts that have been made to this point, and urged the support of other states.

La Délégation du **Mali** remercie la communauté internationale car c'est un pays qui s'est demandé s'il allait encore exister et c'est l'assistance des pays amis qui lui a permis de tenir. Le Nord est libéré. L'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril est un processus extrêmement important. L'Etat partie va connaître dans un proche avenir deux événements majeurs risquant de le rendre partiellement et temporairement inopérant : des élections présidentielles et la saison de pluies. Il demande au Président de bien vouloir autoriser le représentant de la Convention de 1954 à s'exprimer.

Le **Président** invite le Président du Comité de la Convention de 1954 à prendre la parole.

Le **Président du Comité de la Convention de 1954** remercie le Mali et le Président, salue l'action du Mali qui a adhéré au 2^e protocole de la Convention de 1954 permettant la mise en place du mécanisme d'assistance de fonds venant compléter l'assistance d'urgence de l'UNESCO. Il invite d'autres pays à adhérer et inscrire des biens et appelle à créer d'avantage de synergies entre 1954, l'UNESCO, l'ICCROM et l'ICOMOS.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the Ministry of Culture of Mali would make a statement tomorrow regarding this issue.

The **Chairperson** invites the Secretariat to inscribe this in the agenda.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.19** was adopted.

Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139) – 37 COM 7A.20

Le **Secrétariat** explique qu'il ne dispose pas d'informations supplémentaires du fait de la situation sécuritaire. Une mission est prévue à la fin de la saison des pluies.

ICOMOS discussed the preliminary State of Conservation report from the state party, and noted that acts of vandalism have occurred at the site. ICOMOS suggested that with the recent improvement in security conditions, it might be possible for the state party to undertake traditional conservation efforts.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande si des mesures conservatoires sont prises pour protéger les mausolées détruits pendant la saison des pluies qui arrive.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que les autorités maliennes sont prêtes à organiser si nécessaire et le plus rapidement possible le crépissage annuel qui n'a pu être fait depuis 2 ans sur les Tombeau des Askia. Pour Tombouctou, il est envisagé de mettre à la disposition de la communauté locale des moyens pour réaliser les abris temporaires de conservation.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique que les experts maliens ont pris la mesure de la situation et sont en train de réfléchir aux mesures à prendre en coordination avec les communautés locales.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande que l'accent soit particulièrement sur la mise hors d'eau des sites des mausolées détruits.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne que la communauté locale est elle-même très impliquée, qu'ils sont en pourparlers avec les imams responsables de chaque mosquée pour sauver ce qui peut l'être et que certains sont prêts à commencer la reconstruction.

Le **Secrétariat** confirme que des abris temporaires vont être érigés sur les sites touchés mais la communauté locale souhaitait que la mission UNESCO puisse d'abord voir les sites dans leur état actuel.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.20** was adopted.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022) - 37 COM 7A.21
Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 144) - 37 COM 7A.22

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

ARAB STATES

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90) - 37 COM 7A.23

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que le site est inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril depuis 2001 et que les recommandations des deux missions de suivi réactif de 2005 et 2009 n'ont pas encore été mises en œuvre à l'exception du programme d'assèchement de la zone. Il précise que des travaux de démantèlement et de reconstruction ont été entrepris sur certains murs de la grande basilique qui sont contraires aux principes internationaux de la restauration, et qui affectent l'authenticité du bien.

Le Secrétariat informe également qu'une nouvelle mission de suivi réactif a eu lieu en novembre 2012, qui a constaté une aggravation de l'état de conservation du bien. Les problèmes essentiels, outre ce début de reconstruction et l'absence de suivi des recommandations antérieures, sont la montée de sels souterrains et désagrégation des pierres friables ; la détérioration accrue des structures ; la prolifération de nouvelles constructions à l'intérieur du bien ; l'absence de contrôle de l'accès au bien le Secrétariat précise qu'il n'y a pas de nouvelle information depuis la rédaction du document.

ICOMOS noted that Abu Mena was inscribed on the Danger List in 2001 due to a dramatic increase in the water table around the property as a result of agriculture. The recent mission reported that the de-watering project has been abandoned as it is unsustainable and causes destruction due to salt. The mission recommended re-burying the affected areas of the site as the only cost-effective means of protecting the property. The mission also highlighted the need for a visitor-strategy for pilgrims, basic surveys, and conservation and management plans to be progressed.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported by the Delegation of Germany questioned the State Party on which measures have been taken or planned to improve the situation on the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Egypt** presented a number of measures that have been taken: (1) the State Party hosted a mission; (2) underground water levels were lowered at a cost of approx. 10 million USD; (3) a company specializing in rehabilitation has assisted in rebuilding walls; (4) a fence has been erected for protection; (5) a ministerial committee has been formed to review the situation; (6) an

internet website has been devoted to the situation; and, (7) the State Party intends to be meticulous in implementing the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souscrit à l'essentiel du rapport mais apprécie les efforts du pays dans la situation actuelle et encourage le processus de sortie du site de la Liste en péril.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported by the Delegations of **the Russian Federation, Japan, India, the UAE, Iraq, France, Mali and South Africa** recommended an amendment to improve the wording of the Draft Decision to reflect the positive measures that the State Party has taken.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'il y a des problèmes plus compliqués qui persistent et qu'un plan d'action est nécessaire. Elle est donc d'accord avec le paragraphe saluant les efforts de l'Etat partie mais pense qu'un second paragraphe sur le processus de retrait est prématuré. Les Organisations consultatives et le Centre du patrimoine mondial ne manqueront pas de tout faire pour aider à atteindre ces résultats.

The Delegation of **Germany** recommended changing, in the Draft Decision, the mention "no progress has been made" to "takes note of the progress that has been made in recent years and encourages the State Party to continue its efforts.

The Delegation of **Russia** brought a point of order, requesting that the actual state of the property is demonstrated, as opposed to simply discussed.

The Delegation of **Iraq** and **Mali** requested that all countries that expressed support for the amendment be recorded as such.

The Delegation of **the Russian Federation** requested that the State Party submit details relating to the property by 1st February 2014, or in the alternative, that the report be delayed until 2015.

The Delegation of **the United Arab Emirates** supported the Russian proposal to give Egypt more time to conduct the mission.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souscrit au commentaire de la Russie. Il convient de prendre en compte la situation du pays qui rend la soumission d'un rapport dans 6 mois impossible.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported by **Switzerland** recognized Egypt's efforts, but noted that the Committee is bound by its own rules, which state "annually" with regards to preparing reports for sites on the list of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegations of **Qatar, India, Germany, Switzerland, Russian Federation, Estonia** proposed several amendments to the Draft Decision and recommended softening the tone of the statement.

Compte tenu des contraintes de temps, le **Président** suggère que le Secrétariat prenne note des nombreux amendements proposés au Projet de décision et que les

Délégations recherchent un consensus avec le Rapporteur afin de pouvoir reprendre l'examen de ce point lors de la session du lendemain.

Proposal for Suspension of the Rules of Procedure 22.5, 22.6 and 22.7

The Delegation of **India** referred to the Committee's Rules of Procedure 22.5, 22.6, 22.7, which states that States Parties are not permitted to take the floor on issues that concern their own properties. The Delegation recommended the suspension of Rules 22.5, 22.6, and 22.7 for the duration of the meeting, which could be accomplished by a 2/3 majority vote.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported India's proposal.

The Delegation of **Estonia** and **Germany** did not support India's proposal, noting that the Rules were designed to prevent advocacy.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** suggested that the discussion on this subject be resumed the next morning.

Le **Président** propose à la Délégation de l'**Inde** de rediscuter de ce point dès le lendemain matin, ce que la Délégation accepte.

The meeting rose at 12.30 am

SECOND DAY – TUESDAY, 18 June 2013

THIRD MEETING

9.00 a.m. –12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7A. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (*continuation*)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90) - 37 COM 7A.23 (*continuation*)

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that consultations are still ongoing regarding the state of conservation of the World Heritage site of Abu Mena, he proposed to resume the discussion on this matter at a later stage.

Guidance for the drafting of the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR)

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to present the Draft decision 37 COM 7A.40 concerning the guidance for the drafting of the desired state of conservation for the removal of properties from the list of World Heritage in danger.

The **Secretariat** recalled that, at its 35th Session, the Committee amended paragraph 183 of the Operational Guidelines, to formally adopt when considering inscribing a property on the list of WH properties in danger, a “desired state of conservation” for removal of the property from the danger list. This has been previously discussed. The DoC is required to be demonstrated that it is no longer threatened by serious and specific dangers. Guidance Document is intended to enable the Committee to take informed decisions regarding the maintenance of the List. The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies work closely with state parties in achieving this desired state of conservation.

IUCN acknowledged the quality of the document, and noted that there has been progress towards the adoption of desired states of conservation. The IUCN further expressed hope that this would be extended to all sites by 2016.

ICOMOS supported the remarks by IUCN, seeing this as a positive step towards putting in place a process that would effectively speed up the removal of sites from the World Heritage Sites in Danger list.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.40** was adopted.

Proposal for Suspension of the Rules of Procedure 22.5, 22.6 and 22.7
(continuation)

The **Chairperson** opened for discussion the motion by the Delegation of India to suspend the Rules of Procedure 22.5, 22.6, and 22.7 of the Committee.

The Delegation of **India** appealed to the Committee to suspend Rules of Procedure 22.5, 22.6, and 22.7 to allow State Parties express themselves on their own properties. The Delegation stated that by giving State Parties the floor, the information the Committee receives would be more direct, would save time, and allow State Parties an opportunity to explain their position. It would avoid that delegations have to ask others to speak on their behalf. The Delegation reiterated that UNESCO is a body committed to openness and transparency, and that Article 11.6 of the Convention requires consultation with the concerned State Party.

The Delegation of **Japan** strongly supported the proposal. The Delegation referred to yesterday's discussion regarding Egypt, and noted that if Qatar would not have asked the Egyptian Delegation for clarification, the Committee would not have had complete information and may have taken the wrong decision.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite connaître le point de vue du Conseiller juridique sur la question soulevée par l'Inde.

The **Legal Advisor** advised that the Committee may legally suspend the Rules of Procedure in question on the basis of a 2/3 majority of members present and voting.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported India's proposal, and suggested attempting it on an experimental basis to be re-evaluated at the end of the session.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la proposition de l'Inde. La Délégation précise cependant que le changement de procédure doit avoir lieu à la fin et non au cours de cette session du Comité, par souci d'équité entre les Etats parties.

La Délégation de la **France** est d'accord avec le Sénégal et estime que le changement de procédure en cours de session irait à l'encontre d'une sécurité juridique pour les Etats parties. La Délégation propose d'envisager la mise en place d'un groupe de travail pour analyser précisément et en toute indépendance les implications de ce changement de procédure.

La Délégation de l'**Allemagne** est d'accord avec la France pour ne pas changer les règles pendant le Comité. La Délégation ajoute que la formation d'un groupe de travail sur les règles opérationnelles du Comité est prévue et que ce groupe pourrait traiter cette question.

The Delegation of **Colombia** fully supported the comments of Germany.

The Delegation of **Qatar** considered that it was not appropriate to change the rules in the middle of the session. The Delegation would accept the proposal to a certain

extent but with reservations and supported the position expressed by the Delegation of the **Russian Federation** and by the Delegation of **India**.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la proposition de l'Inde mais ne souhaite cependant pas régler cette question immédiatement pour ne pas bloquer les travaux du Comité. La Délégation demande d'inscrire cette question à l'ordre du jour.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that this request is distinct from the standard discussion of Rules of Procedure currently on the agenda. It was a discussion of a suspension of the Rules *for this particular discussion*. The Committee must decide whether to amend the Rules, or to suspend them for the particular discussion.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Russian Federation's proposal to test the amendment by suspending the Rules for this session.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the proposal of the Delegation of India to amend the Rules of Procedure.

La Délégation du **Mexique** soutient la position du Sénégal, de la France et de l'Allemagne, estimant qu'il s'agit de respect vis-à-vis de tous les membres du Comité et en particulier ceux dont les cas ont déjà été traités et qui n'ont pas eu la possibilité de s'exprimer. La Délégation souligne que la décision de modifier le Règlement intérieur viserait à augmenter la crédibilité de la Convention et à renforcer la coopération entre les Etats parties, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported India's proposal.

The Delegation of **Estonia** did not support the proposal. It stated that the Rule is designed to avoid a conflict of interest. Transparency and legitimacy are required. The Delegation added that when new information is provided on the spot at the Committee meeting, it is also not possible to thoroughly evaluate it.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que la proposition de l'Inde concerne tout le monde mais pose la question de la faisabilité. La Délégation rejoint la France et l'Allemagne dans le cadre d'un groupe de travail sur les Orientations qui réfléchira sur cette question d'ici la fin de la session.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that what is being discussed were not the Operational Guidelines; but the Rules of Procedure. It reiterated that the legal issue was clarified by the Legal Advisor, and that the Committee had the power to suspend its Rules. The Delegation reiterated that the current Rules encourage back-door lobbying.

The **Chairperson** noted that this matter raised a number of comments and different proposals regarding its treatment. In view of the different propositions in this regard, the Chairperson proposed to discuss this matter under Item 11 of the Agenda dedicated to the revision of the Rules of Procedure foreseen for examination on Monday 24 June. This proposal was agreed upon.

7B **EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD
HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD
HERITAGE LIST**

Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B
WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add
WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add.Corr

Decisions: **37 COM 7B.1 to 7B. 107**

The Chairperson introduced Item 7B of the Agenda. He recalled that, as for the examination of Item 7A on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the reports concerning the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List will be discussed first followed by the mixed and the cultural properties. He indicated that the five World Heritage regions will be presented in the following order:

- Asia and the Pacific
- Europe and North America
- Latin America and the Caribbean
- Africa
- Arab States

Finally, he informed that, as it was done for Item 7A earlier on, once the relevant Agenda items will be reached, and in order to improve the transparency of our processes, the Committee members who have requested some state of conservation reports to be opened for discussion will be asked to take the floor and explain the reason why they felt important to discuss the report. He recalled that he will keep the debate focussed on the specific issue raised.

Emerging trends and general issues

Decision: **37 COM 7**

The Chairperson indicated that before starting the examination of the state of conservation reports he would like to give the floor to the Secretariat to present the overview on emerging trends and general issues related to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

The **Secretariat** presented this subject and the related Draft Decision 37 COM 7.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne que des facteurs exogènes que les Etats parties ne maîtrisent pas, tels que les conflits, peuvent impacter sur l'état de conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial et souhaite que des réflexions soient menées sur cette question.

The **Secretariat** noted that the Security Council has previously integrated protection of World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of **India** urged the Committee to recognize that it was for the Security Council to determine these items, not the WHC.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by Colombia, suggested including a note of appreciation to the Security Council for including WHS.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation**, supported by the Delegations of **Qatar** and **Colombia**, recommended the setting up of a small drafting group, composed notably of India and Germany, to propose a new drafting of the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Mexique** appuie également la proposition de la Fédération de Russie et appelle à prendre en compte la Convention de 1954 sur les conflits armés.

The **Chairperson** recognized Germany, Russia, India, Mexico, Mali for the drafting Group, to be Chaired by the Ambassador of Germany. The Chairperson indicated that the Secretariat will assist the group in its work.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154) – 37 COM 7B.10

The **Secretariat** introduced the report on the Great Barrier Reef, noting concerns related to agricultural run-off, resource exploitation and port development. The Secretariat noted that the State party indicated an improvement in water quality post State of Conservation Report, but also noted that new development applications are currently being considered although no new development have taken place.

IUCN expressed concern over new development, and recommended that the property remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed financial commitments and progress made thus far, but noted that protection on large sites such as the Great Barrier Reef requires a firm decision of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Mexique** est d'accord avec les informations données par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives. La Délégation considère cependant qu'il convient de prendre en compte les efforts réalisés par le gouvernement australien pour la restauration de ce bien, cela est prévu dans le cadre d'un plan sur quatre ans et le gouvernement a donné un deuxième rapport sur l'état de conservation du site.

The Delegation of **Serbia** acknowledged the progress made by the State Party but showed its concern for the losses that it faces. It supported what was mentioned by the Delegations of Germany, France and Switzerland.

IUCN added that this is the first Draft Decision .

The **Chairperson** asked for further comments before adopting the Draft Decision.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** salue les efforts réalisés par l'Australie et l'exhorte à poursuivre dans la même voie de réduction des menaces pesant sur le site.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated their disagreement with the Draft Decision and supported the change of paragraph 5. It pointed out that the old paragraph 6 mentioned two topics, the impacts of water quality and the ongoing developments. While for the first there have been improvements, the Delegation presented its concern regarding the on-going developments that exist and proposed that this part of the paragraph should be kept. It suggested the State Party to present a progress report on this development.

The Delegation of **Iraq** requested the State Party to clarify the current situation of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** responded that the size of the property and the threats affecting it should be noted and pointed out that coastal developments have been dealt with. It added that the State Party has addressed the matters of coastal developments through a strategic Environmental Assessment and financial investment and is committed to assessing the success of the actions being taken. It stated that a sustainable Management Plan framework is being developed.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegations of **Germany** and **Iraq** whether the answer from the Observer Delegation of **Australia** was satisfactory.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Observer Delegation of **Australia** for the clarification and further reiterated that as the issue of development exists, it should be kept on the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Iraq** considered the explanation adequate.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** concoure avec l'Allemagne en ce qui concerne le développement côtier et ce, en dépit des explications fournies par l'Australie.

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed changes.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.10** was adopted as amended

The Delegation of **India** commented on the ordinary cycle of reporting of two years and supported what the Delegation of the **Russian Federation** equally pointed out regarding the short period given to State Parties. The Delegation of India read out a list of properties which considered not needing discussion.

Le **Président** s'en réfère à la liste des sites à discuter établie par l'UICN et invite l'organisation consultative à expliciter son point de vue et à répondre à l'Inde au sujet des sites en question.

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) - – 37 COM 7B.13

The **Secretariat** provided information on the property and noted that it is amongst the largest terrestrial properties on the World Heritage List. It added that the requested State of Conservation report was submitted on May 24 and that new information had to be added to the Draft Decision. It mentioned that the road project not yet initiated

was approved by the State Party without a Strategic Environmental Assessment of transportation needs and options for the region as was requested by the Committee in the 36th Session. The Centre and **IUCN** have thus proposed a new Draft Decision.

IUCN noted that the road construction could be a possible vector for tree disease, though the causes are currently under investigation. It added that the State Party pointed out potential negative impacts from the road, such as encroachment or illegal mining, and stated that there may be ecological consequences deriving from the fragmentation of the continuous ecological transect. **IUCN** recommend a Reactive Monitoring Mission to assess the extent of road construction impact and assist the State Party to develop a Conservation Strategy.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged the great size and complexity of the property and pointed out that the State Party has provided the required information and that this should be noted. It added that the discussed road passes outside the property. The Delegation accredited the State Party, given the challenges of the property, and demonstrated its concern on whether it is feasible for the State Party to submit a conservation report in 2014 and suggested an extension until 2015. It requested IUCN and the State Party for clarifications.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** acknowledged and respected the Committee's requests. It noted that an appropriate road technology will be sought as not to endanger the Outstanding Universal Value and provide basic needs to the population living on the property. The Observer Delegation welcomed the suggested Reactive Monitoring Mission. It thanked the Delegation of India for the recommendation to postpone the submission of the report until 2015 and underlined that the road is outside the property.

IUCN reconfirmed the existence of two roads mentioned in the State of Conservation report, one built in part of the property and the second built outside the property. IUCN responded to the Delegation of India that given the absence of a report, the State Party was requested to provide one, which was sent in May 24, 2013. IUCN considered that a Reactive Monitoring Mission should visit the property and report back to the Committee in 2014.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated that the State Party of Indonesia invited a Reactive Monitoring Mission and that the report would be available in 2014. It considered that a State of Conservation Report would not need to be presented by February 1. It suggested that all paragraphs regarding the absence of a report to be removed and that the possibility of enlisting the property in the In Danger List or its removal from the World Heritage List will not need to be discussed in the following Session of the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** presented the suggested changes in the Draft Decision .

Contrairement à la Délégation indienne, la Délégation **Suisse** reconnaît l'urgence de la situation et trouve justifié d'exiger un nouveau rapport de conservation en 2014, citant en autres les menaces que font peser la construction de la route et la déforestation illégale sur la biodiversité. La Suisse est d'accord pour discuter de l'inscription du site au patrimoine en danger au comité de l'année prochaine.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that the situation should be closely observed and declared that the Committee should discuss the issue in the following Session and that a new State of Conservation report should be presented in 2014.

The Delegation of **India** questioned the need for both a State of Conservation report in 2014 and a Reactive Monitoring Mission. It noted that the needs of the local population and of the Outstanding Universal Value should be considered. The Delegation added that it is not known whether the property will be inscribed on the In Danger List and hence suggested the deletion of the reference to the potential inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** clarified that the Committee decides based on State of Conservation Reports, which provides the point of view of the State Party, and also on the Reactive Monitoring Mission reports.

The Delegation of **India** affirmed that a State of Conservation report has already been presented and questioned IUCN whether the Reactive Monitoring Mission report would provide the required information and whether another State of Conservation report would provide new information.

IUCN clarified that the intention to request input from the State Party is to assess the Reactive Monitoring Mission and the meaning of the discussed paragraph is that the State Party should provide its perspective, since the Reactive Monitoring Mission report does not present this view. IUCN added that clarification should be made by the Committee concerning how the State Party should provide the mentioned input.

The Delegation of **India** requested the State Party to reply and commented that there are many ways to provide information and that it is the State Party that enables the mission to take place.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** agreed with the Delegation of **India** in that they have invited the Reactive Monitoring Mission and confirmed that the content of the IUCN report would not differ from the State Party's one. The Delegation requested the Committee to decide on how it should report.

The Delegation of **India** intervened concerning the process of a Reactive Monitoring Mission. It questioned how the State Party can have time to reply to what the Reactive Monitoring Mission report presented.

The **Chairperson** pondered on whether the report should be submitted by 2015 and urged the Committee to raise their name plates. It was decided to postpone the submission of the report to 2015.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked for a clarification on how the Committee in 2014 would evaluate the results of the report if the submission deadline was postponed to 2015.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** veut laisser la possibilité à l'Indonésie de s'exprimer avant le comité de 2014 et réaffirme qu'un nouveau rapport de conservation intervenant en 2014 est nécessaire, juste après la mission de suivi réactif.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stated that a consensus was reached in that a Reactive Monitoring Mission needs to be dispatched and that the State Party would submit its report in 2015. It added that if the Reactive Monitoring Mission submits the report in 2014, the State Party will require time to implement the proposed decisions before submitting the State of Conservation report in 2015.

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported the Delegation of India and of the United Arab Emirates.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested the Committee to be aware that the decisions taken in 2014 are going to be based on the Reactive Monitoring Mission and that the State Party will therefore not have the possibility to present its opinion.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** considered that if the submission is postponed to 2015, so should the examination by the Committee be done in 2015.

The Delegation of **Estonia** considered the importance of having the point of view of the State Party and did not agree with postponing the submission of the State of Conservation report.

Le **Président** demande l'avis de l'Indonésie sur l'échéance du rapport et la mission de suivi.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** reiterated their preference for submitting the report in 2015 and agreed with the Delegations of Iraq, India and the United Arab Emirates.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** restated their position but understood the position of the Delegations of Germany and Switzerland. It urged the State Party and the Reactive Monitoring Mission to submit a report by the next Committee Session, but it also agreed with postponing both reports to 2015.

La Délégation du **Mali** prend position en faveur d'un rapport de conservation en 2015 en échange d'une mission de suivi réactif en 2014 en guise de garantie.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** apporte son soutien à la position indonésienne.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** requested a close analysis of the text and added that all reports should be submitted in the same year.

IUCN clarified the point made by the Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** and stated that the Reactive Monitoring Mission will be carried out either in 2013 or early in 2014 and that the report can be submitted in 2014 on the request of the Committee. It added that the Committee may equally suggest deferring the State Party's report until 2015.

Le **Rapporteur** propose une solution qui respecte le vœu de l'Indonésie pour un rapport de conservation à discuter en 2015. La proposition de l'Irak, l'Inde et des EAU est retenue.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** requested to see paragraph 9 and disagreed with its formulation. It further agreed with the Delegation of **India** and

asked for the reasons to recommend the property to be inscribed on the In Danger List. The Delegation proposed the issue to be discussed in the 39th Session, in 2015.

The **Rapporteur** presented the suggested amendments.

The Draft Decision **37COM 7B.13** was adopted as amended.

Intervention du Ministre de la Culture du Mali concernant le patrimoine mondial au Mali

The **Chairperson** turned to the situation of Mali and gave the floor to the Delegation of Mali.

Le **Ministre de la Culture malien** évoque la situation au nord de son pays et loue la mobilisation des participants au Comité contre la destruction des monuments du nord Mali, inscrits au Patrimoine Mondial de l'Humanité. Commenant par remercier le 1^{er} ministre cambodgien et le peuple khmer pour leur hospitalité, l'orateur évoque ensuite le 36^e comité du patrimoine mondial de St Petersburg (2012), profondément marqué par les actes de vandalisme contre les mausolées et les manuscrits de Tombouctou. Le ministre qualifie la guerre au nord du Mali d'agression extérieure sous couvert de Jihad illégitime, soulignant la piété originelle de Tombouctou et sa prééminence intellectuelle dans le monde de l'Islam. Le ministre malien remercie solennellement les individus et organismes qui se sont mobilisés contre les dégâts incommensurables et malheureusement irréparables qu'a subi la civilisation sahélienne lors de cette guerre. Il loue par ailleurs l'action de l'UNESCO lorsqu'elle réhabilite et valorise un patrimoine qui porte l'esprit des peuples. Il exprime enfin sa reconnaissance envers la France pour son engagement militaire au Mali et ses initiatives en faveur de la réhabilitation du patrimoine de Tombouctou. Il affirme la détermination du Mali à mettre en œuvre le plan d'action issu de la conférence de Paris (février 2013) sur le patrimoine malien et du séminaire de Bamako.

East Rennell (Solomon Island) (N 854) (proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger) - - 37 COM 7B.14

The Secretariat presented the threats to the property and recommended it to be inscribed on the World Heritage Danger List.

IUCN added that the Reactive Monitoring Mission reported the property's lack of legal protection and expressed its concern about the impacts pressuring the native wild life. It suggested the inscription of the site on the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Japan** questioned the State Party on how the inscription on the Danger List could lead to a better protection of the property.

The Observer Delegation of the **Solomon Islands** responded that the property was listed in 1998 and confirmed the increasing pressures on the site but added that efforts to face them have been made by the local communities and the Government. The Observer Delegation noted the recommendations and acknowledged that a detailed assessment of the real impact does not exist and requested support to carry it out. It ensured that protection mechanisms and measures have been established

and that a community based monitoring report shall be created. The Observer Delegation appealed for the right to deal with the situation and regretted the decision to inscribe the property in the In Danger List. It added that if it was the case, the Observer Delegation is optimistic that attention and support can be provided when needed and commented that the Centre should have appropriate capacity and means to assist the property to maintain its credibility.

The Delegation of **Japan** accepted the reply and agreed that the property requires assistance.

The Delegation of **India** considered that the adverse impacts are not established and requested that this should be taken into account. It remarked that the State Party should be allowed to assess the impact of logging.

IUCN stated that it has been following a constructive approach and supported the Observer Delegation of the **Solomon Islands** to undertake an assessment of logging in order to clarify the impacts to the Outstanding Universal Value. It recalled mechanisms that can support the State Party in this process.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.14** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 12.30 pm

SECOND DAY – TUESDAY, 18 June 2013

FOURTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia) and H.E. Gustavo Adolfo Carvajal (Colombia)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND PACIFIC (*continuation*)

Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev) – 37 COM 7B.15

The **Secretariat** presented the report, explained the concerns on the construction of a road going through the property, the construction of a dam, the encroachment from neighbouring communities, cattle grazing within the property and other management issues. The Secretariat and IUCN recommend having a reactive monitoring mission on 2014.

IUCN explained that the State Party could not demonstrate sufficient progress on implementing the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission which took place in 2012. More detailed information is needed to assess the state of conservation of the property. Therefore a reactive monitoring mission was recommended by IUCN for 2014.

The Delegation of **India** underlined that the situation for this property was a great example of cooperation among the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the State Party and that no further discussion was needed.

The **Rapporteur** announced a small amendment from India concerning paragraph 8.

IUCN explained that productive discussions have been taken during the last days with the State Party concerned and it agreed with the proposed amendments.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.15** was adopted as amended.

Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672bis) – 37 COM 7B.16

The **Secretariat** presented the report and explained that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were concerned that the aesthetic values of the property, central to the justification of the OUV of the property, were undermined by tourism, water pollution, organic waste from coastal activities and aquacultural activities within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, to assist the State Party with the design of an action plan for the implementation of an integrated management approach.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.16** was adopted.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629rev) - 37 COM 7B.11

Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N1083 bis) - 37 COM 7B.12

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis) - 37 COM 7B.21

The **Secretariat** explained that India requested that this report be opened for discussion, and had no new information to present.

The Delegation of **India** considered that given the large size of the property and the associated difficulties to obtain information, the state of conservation report from the State Party should be requested for 1 February 2015. It considers that no new information could be provided by the State Party in such a short time if it is requested for 1 February 2014.

IUCN considered that the construction of a hydropower station reported by the State Party could have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. Therefore, IUCN recommended making a close follow-up and requesting the state of conservation report to be requested for 2014.

The Delegation of **India** requested the Chairperson to give the floor to the Delegation of the Russian Federation in order to clarify if the reported problem is outside the boundaries of the property.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** clarified that, concerning the hydropower station, monitoring shall be done, as well as an assessment of impact on the natural reserve. The report shall be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in due time.

The Delegation of **India** was satisfied with the response of the Russian Federation.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.21** was adopted as amended.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) - 37 COM 7B.22

The **Secretariat** reported that additional information was received on June 3 informing that as part of the economic modernization plan, the State Party planned to close down the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill and clean up the site to develop alternative industries. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN proposed a revised Draft Decision, to take into account this additional information. Considering numerous other urgent conservation issues, they recommended maintaining the request to the State Party to submit a report on these issues for consideration by next session.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.22** was adopted.

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900) - 37 COM 7B.23

The **Secretariat** reported that additional information was received on June 3 where the State Party confirmed its intention to submit a request for a significant boundary modification by 1 February 2014, as it considered that certain areas included in the property did not contribute to its Outstanding Universal Value and could be excluded from the property to allow the planned development of a ski resort. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterated that a boundary modification must be justified and based only on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and its inherent characteristics and that this issue needs a close follow up by the World Heritage Committee. They also recall that the mission noted several other urgent threats to the Outstanding Universal Value, not reported by the State Party in its report. Therefore they recommend that Committee requests to the State Party to submit a report on these issues to the next session.

The **Rapporteur** explained to the Members of the World Heritage Committee that some amendments from South Africa had been received for several paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to analyse paragraph by paragraph the amendments proposed. It had a question concerning the meaning of "permanent capital infrastructure", included in the proposed amendment. The Delegation expressed that clarification was needed, both from the State Party concerned and IUCN, in order to understand the meaning of the word "capital".

IUCN reported that they do not use the terminology proposed by South Africa and requested for clarifications about the amendments.

The Delegation of **South Africa** reported that the Delegation of the Russian Federation could clarify the term "permanent capital infrastructure". It explained that from its point of view permanent would refer to an infrastructure which affects the OUV.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained that "capital infrastructure" is a concept in the legislation of the Russian Federation, including major buildings, such as large buildings, skiing infrastructure, gas lines, roads, etc. Non-permanent tourist infrastructure

(like cabins, trails...) would not be considered as capital infrastructure by the Russian law.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested IUCN to clarify if the extra wording proposed in the amendment was needed and if for example hotels were covered by this terminology.

IUCN reported that from its point of view the most important is to know the impact an infrastructure will have on the OUV.

The Delegation of **India** argued that, in order to better implement the Decision and its recommendations in the field, it is important to take into account the legislative classifications or definitions of the Russian Federation and suggested including the term proposed by the Russian authorities.

The **Chairperson** recommended looking at the Decision paragraph by paragraph for finding a consensus terminology.

The Delegation of **Estonia** highlighted that in the original decision to inscribe the property, it was noted that its integrity was based on the inaccessibility of the site, so any major new redevelopment could have an impact on the OUV.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** prie le Secrétariat de distribuer le texte des amendements sur papier.

The **Chairperson** suspended the examination of the State of conservation of the property to allow consultations.

Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev) - 37 COM 7B.25

The **Secretariat** explained that new information was received on June 9 concerning the gas pipeline project, where works have been suspended. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are proposing a revised Draft Decision, asking the State Party to submit a state of conservation report for 2015, since the works have been stopped. They remained concerned about the recent changes in the park regulations of the Ukok plateau Natural Park.

La Délégation de la **France** demande à donner la parole à la Fédération de Russie.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** clarified, concerning Ukok region, that the Government of Altai, which is responsible for the nature reserve, adopted a decision on the change of Rules of governance or regimes of the Ukok Natural Park. This decision of the Government of Altai is null and void, as it has not been endorsed by the Federal authorities, which is obligatory for this kind of decisions.

The **Rapporteur** explained to the Members of the World Heritage Committee that no further amendments were proposed.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.25** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225) - 37 COM 7B.17

Gros-Morne National Park (Canada) (N 419) - 37 COM 7B.18

Gulf of Porto: Calanche of Piana, Gulf of Girolata, Scandola Reserve (France) (N 258) - 37 COM 7B.19

Pitons, cirques and remparts of Reunion Island (N 1317) - 37 COM 7B.20

Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Slovakia / Germany / Ukraine) (N 1133bis) - 37 COM 7B.26

Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis) - 37 COM 7B.27

Giant Causeway and Causeway Coast (United-Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 369) - 37 COM 7B.28

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) (proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger) - 37 COM 7B.24

The **Secretariat** presented the report, informing about gold mineral mining licenses and ongoing mining works within the northern part of the property. The mine is located within the boundaries, and new information received from the State Party on June 3 reported that a significant boundary modification was under preparation with the aim to exclude the mining area from the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate their position that the ongoing mining in the property and the removal of part of its territory constitute an ascertained danger to the property's OUV, and therefore recommend that the site be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They consider that the impact of a significant boundary modification on the OUV will need to be assessed carefully. They note that mining operations are already being undertaken, without waiting for the approval of the Committee.

The Delegation of **India** argued that it is a large property and that the gold mining area is a small portion of the property. The Delegation explained that if a boundary modification was being prepared to exclude the mining part, it was not necessary to take any decision on the site at this stage. It requested the Delegation of the Russian Federation to be consulted on this issue.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked to clarify if the mining zone was within the boundaries of the property and if it was built.

The **Secretariat** responded affirmatively.

The Delegation of **Germany** explained that mining had been discussed during years in the Committee and that is a clear threat. It reminded that a boundary modification, as described in the *Operational Guidelines*, was supposed to enhance the OUV and not to exclude one part of the property.

The Delegation of **Serbia** explained that some amendments had been presented, because of the recent information received referring to the boundary modification. According to the Russian Federation, the gold mining areas were included by error when it was inscribed, and that this area was not pristine. Therefore, the new

boundary modification aims at solving the mistake. It was also stressed that just 0.2% of the large property would be out of the property. It mentioned that since numerous authorities of different levels were involved in the boundary modification process and that the main part of the project had been finished, the State Party should be given more time and suggested postponing the decision for the next session of the Committee.

La **Délégation de la Suisse** suggère de traiter séparément les deux questions. D'une part, elle rappelle que la modification des limites ne sera examinée qu'en 2015. D'autre part, elle souligne que la discussion actuelle concerne l'état de conservation, notamment les questions de la déforestation et des activités minières.

The Delegation of **Estonia** agreed with the argumentation of the Delegation of Germany about not accepting mining works in the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its agreement with the Delegations of Germany and Switzerland.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated that the property has 4.2 million ha and that the part that was going to be excluded is just a small zone. It asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the Russian Federation in order to confirm and clarify this point.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that there is not yet an active gold mining operation at Chudnoye. Only geological surveys took place. It explained that the total area of the property is 4 million ha, while the area subject to discussion is only 19,000 ha, ie only 0.2% of the total. It stated that such a minor portion of surface cannot have any impact on the preservation of the site. It further stated that at the time of the proposal for inscription, in 1994/1995, a mistake was made, which shall soon be corrected through the submission of the request for boundary modification, whereby additional 200,000 ha of virgin forests shall be protected.

The Delegation of **India**, in relation to the argumentation by the Delegation of Germany, stated that in the previous session of the Committee Germany agreed with mining activities in one property in Africa.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the Members of the Committee that the conservation of this property was the priority. It was also argued that this situation was different from the discussion taken in the previous Committee session, where the Committee was requested to evaluate a boundary modification proposal before a mining operation was started.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that the property is a large site and that if the State Party had already admitted the mistake done during the inscription, the Committee should support the State Party in order to follow the Rules and solve the mistake.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** propose d'accorder du temps à l'Etat partie, pour que celui-ci puisse proposer une modification des limites en 2015.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** pose la question si la modification des limites mentionnée par la Russie serait considérée comme mineure ou majeure. Par ailleurs, elle appuie la proposition de donner du temps à l'Etat partie, pour un rapport en 2014.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne qu'il s'agit de maintenir l'équilibre entre la préservation et le développement. Elle suggère qu'il faut encourager l'Etat partie, notamment pour l'extension de la zone tampon, pour une meilleure protection.

IUCN noted that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN had confirmed that at the time of inscription the area where the mining is taking place was already included in the property. It confirmed that the proposal by Russian authorities was for a significant boundary modification.

The **Secretariat** explained that the mining license is for a small area, situated on the northern part of the site, but that it is considered that infrastructure will be needed to reach; in addition the area is not at the edge of the site. It considered that, taking into account the current information and without having seen the boundary modification proposal, a mining enclave could therefore be in the middle of the site. It would be necessary to remove a long part from the property than the mining area.

The **Chairperson** proposed to distribute on paper the Draft decision to allow an easier examination of the amendments proposed.

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (Continuation)

The **Rapporteur** reads out the clarification submitted by Russian Federation, where "projects of capital development" is proposed to replace "permanent capital infrastructure".

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that being a legal term, "permanent capital infrastructure" should not be used and suggested keeping to the original wording in the decision and referring to the impact on the OUV, whichever type of infrastructure is.

The Delegation of **India** considered that capital development should be used because it is an useful and comprehensive word for the Russian authorities, who will be in charge of the responsibility of implementing the decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que l'important réside dans l'impact sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et non pas dans le terme qui sera utilisé. Elle soutient la proposition de l'Allemagne.

The Delegation of **Colombia** highlighted that the term "capital" should be translated in a universal manner, while the current translation is different in English and French.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** explained that the country will have to implement the decisions which shall be adopted, therefore it would be desirable to use the specific term which is used in the Russian legislation. This would avoid excessive bureaucracy during the implementation. They explained that they wanted to avoid having to request the agreement of the Committee on small infrastructures.

The **Rapporteur** proceeded to the adoption of the Draft Decision, paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked for clarification on the means for "capital".

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that "projects of capital development" was the wording proposed by the Russian Federation, following the terminology of its legislation.

La Délégations de la **Suisse, Inde, Allemagne** présentent des amendements au projet de décision.

The **Secretariat** suggested using the terms of the paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* in order to solve the discrepancies on the use of terminology.

The Delegation of **India** requested the Chairperson to give the floor to the Russian Federation for clarification.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** suggested specifying in brackets the types or examples of "capital infrastructure".

After the interventions of the Delegations of **Mexico, Switzerland, Colombia, India, the Russian Federation, South Africa and Germany** as well as **IUCN**, the Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.23** was adopted as amended.

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (Continuation)

The **Rapporteur** announced that the Draft Decision was distributed on paper, with significant amendments by Serbia.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'il est impossible de juger s'il y a de l'exploitation minière sur ce site, et par conséquent il ne serait pas approprié d'inclure dans la Décision des félicitations à l'Etat partie.

IUCN commented that the language used in paragraph six was standard language concerning mining issues and boundary modification.

The **Secretariat** reminded that the Selous decision of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee might be used as an inspiration for this paragraph.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** requested more information concerning guarantees that the concerned State Party could provide.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded that the original Draft Decision urged for the implementation of corrective measures and the inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger. In the amended Draft Decision these concerns are missing and therefore Germany requested clarifications from the State Party and the Secretariat on this matter. The Delegation further commented that the paragraph 7B as amended by Serbia was far beyond the original proposed Draft Decision and would be difficult to accept.

The **Secretariat** explained that the references to these concerns had been included in the original draft decision.

La **Délégation du Mali** fait remarquer que dans la version française, les paragraphes 6 et 7 sont identiques.

The **Chairperson** proposed the creation of a working group to further work on the Draft Decision . This proposal was agreed upon.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032) - 37 COM 7B.20

Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis) - 37 COM 7B.21

Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev) - - 37 COM 7B.31

Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161) -- 37 COM 7B.32

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

AFRICA

Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407) -- 37 COM 7B.1

The **Secretariat** explained that it welcomed together with the Advisory Body's the State Party's decision to reduce by 20% the size of the mining exploitation zone of the Venture Capital Company and noted the potential threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in particular from the mining projects by Venture Capital Company and GEOVIC, the construction of the Mekin Dam and the industrial rubber plantations which are planned adjacent to the site. Despite some advances on a national level, in setting up a consultative and collaborative framework, the Secretariat and IUCN recommended that the Committee maintain the possibility of an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 38th session in 2014, if further significant progress is not made before the end of 2013.

IUCN recalled that the Committee at its 36th session had requested the State Party to fulfill four conditions, to avoid the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN recognized that there have been some positive advances on these issues, yet some key requests still need to be implemented as mentioned by the Secretariat.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remarque que le rapport de l'Organisation consultative souligne le fait que l'Etat Partie a pris des initiatives importantes pour neutraliser les impacts négatifs potentiels sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle demande à ce qu'on donne la parole à l'Etat Partie avant de commencer les discussions, afin qu'il précise davantage les efforts accomplis et donne des éléments d'appréciation plus objectifs, seule l'accusation ayant parlé pour l'instant.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne également les efforts importants consentis par l'Etat partie. Elle ajoute qu'au point de vue institutionnel, un cadre de consultation ainsi qu'un Comité interministériel ont été mis en place, ce qui montre qu'il y a une volonté politique. Enfin, il y a un engagement de la fondation qui aide l'Etat partie à sauvegarder le bien. Dans l'ensemble, les recommandations sont donc en voie d'être mises en œuvre. Il faut donc accorder davantage de chances à l'Etat partie.

L'Observateur du **Cameroun**, après examen de l'état de conservation du Dja et du Trinational de la Sangha, assure que les actions entreprises seront poursuivies afin de garantir leur valeur universelle exceptionnelle dans la vision d'un Cameroun émergent. Le Cameroun, comme bon nombre d'Etats africains, est confronté au problème de sécurité transfrontalière et de piraterie qui mettent en danger la conservation du site en question. Un certain nombre de mesures sont déjà mises en œuvre pour la préservation du site du Dja et l'Etat partie garantit que toutes ces actions vont être poursuivies jusqu'à leur terme.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, soutenue par les Délégations d'Afrique du Sud, de l'Algérie, et des Emirats Arabes Unis, propose de supprimer le point 11 du projet de décision et demande d'ajouter au point 12 que l'Etat Partie présente son rapport au 1er février 2015.

Le **Rapporteur** résume les amendements proposés.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked to maintain the original date of 2014 in paragraph 12 and was supported by the Delegation of **Switzerland**.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.1** was adopted as amended.

Sangha Trinational (Cameroun / Central African Republic / Congo) (N 1380rev) - - 37 COM 7B.2

The **Secretariat** reported that the political and security issues in the CAR have now also impacted the CAR part of the Sangha Tri-national where an militia elephant poaching attack took place in May 2013. The World Heritage Centre has been following the situation in the site on a daily basis. The Secretariat further reporting that a presidential meeting between Central African Republic (CAR) transitional government and Gabon took place to discuss the worsening ivory poaching situation in Central African Republic where Gabon offered technical support to address the poaching crisis as well as assistance, in developing a national parks agency and training staff in conservation and management of protected areas.

L'Observateur de la **République du Congo** explique que les effets collatéraux du conflit politico-militaire en République Centrafricaine depuis les deux derniers mois sont inquiétants. Il confirme que l'intrusion des braconniers a effectivement eu lieu en République Centrafricaine, mais que la situation est plus ou moins maîtrisée à l'heure actuelle. Les dégâts sur la faune ont été évalués à 26 éléphants tués dans la saline de Dzanga-Sangha, la seule touchée. Des mesures de sécurisation du site de Dzanga-Sangha ont été prises, notamment au niveau du suivi écologique et des actions de surveillance. Le dispositif de protection et de surveillance a été renforcé à titre préventif en République du Congo et au Cameroun autour des parties du bien situées sur leurs territoires respectifs. En outre, le Cameroun accueille dans les prochains jours un sommet des chefs d'Etat consacré exclusivement aux problèmes de sécurité et de piraterie transfrontalière. Le braconnage des grands mammifères en Afrique Centrale prend des proportions alarmantes, et si rien n'est fait pour renverser cette tendance, certaines espèces animales emblématiques telles que l'éléphant de forêt ou les grands singes vont disparaître dans les 20 prochaines années. L'Observateur de la République du Congo lance un vibrant appel à la

communauté internationale pour apporter un appui soutenu et multiforme aux Etats de la région afin de les aider à mettre en œuvre leurs plans de lutte anti-braconnage et garantir la conservation durable du Trinational de la Sangha.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, soutenue par celle du **Mali**, exprime sa révolte face aux images diffusées et souhaiterait que l'Observateur du Cameroun prenne aussi la parole.

L'Observateur du **Cameroun** confirme que son pays accueille 20 chefs d'Etats du 24 au 25 juin sur le thème de la sécurité et de la piraterie. Elle explique que le Cameroun, comme d'autres pays voisins, a déployé des brigades d'intervention spéciale et souligne que le braconnage sert aussi à financer le terrorisme. Ce sommet sera l'occasion d'obtenir de meilleurs résultats et une meilleure visibilité.

Le **Rapporteur** déclare qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu.

The Draft Decision **37COM.7B.2** was adopted.

Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis) (proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger) -- 37 COM 7B.4

The **Secretariat** explained that World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that State Party of Ethiopia has not invited the mission nor submitted a report and has not halted the construction works on the dam and related irrigation projects as requested by the Committee at its 36th session. They recall that the World Heritage Committee decided not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger to allow for the reactive monitoring mission to also go to Ethiopia and to consider its findings.

The **World Heritage Centre and IUCN** further note that the State Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia did not provide any information on the Committee's request to have them engaged in a bilateral dialogue to conduct a SEA to review the cumulative impacts on the property of the Gibe III Dam and related irrigation projects in Lower Omo valley.

IUCN recalled the recommendations of the 2012 reactive monitoring mission to the property and noted that the Environmental Impact Assessment submitted by Ethiopia does not assess any impacts beyond the Ethiopian territory, and thus did not assess impacts on the property. IUCN considers that the potential cumulative impacts on the property of the Gibe III dam and other related developments would be significant, as detailed further in the State of Conservation report that was presented to the Committee at its 36th session.

The Delegation of **India** requested information from the Observer Delegation of Ethiopia why the mission did not take place.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne les progrès importants accomplis par l'Etat partie du Kenya. Un plan de gestion intégré a été élaboré afin de minimiser d'éventuels dangers sur le site. Il n'y a pas eu d'impacts de l'exploitation aurifère sur le bien. Le Mali souhaite donner la parole à l'Etat partie.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle qu'il s'agit d'une question extrêmement sensible, déjà évoquée l'année précédente. Il avait alors été suggéré d'organiser un certain nombre de missions sur le terrain pour s'assurer *de visu* de l'impact du barrage sur le lac Turkana. Cependant, le contexte global doit également être pris en compte. Les deux pays concernés ont traversé des périodes assez complexes cette année : l'Ethiopie a perdu son dirigeant et le Kenya était engagé dans des élections compliquées. Cela peut expliquer leur manque de réaction par rapport aux recommandations du Comité ; mais ils sont d'accord pour engager une concertation. Il faudrait leur donner une chance de se retrouver, de permettre aux Organisations consultatives de faire leur travail et ne pas prendre de décision sur la base du conditionnel. Il faudrait que ce soient des faits avérés et contrôlables *de visu* car la mise en péril est lourde de conséquence. Le Sénégal souhaiterait entendre les deux Etats parties et signale qu'il a déposé des amendements.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** reminded the Committee that the both concerned countries have new heads of states who should be given time for dialogue.

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** stated that all necessary measures have been implemented, including the preparation of assessments and the holding of a joint commission. There have been some legal obstacles to invite a joint IUCN mission. The Observer Delegation reminded that at the 36th session it had expressed its dissatisfaction with the Decision and therefore it had been difficult to implement it.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the development takes place in Ethiopia while the impact is in Kenya. Kenya asked for more time for the trans-boundary dialogue to further progress.

Le **Rapporteur** demande que le projet de décision soit mis à l'écran afin de voir les amendements proposés par les Délégations du Sénégal et du Mali. Elles ont proposé de supprimer le paragraphe 5, de modifier le paragraphe 10 et d'ajouter un nouveau paragraphe 11. Le Rapporteur lit les modifications et ajouts.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated that it could not agree with the deletion of paragraph 5 in order to retain the references to the concerns regarding the GIBE dam and would find it preferable if the State Party could report back in 2014, which was supported by the Delegations of **Serbia** and **Switzerland**.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime qu'étant donné la complexité de la situation, il faut se donner le temps de la réflexion et analyser froidement la situation. Le barrage a déjà été construit et ne sera pas détruit. Il faut se donner le temps d'évaluer son impact réel, et le cas échéant le Comité prendra la décision idoine. Exiger de deux pays qui sont en train de reconstituer leur gouvernement de mettre en place de nouvelles institutions et de donner un rapport dans quelques mois n'est pas raisonnable. Il faut leur donner le temps de travailler dans la sérénité avec les Organisations consultatives afin de mener une évaluation objective et de permettre au Comité de prendre une décision justifiée et argumentée en 2015.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported this point of view, and highlighted the danger of a potential conflict if not enough time is given for the discussions between the parties.

La Déléation du **Mali** rappelle qu'on ne parle que de danger potentiel. Du point de vue scientifique, il n'y a pas eu d'étude d'impact environnemental qui pourrait aider le Comité à évaluer l'impact du barrage sur le bien. La volonté politique affichée par les deux Etats parties mérite également qu'on leur laisse un peu plus de temps.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the continuation of bilateral negotiation but proposed that the Committee should be made aware of the progress of the bilateral negotiations in 2015.

La Déléation du **Mexique** rappelle que le Comité travaille sur cette question depuis déjà deux ans. Elle estime qu'il n'est souhaitable ni pour le Comité, ni pour les Etats parties, de repousser les délais, et que la présentation du rapport en 2014 sera au bénéfice de la bonne mise en œuvre de la Convention.

La Déléation du **Sénégal** estime que le Comité a toujours eu la sagesse, lorsque deux pays sont en conflit sur des questions de patrimoine, de leur laisser le temps de se concerter et de négocier, et ce parfois depuis des décennies. Elle ne comprend donc pas pourquoi cette possibilité serait refusée à des Etats africains.

The Delegation of **Colombia** reminded that this topic had been recurrent at the Committee for a past few years and that the States Parties had been keeping on asking for more time to reach a consensus. It considered that the report should be presented in 2014 is. It added that either the site was inscribed on the List in Danger, or the paragraph was fully deleted.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** stated that the African States Parties know their particular situation best and proposed that the World Heritage Centre could be asked to monitor the situation but that there is a need to give more time until 2015.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the Committee that the original Draft Decision proposed the inscription on the List of World Heritage on Danger, but if the reporting dead line for 2014 is retained, than this could be acceptable.

The Delegation of **India** proposed an amendment to paragraph 11 to urge the State Parties to allow for the completion of the ongoing bilateral discussions and delete "Decides not to inscribe".

The Delegation of **South Africa** reminded the Committee about previous decisions taken at this session of the Committee in which a postponement has taken place because of the conflict situation. For consistency considerations the State Party should be given time and report back to the Committee in 2015.

La Déléation du **Mali** insiste sur le fait qu'il faut donner suffisamment de temps aux deux Etats pour se consulter et conserver la date de 2015. Elle estime qu'il s'agit d'une question de politique et de gouvernance.

La Déléation du **Mexique** fait remarquer qu'il n'est pas question ici d'impatience mais qu'il s'agit ici de faire face à la dégradation d'un bien naturel. Si le Comité reporte une décision à ce sujet, la destruction du bien va se poursuivre.

La Déléation de l'**Algérie** lit le projet de décision proposé pour le cas de l'Albanie : "soumettre d'ici le 1er février 2014 et le 1er février 2015 respectivement des rapports

dont l'examen se fera à la 39e session en 2015". Elle considère que cela pourrait régler la question. La Délégation de la **France** soutient cette proposition qui lui semble équilibrée et mesurée.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne l'urgence des problèmes de ce site. Elle estime qu'attendre une année de plus pourrait être l'année de trop et qu'un rapport pour 2014 est un minimum pour un site proposé à l'origine pour inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** suggested a compromise to submit a progress report in 2014 and that a final report should be presented to the World Heritage Committee for discussion in 2015.

Le **Rapporteur** note que la non-inscription sur la Liste en Danger semble acceptable par tous les Etats, y compris ceux qui souhaitent un rapport pour 2014. En ce qui concerne cette dernière date, elle estime que la proposition de la Malaisie pourrait être un bon compromis.

Les Délégations du **Sénégal** et des **Emirats arabes Unis** acceptent cette proposition.

The Delegation of **Serbia** reiterated its support for the submission of a report in 2014.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** revient sur sa proposition. Elle note que lorsque les rapports sont soumis en février de chaque année selon les procédures régulières, il y a une liste de biens soumis pour discussion et de biens non soumis pour discussion. Elle se demande si tous les Etats sont au courant des décisions qui sont prises à ce propos, et demande à la Conseillère juridique si le rapport envoyé en 2014 par le Kenya pourrait être soumis pour discussion l'an prochain dans le cas proposé par l'Algérie.

La **Conseillère juridique** estime qu'il ne s'agit pas là d'une question juridique mais d'une question de procédure qui relève du Secrétariat.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the progress report which would be submitted in 2014 would not be discussed by the World Heritage Committee however, the Committee could take note of the report.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande alors d'ajouter la mention d'un possible examen du rapport d'avancement par le Comité à sa 38^e session.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported this proposal.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked for clarification if there would be a difference between a state of conservation report and the progress report.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the state of conservation report follows a special format, which includes a Draft Decision for consideration by the World Heritage Committee. Whereas the progress report would not entail such a decision but the Committee would simply be informed about the progress with the negotiations for the Committee's appraisal.

La Délégation du **Mali** considère que la proposition du Secrétariat de demander un rapport d'avancement pour 2014 et un rapport d'état de conservation pour 2015 est consensuelle.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose d'ajouter "un rapport sur l'état d'avancement" dans la version française.

The Draft Decision **37COM 7B.4** was adopted as amended.

Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199bis) -- 37 COM 7B.7

The **Secretariat** informed that it received on June 7 some additional information from the State Party on the implementation of decision **36 COM 8B.43**, in particular in relation to the implementation of the commitments made by the State Party in its letter of 1 July 2012:

- In terms of the inclusion of additional valuable wildlife forest area to compensate for the area which has been removed from the property at the last session, the State Party informed that the Undendeule Forest Reserve together with the Mnarangandu Wildlife management area are protected areas adjacent to the property, which act as buffer zones to protect its outstanding universal value. However, the report provided no information on efforts to include these areas into the property as had been announced in the letter;

- In terms of the protection of the Selous Niassa corridor, the State Party indicated that it is negotiating a new conservation project for the area with the Government of Germany. It also noted that the Wildlife Conservation act of 2009 makes it possible to give a protective status to wildlife corridors and that this is underway for the Selous Niassa corridor;

- The State Party reaffirmed its commitment not to develop mining activities within the property following the exclusion of the Mkuju River mining site;

- It confirmed that agreements are under preparation with the mining companies to ensure they will contribute to the conservation of the site;

- It further noted that the process of establishing the Tanzanian Wildlife Authority is underway and should be completed by November 2013,

- The State Party further reaffirmed that development activities within the property will be undertaken in accordance with the operational guidelines. However, it does not provide any further details on the Stiegler's Gorge hydroelectric project;

In terms of the requests of the Committee in relation to the Mkuju mining project the State party provides the following information:

- It has formed a team of experts from various sectors to monitor the mining but provides no details on the environmental management and monitoring plan of the mining project;

- It indicated that regulations are under preparation which will clearly establish the responsibilities of the Government and the mining company for the integrity of the reserve

- It further assured that mining activities will be carried out in accordance with the International Atomic Energy Agency Rules;

- It noted efforts to strengthen the conservation of the overall Greater Selous ecosystem but did not provided any information on the proposal for extension of the property which the Committee requested to submit by 1 February 2013.

In view of this additional information, the Secretariat and IUCN indicated that a revised Draft Decision has been distributed.

IUCN stated that it remained concerned about the Stiegler's Gorge and Kidunda dam projects, which would have clear impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property if they are to proceed. IUCN also expressed concern about elephant poaching in the property, and noted the recent results of the "Monitoring of Illegal Killing of Elephants" (MIKE) project which showed a significant increase in the proportion of illegally killed elephants from 2002 to 2011, with 64% of known elephant carcasses in 2011 being a result of poaching. IUCN recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to submit the report on poaching under preparation to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible, including data that support the State Party's statement that poaching of elephants has significantly decreased since the introduction of its new anti-poaching programme.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated that it lent full support to the conservation activities at this World Heritage property which are carried out by the Frankfurt zoological society which is involved in strengthening the capacities of the site managers for the management of the property. The Delegation further requested information on the boundary modification to which the SP committed during last session of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaiterait entendre l'Etat partie sur cette question.

The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** reminded the Committee that the property covered 50.000 square metres even after the permit for the Mkuju uranium mining location. It noted that rich natural resources are located in this region, but that the national authorities are currently implementing measures to address the challenges arising from development pressures including the organization of workshops and high-level meetings to raise awareness about the importance of the conservation of the property. Tanzania further assured the Committee that it would act in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* and invited a joint Reactive WHC/IUCN monitoring mission.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de Décision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.7** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800) - 37 COM 7B.26

Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (N 289) - 37 COM 7B.28

Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162) - 37 COM 7B.29

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

ARAB STATES

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506) -- 37 COM 7B.8

The **Secretariat** reminded that item was opened for discussion by a Committee Member.

Le **Rapporteur** lit les amendements soumis par l'Iraq aux paragraphes concernant ce projet de décision.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated that since the mission was requested, it was not necessary to request a report in 2014, allowing the State Party enough time. Therefore the reporting to the World Heritage Committee should take place in 2015.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime son accord avec le point soulevé par la Délégation de l'Inde ainsi qu'avec la date proposée de 2015. Mais elle demande que soient utilisés les termes habituels au paragraphe 8, à savoir "demande" et non pas "encouragement".

The Draft Decision **37COM 7B.8** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ARAB REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1253) - 37 COM 7B.32

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (*continuation*)

The **Chairperson** asked about the progress with the working group on the draft decision of Virgin Komi, Russian Federation.

The Delegation of **Germany** responded that there had been no time to convene the working group, yet.

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Committee to move to the consideration of the mixed World Heritage properties in the Latin America and Caribbean region.

MIXED PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) - 37 COM 7B.35

The Delegation of **India** explained that this site was in a list of three for which the reporting was foreseen for 2014 and was the only one in that case for Latin America. That was the reason why the Delegation of India wanted it to be opened.

The **Secretariat** reported that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been submitted for approval by the Committee at the present session under agenda item 8E.

ICOMOS acknowledged the information submitted during this session and stated that it would be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies as soon as possible. The property has been discussed for 14 years. However many challenges remain for the conservation of the property, including the preparation of a public use plan, risk management plan and the establishment of a support panel.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de Décision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.35** was adopted as amended.

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 19 June 2013

FIFTH MEETING

9 a.m. –12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

**ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD
HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

**7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD
HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD
HERITAGE LIST *(continuation)***

MIXED PROPERTIES

AFRICA

**Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N
1147rev) - 37 COM 7B.33**

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité du patrimoine mondial d'un projet d'aménagement routier le long de la partie nord du bien, où se trouvent les sites archéologiques, tel que cela lui a été communiqué en mai 2012. Les trois courriers adressés à l'Etat partie étant restés sans réponse, le Centre exprime sa préoccupation et celle des Organisations Consultatives quant à l'impact de ce projet sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien.

ICOMOS informed on the location of the proposed road in relation to the property and represented concern for the possible adverse impacts it could bring. It added that the State Party did not include a Heritage Impact Assessment essential for the analysis of potential impacts.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite que la parole soit donnée au Gabon. L'Etat partie n'étant pas présent dans la salle, la Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle le travail qui a été effectué pour inscrire ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et l'inventaire des biens archéologiques qui avait été demandé pour renforcer la valeur du bien. La Délégation exprime sa préoccupation et demande à l'Etat partie d'évaluer l'impact de la construction de la route sur les biens archéologiques et de prendre des mesures préventives afin qu'ils ne soient pas détruits par ce projet d'aménagement.

Le **Rapporteur** indique qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.33** was adopted.

Bandiagara Cliffs (Land of the Dogons) (Mali) (C/N 516) - 37 COM 7B.34

Le **Secrétariat** exprime sa préoccupation en rappelant que ce bien a été affecté dans sa partie septentrionale avec la destruction du grand Toguna dans la ville proche de Douenza par la crise qui a touché le nord du Mali. Cette destruction a eu des impacts sur les traditions culturelles, sociales et religieuses des Dogon, qui sont installés dans les 400 villages du périmètre inscrit. L'installation des groupes armés en périphérie du bien a provoqué l'arrêt du tourisme et l'exode des populations.

ICOMOS commented on how the crisis in Mali was affecting the property and mentioned that no immediate threats have affected the Outstanding Universal Value. It noted other emerging factors posing constraints to the continuation of traditional practices for conservation management and awareness raising. ICOMOS further informed that it will continue to collaborate within the framework of the Action Plan for the rehabilitation of the property to ensure long-term conservation and sustainable use.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande que l'Etat partie apporte des éclaircissements.

La Délégation du **Mali** confirme les informations fournies par le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS et explique les conséquences dramatiques sur le plan économique de l'arrêt du tourisme culturel sur le site pour les communautés locales, la gestion et l'organisation des traditions sociales et religieuses, telles que les funérailles. La partie du site a pu être sauvé *in extremis* suite à l'intervention militaire.

Le **Rapporteur** indique qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.34** was adopted.

7A. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continuation)

Abu Mena (Egypt) (continuation)

The **Chairperson** proposed the discussion of the Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.23** to be resumed.

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7A.23** was adopted as amended.

7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (continuation)

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to present the amended version of the Draft Decision following the proposal of the drafting group.

The **Rapporteur** informed that the paragraphs could be adopted one by one.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.24** was adopted as amended.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705) - 37 COM 7B.60

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report and noted the lack and delay of information concerning the project for in-situ lift-up of the Yuzhen Palace. It added that due to this, the Centre and ICOMOS could not comment on the project before the work had started. Although the State Party affirmed that there would be no impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, the Centre stressed that if the plan to surround the Palace by water advanced, the relation with the other components of the property of ICOMOS could be affected. The Centre took note that the State Party is considering inviting an advisory mission and stated that dialogue is vital to understand and address the potential impacts. The Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommended that a Reactive Monitoring mission be organized to allow a full understanding of the potential negative impact of the project on the OUV of the property.

ICOMOS provided further information and demonstrated its concern about the relation of the palace with the remaining components of the property and the landscape after the complete expansion of the reservoir. It pointed out that a Management Plan, an understanding of the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value and of the processes to be followed for major projects appeared to be lacking. ICOMOS confirmed the possibility of sending an Advisory Mission to understand the development of the project.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** remercie le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS et, rappelant l'importance de ce projet pour le site, demande les commentaires de l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Estonia** questioned ICOMOS on the wording used in the Draft Decision and on the request for a Reactive Monitoring Mission and a state of conservation report as it considered them too gentle given the major threats which were identified for the authenticity of the component. It requested ICOMOS' opinion on the issue of dismantling and rebuilding structures within World Heritage sites, questioning whether and to what extent these interventions affect authenticity and are in line with conservation principles stated in the World Heritage Convention, the Nara Document and the Venice Charter.

ICOMOS remarked its concern over the impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and reiterated that a Reactive Monitoring Mission should take place in order to retrieve further information and assess the impacts.

The Observer Delegation of **China** thanked for the concerns and noted the national importance of the project to solve water shortage. It informed the Committee of the inclusion of multidisciplinary experts to deal with the constraints and of the decision

to leave the Palace in its original location. It invited a Reactive Monitoring mission to review the project in October of 2013 and hoped that the international experts could provide advice on how to properly protect the Palace and the property as a whole.

The **Chairperson** noted the State Party's agreement to invite a Reactive Monitoring Mission.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.60** was adopted.

Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241) - 37 COM 7B.61

The **Secretariat** informed that the report from the State Party was submitted in January 2013 and noted the steps taken to remove the debris of the collapsed bridge and the proposed location for the vehicular bridge, despite the absence of a time frame for the finalization of these works. It commented on the slow progress to finalise and implement the Integrated Management Plan as was requested when the property was removed from the Danger List in 2006 and added that modalities of implementation or sustainability of funding have not been mentioned. It remarked that the Centre, together with the Advisory Bodies, consider the need to recognise the living function of the Virupaksha temple as supporting the Outstanding Universal Value. It recommended the Committee Members to request a Reactive Monitoring Mission to review the steps taken to implement previous monitoring mission recommendations and Committee decisions.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** commented on the exceptionality of the property and its size and remarked that appropriate steps have been taken in upholding the Outstanding Universal Value. It saw no need to send a Reactive Monitoring Mission considering the absence of immediate dangers. It suggested that the UNESCO Office in Delhi could be requested to continue working with the State Party if necessary.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, soulignant aussi bien l'existence des problèmes liés au bien (démolitions, effondrement d'un pont, etc.) que les efforts réalisés par l'Etat partie, demande que la mission de suivi réactif soit maintenue pour une meilleure information du Comité et l'aider dans le processus de ses décisions.

The Delegations of **Malaysia, South Africa, Qatar, Iraq, Colombia, Ethiopia, United Arab Emirates** and **Thailand** supported the Delegation of the **Russian Federation**. The Delegation of **South Africa** also noted the State Party's availability to continue funding the implementation of the Plan.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime que les efforts entrepris par l'Etat partie depuis 2006 sont considérables, qu'il est important de finaliser le plan de gestion tel qu'indiqué par l'Etat partie, qu'une mission de suivi réactif pourrait être effectuée après l'établissement de ce plan, et que, par conséquent, cette question pourrait être réexaminée à partir de 2015.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** salue les efforts de l'Inde pour la conservation de ce site et, se ralliant à la Fédération de Russie, est d'avis que la mission de suivi réactif n'est pas nécessaire à ce stade. La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, se référant au paragraphe 5 du projet de décision **37 COM 7B.61** et notamment à la décision prise

par la Haute Cour de Karnataka relative aux travaux de démolition dans le secteur du bazar de Hampi, demande aux Organisations consultatives quelles sont les incidences de cette décision sur l'état de conservation du bien.

ICOMOS mentioned paragraph 5 as acknowledging the information given by the State Party and that no further information is being requested.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.61** was adopted as amended.

Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115) - 37 COM 7B.62

The **Secretariat** informed that the State Party did not submit the State of Conservation report and pointed out the conservation issues affecting the site. It noted that the Reactive Monitoring Mission was informed that works on the metro line 2 are under investigation and will be halted until 2016 for economic reasons. It requested the State Party to clarify this situation and added that if the projected works on the metro line 2 go ahead, proposals for constructions, metro line inspections or drillings need to be submitted and a Cultural Impact Assessment needs to be undertaken. It stated that the Mission was informed of the possible completion of the Jahan-Nama building's height reduction by the end of June 2013. It indicated that the State Party has followed the decisions from previous Committee sessions regarding the development of the Management Plan and other aspects for the conservation of the site. It asked the State Party to address the remaining issues.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged the difficulty of balancing development and conservation but noted that steps have been taken and requested the State Party to clarify the current state of conservation.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** clarified that the efforts have proven to be unprecedented and noted the support of the Iranian authorities. It mentioned the challenges of safeguarding a property surrounded by development and added that the metro line 1 has been monitored but that for metro line 2 there have been no feasibility studies. It stated its availability to collaborate with UNESCO. It informed that the height reduction of the Jahan-Nama building has been nearly completed. It remarked that the State Party considers it has been accomplishing its commitments and guaranteeing the safeguarding of the site.

La Délégation de la **France** salue les efforts accomplis par l'Iran en réponse aux demandes faites par le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

The **Rapporteur** announced there were no amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.62** was adopted.

Masjed-e Jame of Isfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1397) - 37 COM 7B.63

The **Centre** informed that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2012 and made reference to the recommendations from Decision **36 COM 8B.33**. It

noted that a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment was requested, but that a state of conservation report was not received and the Advisory Mission was not carried out. It encouraged the State Party to invite ICOMOS Advisory Mission again to assist in the revision of the Meydan-e-Atiq project and related Archaeological Impact Assessment.

ICOMOS mentioned that several requests were made to the State Party for an updated state of conservation report and added that the State Party did send an invitation for an Advisory Mission. It noted the need for recommendations to be implemented.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie pour qu'il apporte des clarifications.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** acknowledged that recently the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List and considered the state of conservation to be under control. It reconfirmed the invitation for an ICOMOS Advisory Mission and expected a report to be submitted soon.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.63** was adopted as amended.

Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451) - 37 COM 7B.67

The **Secretariat** noted the potential impacts on the integrity of the property deriving from construction projects and mentioned the requests made in the 33rd and 34th Session of the World Heritage Committee. It added that the requested information was submitted in 2013 and included a revised layout of the port development, an Archaeological Impact Assessment and the map of the newly revised buffer zone. It proposed changes to the Draft Decision following new information sent by the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.67** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Historic Centre of Macao (China) (1110) - 37 COM 7B.59

Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi (Kazakhstan) (C 1103) - 37 COM 7B.64

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121) - 37 COM 7B.65

Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143) - 37 COM 7B.66

Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602rev) - 37 COM 7B.68

Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev) - 37 COM 7B.69

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The **Secretariat** presented the list of State of Conservation reports open for discussion and mentioned that revisions were proposed by the Centre and Advisory Bodies for two properties, given that late information regarding these properties was received.

Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis) -37 COM 7B.70

The **Secretariat** pointed out that opening of the discussion of the state of conservation report was requested by the Delegation of **Germany**. It noted that additional information had been provided by the State Party on a new hotel project development within the property and on its current progress.

ICOMOS presented the results of the reactive monitoring mission report, pointing out the difference between both towns in addressing several issues such as the illegal constructions. The report suggested strengthening protection and establishment of one overarching management structure. It took notice of the vulnerability of the property and the need for resources and capacity building, and also acknowledged the commitment of the stakeholders involved. It suggested a time framed Action Plan to address the issues which might threaten the Outstanding Universal Value and to include control of planning processes, as well as management and risk preparedness frameworks. ICOMOS commented that the Mission was not informed of the proposal for a new hotel and therefore a review of the project not possible. It suggested the development of a Heritage Impact Assessment study.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the new revised Draft Decision in which the concerns about the new hotel construction are expressed.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.70rev** was adopted as amended.

World Heritage properties of Vienna (Austria) - 37 COM 7B.71

- **Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)**
- **Historic Centre of Vienna (C 1033)**

The **Secretariat** remarked that the state of conservation report has been opened for discussion by ICOMOS and the Centre due to concerns about the height of new buildings in the historic centre. It indicated that letters from non-governmental organisations and individuals were received concerning the project. It added that the Centre and the Advisory Bodies proposed a revised decision, pointing out to paragraph 4.

ICOMOS presented the main outcomes of the reactive monitoring mission . It noted that the Mission considered the Intercontinental Hotel project promising for involving the participation of the community but stressed that the project includes a building that is higher than the existing ones. It requested the State Party to provide further details along with a Heritage Impact Assessment study, including a visual impact assessment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, ayant reçu des informations concernant ce projet d'hôtel Intercontinental, qui laissent présager un impact négatif pouvant porter atteinte à la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien, soutient la révision du projet de décision telle que proposée par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.71** was adopted as amended.

Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066) -37 COM 7B.75

The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation report and informed that letters were received from individuals and Non-Governmental Organisations expressing concern about the negative impact of a bobsleigh track, but also sharing opinions on the limited impact of the existing summer cable car infrastructure. It added that an additional evaluation might be required for the projected winter cable car installations. The Chair asked the Delegation **France** to clarify the reasons for their request to open the Draft Decision for discussion.

ICOMOS added that the planned projects were not compatible with the Outstanding Universal Value but commended the Master Plan as exemplary and highlighted the participatory approach. It remarked that challenges remain in balancing interest groups, layers of authority and the relationship of the Plan with the overall framework. It considered that the Master Plan should be more specific in terms of policies and of appropriate types of development.

La Délégation de la **France** demande que l'Etat partie puisse apporter des précisions quant à l'avenir de ce système de câble téléphérique, qui était une opération temporaire devant être retirée en juin 2014, et quant à son impact sur le bien.

The Delegation of **Germany** clarified how the cable car successfully connected both banks of the river and appreciated the recommendations from ICOMOS with the exception to the one related to the cable car system. It considered the conclusion of the Advisory Mission report inconsistent with the Outstanding Universal Value and that no threats to the value of the property are posed by the cable car system but added that it will be dismantled at the latest 2026.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande à l'ICOMOS de clarifier l'impact de cette installation sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien.

ICOMOS commented on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It expressed concern for the visual and aesthetic impact of the line of the cable car in the overall landscape and considered the element undesirable.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered the importance of cable cars and commented that the installation of this component enabled better access for the population. It supported the use of the cable car until 2026.

La Délégation du **Mexique** décrit les particularités de ce cas et les bénéfices que le câble téléphérique apporte à la population locale, et demande à l'ICOMOS de mener une étude sur les installations et fonctions des câbles téléphériques afin d'évaluer

leurs impacts visuels et généraux sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle des biens, faisant également référence à leur utilisation sur des sites en Amérique Latine.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered the Advisory Body's analysis too strict and that the visible landscape could evolve over time. It made reference to the population living in the property.

La Délégation de la **France**, soutenu par la **Colombie, le Mali et la Serbie**, propose d'ajouter au Projet de décision la mention une date limite au 30 juin 2026 au plus tard.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the amendment suggested by the Delegation of **France**.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** prend acte de l'évolution de la recommandation et attire l'attention du Comité que les questions d'aménagement et de mise en valeur du territoire ne devraient pas entrer en conflit avec la sauvegarde du patrimoine. La Délégation du Sénégal appuie la Délégation de la France et s'engage à revenir sur ces questions.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle que ce téléphérique a été construit avec une promesse de démantèlement après l'exposition en raison de son impact important, et exprime son incompréhension quant à la décision de ce jour, selon laquelle il n'y aurait plus d'impact négatif et qui permet donc de maintenir l'installation jusqu'à la fin de sa durée de vie.

The Delegation of **South Africa** informed it did not oppose the amendment. It requested the Committee to be consistent and for a similar approach to be followed in respect to comparable sites discussed in the context of this Committee Meeting.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** agreed with the Delegation of South Africa as the case will create precedence for other sites. It did not oppose the amendment.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande s'il ne faudrait pas rajouter d'autres types de bâtiments en plus des bâtiments hôteliers mentionnés dans le Projet de décision et sollicite des clarifications sur l'expression « de grande envergure ».

The Delegation of **India** requested a response for the question posed by the Delegation of Algeria and supported the Delegations of South Africa and Malaysia in that consistent norms should be established and followed.

ICOMOS clarified paragraph 6c of the Draft Decision in which the State Party was recommended not to approve large scale developments but noted that the Advisory Mission report stressed the need for the Management Plan to develop specific policies regarding the most appropriate and sustainable type of development to serve both the local population and the tourists. It supported the idea of consistency but stressed the need for issues to relate the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value. It added that Impact Assessments on the Outstanding Universal Value should be consistent and that results are case-specific.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the original version of the paragraph on the cable car but equally accepted if a new proposal with less visual impact would be

presented by the State Party in the following year because it considered that positive aspects could be brought to the property by the cable car.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that she received different proposals from the Committee members and stated that no consensus was achieved regarding the changes proposed by the Delegation of **France**. She inquired whether there were new proposals and suggested to return to the previous proposal.

La Délégation de la **France** exprime sa satisfaction quant aux explications apportées par l'Etat partie, notamment sur l'utilité de l'installation à l'égard de la population et sur la durée de l'utilisation de l'équipement. La Délégation de la **France** considère ces éléments comme des garanties.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'elle peut accepter l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la France en tant qu'exception, mais souligne que l'élément déterminant est l'impact sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle des biens et non l'utilité de l'installation ou de l'infrastructure dans un site du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stressed the importance of the cable car and noted the non-profitability of the project. It added that it guarantees accessibility to the World Heritage site.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated that the issue is one of consistency and that, despite the need for access, the same set of standards should be applied for other cases. It showed surprise for the length of time considered on the project.

The **Chairperson** added that a fair decision should be taken and commented that there were no arguments opposing the adoption of the decision as amended but noted that several proposal concerning management were made and added that the **Centre** and **ICOMOS** should consider them.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.75** was adopted as amended

Neolithic Site of Çatalhöyük (Turkey) (C 1405) - -37 COM 7B.86.Rev

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'état de conservation du site.

The Rapporteur presented the revised Draft Decision proposed by ICOMOS and the Secretariat.

Le Projet de Décision **37 COM 7B.86.Rev** est adopté.

Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) - -37 COM 7B.88.Rev

The **Secretariat** reported to the Committee that substantial new information has been brought to the attention of the Secretariat, further to the reactive monitoring mission carried out in April 2013, therefore it was considered important by the Centre and the Advisory Body to reflect the recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring mission in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that the Committee should take note of the positive progress made by the State Party, and suggested that the Committee should support the revised Draft Decision proposed by ICOMOS and adopt it without further consideration.

ICOMOS indique qu'il s'agit des questions urgentes et appelle également au renforcement du cadre juridique pour la protection des biens du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that the high-rise building visible on the photo included in the PowerPoint and taken by the mission team affects seriously the visual aspect of the property. It further compared the case to the one of the Cologne Cathedral several years ago, which was included on the Danger List, and stated that the recommendations of ICOMOS were quite soft.

ICOMOS répond à la Délégation d'Allemagne regrettant que la construction ait continué et indique que des mesures d'atténuation auraient pu être envisagées. ICOMOS est prêt de travailler avec l'Etat partie pour identifier les mesures les plus adéquates.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** considère que la photo présentée ne permet pas de comprendre pleinement la situation. La Délégation ajoute qu'un moratoire sera mis en place prochainement et que l'Etat partie pourrait expliquer pourquoi la mise en œuvre de ce moratoire a pris du retard. La Délégation précise cependant qu'il convient de prendre en compte le début d'exécution des procédures de planification urbaine. La Délégation fait appel à un avis concerté entre l'Etat partie et les Organisations consultatives sur ce projet avant d'engager la démolition, puisque qu'il existe une volonté de l'Etat partie de réduire cet impact et qu'une étude est en cours.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party to answer the question.

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** assured the Committee of its willingness to fulfill the decisions adopted by the Committee. It further explained the mitigation measures planned to be implemented.

The Delegation of **Germany** called for consistency and recalled the decision of the Committee in 2006 regarding Cologne.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained the topography of the City of Kiev, and expressed its view that although the building in the photograph looked disturbing, in reality, it should not be really disturbing, taking into account the topography of the city. It therefore suggested adopting the Draft Decision proposed by the secretariat and ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son appui à la position de la Délégation de la Fédération de Russie. La Délégation propose de donner du temps à l'Etat partie pour que le rapport parvienne l'année prochaine et que les membres du Comité puissent prendre une décision en toute connaissance de cause lors de la prochaine session du Comité.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with Russia about the fact that the photo could be misleading. Furthermore it recalled a recent expert meeting in India raised the question about the notion of visual integrity, and mentioned that this notion is not

addressed by the Operational Guidelines. The Delegation supported the revised Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** estime que la position de la Délégation de l'Allemagne est très raisonnable. La Délégation souligne l'importance de la décision du Comité sur ce point car cela risque de porter atteinte à plusieurs sites.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its view that the Committee has not used in the past the tools which are available to the Committee.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** insiste sur la volonté de l'Etat partie de limiter l'impact sur l'intégrité du site mais exprime son appui au projet de décision proposé par ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Mexique** appuie le projet de décision révisé. La Délégation ajoute qu'il est pertinent d'aborder de manière la plus précise dans les orientations des questions aussi spécifiques de l'évolution des villes, des paysages culturels et des paysages urbains.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime qu'il serait bénéfique pour le site de donner du temps à l'Etat partie mais appuie le projet de décision proposé.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** and the Delegation of Qatar expressed their support for the Draft Decision proposed.

Furthermore it suggested that the possibility of including the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger proposed by Germany can be decided next year, if the recommendations made by ICOMOS are not implemented.

The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed to the adoption of the Draft Decision .

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** s'oppose fermement à la proposition d'amendement de la Délégation de l'Allemagne. La Délégation propose de décider lors de la prochaine session s'il y a lieu d'inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated its support for the position of Algeria, by expressing that the danger listing would not bring fruitful results.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the view of the Delegation of Russia

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la position des Délégations de l'Algérie et de la Russie.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by **Switzerland**, underlined that the state of conservation of the site has been on the agenda of the Committee for 2 consecutive years, and recalled that nothing had happened so far. It further recalled that it was time to see the action and results.

The Draft Decision **37COM 7B. 88 Rev** was adopted as revised.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784) -37 COM 7B.72
 Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217) -37 COM 7B.73
 Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (C 85) -37 COM 7B.74
 Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis)-37 COM 7B.76
 Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829)-37 COM 7B.77
 Portovenere, Cinque Terre and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) (Italy) (C 826) -37 COM 7B.78
 Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) (C 1046) -37 COM 7B.79
 Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544) -37 COM 7B.80
 Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170) - 37 COM 7B.81
 Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632) -37 COM 7B.82
 Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545) -37 COM 7B.83
 Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev) -37 COM 7B.84
 Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) -37 COM 7B.85
 L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865bis) -37 COM 7B.86
 Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215) -37 COM 7B.87
 Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis) -37 COM 7B.88

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526) - 37 COM 7B.96.Rev

The **Secretariat** introduced the item by explaining that the State Party submitted by e-mail the response of the Sans-Souci Holding to the mission that took place to the property. This documentation focused on the possible avenues for the real estate projects to comply with the elements on the OUV of the property.

ICOMOS welcomed the progress made by the State Party and underscored the importance of the adoption of the regulations for the efficient management of the Site, as well as the final approval of the buffer zone.

ICOMOS welcomed the request made by the State Party to invite an advisory mission.

La Délégation du **Mexique** appuie la position du Comité afin de réduire l'impact visuel des projets de développement sur le bien en péril de Chiloé. La Délégation précise que l'Etat partie prévoit dans sa législation la réduction de la hauteur des bâtiments et la préservation des espaces publics.

The Delegation of **Colombia** suggested that the Committee should listen to information from the State Party.

The representative of **Dominican Republic** expressed its willingness to work in line with the decisions adopted by the Committee.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que le projet de décision révisé a été distribué au cours de la matinée. Le Rapporteur invite le Président du Comité à procéder à l'adoption de la décision.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated its concern on the state of the conservation of the site, and underlined that while the development projects being originated by private sector, the Committee should address to the State Party.

Le Projet de Décision **37 COM 7B.96 Rev** est adopté.

The meeting rose at 12.30 pm

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 19 June 2013

SIXTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

**ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD
HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

**7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD
HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD
HERITAGE LIST *(continuation)***

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

City of Potosí (Bolivia) (C 420) – 37 COM 7B.91

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the state of conservation report for the City of Potosí (Bolivia) has been proposed for discussion by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies taking into consideration that the unstable situation at Cerro Rico Mountains may be conducive to its potential inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A reactive monitoring mission is therefore requested for 2014 instead of 2015. Furthermore, the State Party submitted the final Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for approval at the present session of the Committee.

ICOMOS noted that the report on the state of conservation of the property did not provide detailed information on the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee to improve the security and stability of the site, as well as other conditions necessary to allow for sustainable mining activities and any other interventions that might constitute a serious risk for the stability of the Cerro Rico Mountain. ICOMOS underscored that it is crucial to finalize the scientific studies of the Cerro Rico. ICOMOS suggested that the Committee might wish to recommend a reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the current conditions and to evaluate whether there are ascertained or potential dangers to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property that would warrant inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.91** was adopted.

**Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia,
Plurinational State of) (C 567rev) – 37 COM 7B.92**

The **Secretariat** informed that after the submission of the state of conservation report, the State Party has submitted, on 17 June 2013, a first draft of the conservation measures to be implemented at the property with the assistance of the

Japanese Funds-in Trust for the Preservation of World Heritage. The conservation plan is being designed by the Ministry of Cultures, in close cooperation with the Municipality and the local communities on the basis of the recommendations made by the International Expert's Group which met from 29 to 31 August 2012. The Secretariat highlighted the good progress made by the State Party and informed the Committee that the appointment of the new Director of CIAAT will take place in the following months, as related by the national authorities.

ICOMOS welcomed the recent development and invited to proceed with the revision of the work plan of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust project and to establish close monitoring for the implementation of conservation measures.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.92** was adopted.

Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445) – 37 COM 7B.93

The **Secretariat** presented the document and stated that no additional information has been received since the state of conservation report was submitted.

ICOMOS wished to draw the Committee's attention to its concern that no technical details or specifications have been submitted regarding infrastructure development for World Cup 2014 and that no information was included concerning any Heritage Impact Assessments being carried out.

The Delegation of **India** suggested some amendments on the Draft Decision in order to postpone the deadlines for submitting the reports in the context of the on-going construction of associated infrastructures for the organisation of the World Cup and the Olympics Games. It asked the State Party to take the floor for additional information.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** stated that the infrastructure development plans are under review of the Brazilian Heritage Authority and then of the local legislative body. It informed the Committee that the process is in the way so it will be in difficult to produce a final progress report in 2014 as it was proposed in the original Draft Decision. It informed that the State Party will invite ICOMOS to work together with the local heritage authorities. It finally recalled that the Architectural Archive of Oscar Niemeyer has been recently included in the UNESCO Memory of the World as recognition of the outstanding work of the architect.

La Délégation du **Mali** est inquiète parce que le paragraphe 5 parle de donner la situation de la réalisation des infrastructures. Or ces dernières ont peut-être déjà été réalisées, étant donné qu'elles doivent être utilisées en juin 2014.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** informed that the main stadium has already been inaugurated but the infrastructures surrounding are in the process to being put in place and that it was ready to submit the plans to ICOMOS.

The Delegations of **Colombia**, **Algeria** and **France** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of India.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande en outre s'il s'agit de soumettre un rapport d'avancement au 1 février 2014 et un rapport d'état de conservation au 1 février 2015, ou le contraire.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** confirmed that it is willing to submit a progress report by 1st February 2014 and an updated report by 1st February 2015.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que puisque le stade a déjà été réalisé, le paragraphe 5 devrait parler des infrastructures autour du stade et non dans le stade lui-même. Elle soutient également l'amendement déposé par la Délégation de l'Inde.

ICOMOS re-confirmerait sa préoccupation concernant l'infrastructure et la stratégie de transport public en général dans les limites de la propriété.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.93** was adopted.

Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971) – 37 COM 7B.94

The **Secretariat** informait que suite à la demande faite par le Centre du Patrimoine Mondial en conformité avec le paragraphe 172 des *Directives opérationnelles*, le Gouvernement du Chili a soumis, le 12 mars 2013, un rapport technique sur la construction d'un centre commercial à Castro, près de l'église de San Francisco, une composante de la série de propriétés des Églises de Chiloé.

ICOMOS a déclaré qu'il n'y avait aucune disposition légale ou mesure réglementaire en place et que le mandat limité du Conseil national des Monuments est insuffisant pour protéger la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de la propriété. Ce manque de protection est reflété dans le processus qui a conduit à l'approbation de la construction du centre commercial à Castro, qui a un impact négatif significatif sur les caractéristiques visuelles de la composante de la série de propriétés et de son contexte. **ICOMOS** a demandé une mission de surveillance réactive pour trouver une solution afin d'atténuer l'impact visuel de la nouvelle construction.

La Délégation de **Colombie** a expliqué les amendements qu'elle proposait. Elle a souligné que l'État partie a réitéré sa conviction quant à l'utilité des missions d'experts et suivrait ses recommandations. La Délégation de **Colombie** ne voulait pas préjuger des conclusions de la mission. L'État partie inviterait une mission réactive conjointe et la Colombie était prête à fournir toute coopération requise.

La Délégation de **Japon** a demandé à **ICOMOS** de préciser quelles règles s'appliquent en ce qui concerne la construction et, à l'État partie, de décrire la situation dans cette zone du point de vue de ses habitants.

ICOMOS a précisé que les zones tampons des parties de la propriété sont limitées à englober uniquement les zones adjacentes ou les places.

La Délégation d'observateur de **Chili** a rappelé que Chiloé était un archipel. Il y avait eu des consultations et un soutien fort de la communauté. Il y avait également eu beaucoup de débats dans le pays concernant le développement près de la propriété.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** welcomed the proposal of a reactive monitoring mission.

La Délégation de la **France** demande si, dans la mesure où les immeubles dépassent la hauteur prévue par la réglementation en vigueur, il y a des procédures en cours au niveau national.

The Observer Delegation of **Chile** explained that a number of irregularities had been found by the authorities and were now dealt with. They were waiting for the outcome of the legal proceedings before anything could be done on this case.

The Delegation of **India** asked clarifications on the concept of “visual impact” mentioned by ICOMOS and how to judge it. It underlined the need to have an agreed methodology and it asked ICOMOS whether the site is within the buffer zone or not, in which case there would be no legal basis for the Committee to take a decision.

ICOMOS affirmed that following the *Operation Guidelines*, the Committee is allowed to make comments on the setting of the property because the attributes of the property may be linked to its surroundings.

The Delegation of **India** observed that the setting is not reflected in the inscription of the property and ICOMOS is giving a subjective position. It also stated that it is a case of ex-post rationalisation and, lastly, that the photographs showed by the Secretariat reflect a more subjective point of view.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recalled the discussions held during the 36th session about the inscription of Rio de Janeiro. This case showed once again the need to look at the overall issue of historic urban landscapes and the impact development could have. The project is outside the buffer zone but it may have an impact visually on the property itself.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.94** was adopted as amended.

Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev) – 37 COM 7B.95

The **Secretariat** reported on a series of communications received from the civil society raising attention to the risks for heritage in the property. The Secretariat informed the Committee about a letter received on 18 June 2013 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs inviting an advisory mission to the site. The Secretariat highlighted the spirit of cooperation and commitment demonstrated by the Chilean authorities with regard to the implementation of the required conservation measures to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

ICOMOS also recognised the significant effort made by the State Party to put forward the Master Plan for Heritage Management. However, the fragmentation of competencies and mandates by sectors and by different levels of government does not currently allow for the management of the property with respect to its Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS welcomed the information received by the State Party inviting and advisory mission, and recommended that the terms of reference for the reactive monitoring mission include an evaluation of the overlapping of institutional mandates and of the diversity of protective types, as well as an assessment of social,

economic and heritage impacts of the new proposals concerning physical connectivity including the assessment of the impacts of touristic cruises activity, of the transformation of the traditional fishing sector, taking particular attention to evaluate the significance of underwater archaeology.

The Delegation of **Colombia** explained that the amendment it had proposed focused on the invitation made to ICOMOS of an advisory mission as soon as possible to assess the state of conservation of the site. The State Party made important efforts to reach a consensus. The extensions conducted were fully in line with the development plan of the site as approved by the Committee ten years ago. The objective was to ensure the authenticity and the integrity of the site.

The Delegation of **India** asked a clarification on the boundaries of the property and whether the developments plans are within the site inscribed. It asked who will bear the costs of holding the delays of the works due to the evaluations requested by ICOMOS and recalled that the property is a living and fully functionally place.

La Délégation de la **France** salue les efforts de coopération des autorités chiliennes et encourage vivement la venue d'une mission consultative.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked what was decided at the time of inscription of the property regarding the development plans and what said the evaluation mission at the time of inscription.

The Observer Delegation of **Chile** explained that the plan presented in the nomination file in 2001 for the coastal area covered what was carried out now to extend the terminal.

ICOMOS replied that the details on the development projects are in the process of being discussed with the State Party.

La Délégation du **Mexique** estime que l'Etat partie mérite des compliments car c'est un des gouvernements d'Amérique latine les plus engagés dans la protection du patrimoine culturel. Un travail très étroit a été mené l'an dernier avec les comités nationaux. Actuellement, l'Etat revoie entièrement sa réglementation sur le patrimoine afin d'améliorer l'état des sites du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, supported by the Delegation of **Thailand**, mentioned its satisfaction with the comments made by ICOMOS and the reply made by the State Party on the future of the site. It shared the concern of India regarding future developments and implications of this project. It deemed that the Committee should wait for the results of the mission to know the future steps to be taken.

La Délégation de **Suisse** estime que le plus important à juger dans chaque cas individuel est l'impact du projet sur le bien et sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Les questions soulevées par l'Inde, telles que le fait que l'Etat partie soit d'accord ou non avec ce jugement, ne sont pas si décisives. Juger si une infrastructure a un impact négatif est un avis scientifique. La Convention oblige à protéger ces biens dans tous les cas.

The Delegation of **India** affirmed that there was no scientific corpus of rules, no agreed set of norms on the visual impact. It asked the Legal Advisor to finally participate to the discussions and advice.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** salue les efforts consentis par l'Etat partie dans la préservation du patrimoine et l'exemple qu'il donne dans la collaboration avec l'ICOMOS. L'intégrité visuelle et les projets de développement sont des sujets récurrents et préoccupants. Ces sujets vont être discutés dans le cadre du groupe de travail sur les *Orientations*. Pour le cas actuel, il faut laisser l'ICOMOS et l'Etat partie régler ces questions ; l'Etat partie doit avoir des prévisions d'aménagement où seront pris en charge le futur de ce projet.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The **Director of the Centre** recalled that the Budget Group did not include funding for this mission, which therefore will need to be funded by the State Party due to the financial constraints of the World Heritage Fund.

The Observer Delegation of **Chile** confirmed that it was ready to finance the advisory mission.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.95** was adopted as amended.

City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) – 37 COM 7B.97

The **Secretariat** explained that the information provided in the report included technical and graphical details on the development of the Metro of Quito, as well as the proposals for new interventions at the Jesuit ensemble. The World Heritage Centre received additional information from the State Party after the submission of the State of Conservation report, namely a summarized Heritage Impact Assessment regarding conservation environmental and social aspects linked to the Metro of Quito. The Secretariat informed that the Government of Ecuador invited the World Heritage Centre to organize an ICOMOS Advisory Mission to provide guidance on the Conservation Plan, including management arrangements, for the property. Following consultations with the State Party, a revised Draft Decision is proposed for adoption.

ICOMOS recommended that the Committee express its concern about some of the activities proposed that include demolition and new construction. ICOMOS considered essential that the State Party provides further details on the precise location of the areas and on the scope of the activities foreseen so that adequate guidance can be provided. ICOMOS finally called for an evaluating mission.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que les travaux n'ayant pas commencé, la solution proposée par l'ICOMOS est bonne puisque l'étude peut être faite avant lesdits travaux.

The Delegation of **India** explained that historic city centres have symbiotic relations with the surroundings, and that inhabitants need to be able to travel within the metropolitan area. It was concerned about the delays and costs that a mission will entail and which the State Party will need to afford. It asked for further details from ICOMOS to justify the real need of a mission.

ICOMOS explained that the intention is not to delay the project but, since the precise location of the metro stations had not been set yet, the mission would be an occasion to consult with the local authorities on the location of the metro entrances.

The Delegation of **Colombia** would like to congratulate the State Party for the efforts made to conserve the Historic Centre of Quito, the first to be listed as World Heritage and a very extensive one. It further noted a very detailed plan to limit the impact on Plaza de San Francisco by opening two metro stations. It requested that the State Party be given the floor for clarifications.

The Observer Delegation of **Ecuador** explained that it had an established government policy to roll out a management and conservation policy focusing on its own heritage. Over the last 6 years, 500 million dollars were invested on such project. Concerning Quito, the Government was very mindful of the situation; a renovation plan was being developed, including a 600 million dollars investment over the next 4 years. This significant investment clearly illustrated the great value the State Party gave to the management and preservation of Quito Historic Centre, which was a living one. The State Party had considered the possibility of setting up a second entrance to the metro station at Plaza del Teatro. This would halve the number of people coming out at the Plaza de San Francisco, in order to limit the impact of the metro, and would service the historic centre in an effective way. He reminded that the metro was important for the city. Funding had already been secured. A mission had been invited to look at all possible measures to limit the impacts of the construction of the metro on the Historic Centre of Quito.

The Delegation of **India** recalled that the primary issue is to allow people to reach the city centre and it stated that any delay will inevitably produce additional costs for the State Party.

La Délégation du **Mexique** déclare qu'elle partage les commentaires faits par les Délégations de l'Algérie et de l'Inde. En ce qui concerne la question du développement des centres historiques qui sont encore vivants et dont on ne peut pas arrêter l'évolution naturelle, elle souligne que le Centre Historique de Quito a été le premier d'Amérique latine à avoir été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et qu'il s'agit d'un des mieux conservés dans la région. Cela montre bien l'engagement de l'Etat partie vis-à-vis de la Convention et- de sa bonne mise en œuvre. Elle estime que son souhait de coopérer avec l'Organisation consultative concernée est tout à fait louable.

The Delegation of **Germany** commended the decision to build the metro and called for avoiding any delay in the decision-making plan.

ICOMOS clarified that the mission was intended to look more on the integration of the planning tools together with the local experts and that the intention is to work as quickly as possible with the State Party.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.97** was adopted as amended.

Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis) (proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger) – 37 COM 7B.100

The **Secretariat** informed about additional information received after the submission of the state of conservation report on 31 January 2013 by the State Party, namely an updated registry of the survey of the condition of old houses in the Historic District; a Cultural Cooperation Agreement between the State Party and Herity International signed in February 2013; a revised Request for Minor Boundary Modification; a report on the current state of Social Housing in the Historic District of Panamá; and the Government Decision-Making Flow Chart regarding National Heritage in the State Party. On 7 June 2013, the World Heritage Centre received a letter from the State Party requiring clarifications on the text of the State of Conservation document. On 29 May 2013, the State Party confirmed its agreement with the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property which is proposed for approval by the Committee at the present session on item 8E of the agenda. On 15 June 2013, the World Heritage Centre sent a response letter containing the answers provided by the Advisory Bodies to the clarifications requested.

ICOMOS stated that, given the current degree and extent of the adverse impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property derived from the construction of the Maritime Viaduct and the state of conservation of the built fabric, the World Heritage Committee might wish to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India** asked for giving the floor to the State Party and questioned ICOMOS whether the viaduct is within the property or its buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Qatar** agreed with the Delegation of India and asked the State Party whether the maritime place had an impact on the criteria for which the site had been inscribed.

ICOMOS informed that the boundaries of the property have not yet been adopted by the Committee.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remarque qu'il existait des limites du bien qui avaient été retenues et que la date de clôture de dépôt des limites n'a pas été dépassée. Elle demande si le viaduc actuel est dans la zone tampon, telle qu'elle ressort des limites établies lors de l'inscription du bien.

ICOMOS recalled that there are two components of the property and that the historic centre itself does not have a proper buffer zone adopted by the Committee.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** s'inquiète de la dégradation des bâtiments historiques menaçant directement la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et de l'état de conservation global du bien. Elle demande à l'Etat partie ce qu'il en est de la mise œuvre du cadre légal nécessaire à la protection et des problèmes de conservation et de gestion.

The Delegation of **India** observed that the discussion was about the historic centre and that the problems did not come from the State Party but, maybe, from the World Heritage Centre.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** declared that the first picture on the screen was a wrong one. It declared that Panama had invested over 180 million dollars for the conservation of the property. The main achievement was the management plan which was quite vast since it comprised the the two components of the site of Panama into one management plan. The State Party also invested 130 million dollars to relocate the road which intersected the archaeological site, following a request from UNESCO 10 years ago. Inside the historic district, the Government had invested 55 million dollars to rehabilitate the drinking water system, the sewage lines, the garbage storage and the waste water system in order to fix the buildings. The state of conservation report mentioned that 44% of the property was being fixed, whereas 72% of the property was in good condition. This factual error, which was pointed out to the World Heritage Centre, was used to justify the proposition for Danger Listing. The project did not affect criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). Therefore the implementation of the maritime viaduct was feasible, and therefore there was no reason to request the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The current state of the site was actually better than when it was inscribed. It stated that the Panama was most willing to receive UNESCO to analyse the situation *in situ*. It clarified that the maritime viaduct was outside both the buffer zone and the historic district. In 1995, the nomination file had identified that the fortifications and historic buildings as the attributes conveying Outstanding Universal Value; the site was therefore a group of buildings according to Article 1 of the Convention. Under the Panamean law, the 150,000 m² related to immediate environment. The maritime viaduct being completely outside the buffer zone, it should not be seen as part of the immediate environment. The visual impact was not laid out in an objective manner in the Operational Guidelines. Therefore, the conclusions of the report were based on subjective premises and were therefore invalid in the State Party's view.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked for clarification whether UNESCO had requested to relocate the mentioned road.

La Délégation de **Suisse** souligne que la construction du viaduc maritime est certes en dehors de la zone inscrite, mais sa position n'est pas la question décisive. La règle veut que l'impact sur les biens inscrits soit à considérer également s'ils viennent de l'extérieur, ainsi que l'a formalisé le paragraphe 112 des *Orientations*. L'argument selon lequel le viaduc ne devrait pas être considéré parce qu'il est en dehors du bien n'est donc pas recevable. Elle ajoute avoir fait quelques recherches sur Internet et avoir reçu des photos de la société civile panaméenne et demande à ce que ces photos soient montrées afin de permettre au Comité de juger de l'impact de cette infrastructure sur le bien

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked since when ICOMOS and WHC had been working with the State Party and which recommendations were given and entirely rejected by the State Party, giving rise to such criticism from ICOMOS and the Centre.

ICOMOS explained that the issue was first raised in 2009 and that a reactive mission took place in 2010, then another in October 2010, and, finally, in 2011 a technical working group with the State Party identified the best possible solutions. A further planned mission unfortunately did not take place.

The Delegation of **India** asked for a specific answer from a legal point of view from the Legal Advisor on whether it would be possible to take into consideration the broader setting of an inscribed property.

The **Legal Advisor** declared not being able to answer to the specific question raised but gave a general overview of the principles guiding the *Convention* and its *Operational guidelines*.

The Delegation of **India** observed that the Legal Advisor did not answer to the question raised.

The **Representative of the Director-General** took the floor for explaining that the question raised by India cannot be answered in legal terms, as it is too general and stated that in case there are no norms, one has to refer to the jurisprudence and the professional principles. As regards to the jurisprudence, the Committee already looked in the past to the impact of constructions outside the site and its buffer zone (London, Cologne, Isfahan, Potsdam, Saint Petersburg, etc) and the *Operational Guidelines* provide for to this possibility. In addition to that, there are the International Charters and Recommendations as the Venice Charter, which is a key conservation document, the Charter of Washington, the Xi'an Recommendations etc, with lots of references on settings, which may guide the Committee in its decisions and help its considerations. In conclusion, he stated that the Committee can and should consider impacts coming from outside as this is part of its important practise and past experience.

The **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to show the photographs on the screens.

ICOMOS commented on the images received.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que la situation est délicate mais qu'il est possible de trouver une solution. Elle considère que ce n'est pas l'ensemble du bien qui a des problèmes puisque l'ensemble archéologique est dans un état de conservation acceptable, de même qu'une partie de la ville historique. Elle considère par conséquent que le problème fondamental vient du viaduc et de son impact visuel et propose de trouver une solution technique par trois propositions concrètes : en premier lieu d'avoir une coopération proche entre l'Etat Partie et l'ICOMOS ; puis de procéder à des modifications des limites n'incluant que les parties du bien qui sont encore conservées ; enfin de procéder à des mesures correctives. Elle estime cependant qu'il ne faudrait en aucun cas aller vers l'inscription sur la Liste patrimoine mondial en péril.

Le **Président** demande à la Suisse de partager son impression après avoir vu les photos du site présentés par l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie l'ICOMOS d'avoir montré les photos et images. Elle estime que la construction du viaduc a un impact négatif grave qui annihile toute relation du bien avec la mer, soulignant que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien mentionnait dans sa description la situation côtière et son contexte particulier. La Délégation de la Suisse considère par conséquent que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle est gravement atteinte et qu'une inscription sur la Liste en péril serait la moindre des choses à envisager.

The Delegation of **India** encouraged flexibility with regards to reasonable development.

The **Representative of the Director General** reiterated that this is a professional process and judgment, based on in depth analysis, exchanges with the State Party and long-term experience of the organization.

The Delegation of **Qatar** suggested that the viaduc may add something positive, by virtue of providing a new angle from which to view the site.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Qatari statement that the bridge enhances, rather than detracts from, the property.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted the damages and impacts caused by the viaduct, and supported the Draft Decision as it stands, stating that it may be too late to delay the decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that the property was listed in 1997, and reiterated the specific criteria used: (ii) *leads to great value to mankind, (iv) *provides an example of a technological model, and (vi) *relates to historical value. The Delegation noted that the criteria contained no reference to setting or landscape. The Ambassador further noted the size of the city and the need to improve infrastructure for the local population. The Delegate opposed the motion to put the property on the List of properties in danger, and recommended that ICOMOS work with the WHC to identify a path forward.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted a decision from the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, which highlighted that the fulfillment of the protection mission of the World Heritage Convention is first and foremost a function of the State Parties. The World Heritage Conventions does not provide absolute protection against every change, and the Delegate noted that in certain circumstances the site should be de-listed as a World Heritage. The Delegate recommended therefore that the site be de-listed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** commente la citation du représentant indien qui a fait référence au texte mentionnant « un cadre physique large ». Elle estime à cet égard qu'en cas d'interprétation à faire entre définition large et définition étroite, la définition étroite est celle qui correspond à la volonté du législateur. Elle recommande également de se pencher sur la vision exposée par M. Bandarin et considère que le Comité est en train de créer une jurisprudence au sujet de l'interprétation d'impact visuel majeur. A cet égard, elle ajoute qu'il n'y a pas lieu de considérer uniquement ce cas, mais qu'il faut considérer l'importance de cet impact et le mesurer à d'autres biens ou la jurisprudence établie maintenant sera également prise en considération. Estimant qu'il y a dans la salle des professionnels de la négociation et des professionnels de la conservation du patrimoine, le représentant de la Délégation suisse recommande de prendre en compte l'opinion des professionnels du patrimoine au-delà des avis personnels, afin de suivre des critères objectifs.

The Delegation from **Thailand** noted that the viaduct may protect the site from the sea.

La Délégation du **Mexique** réitère le fait qu'il faut tenir compte des textes normatifs qui régissent la *Convention*. Elle cite le Représentant de la Directrice générale qui a rappelé les documents fondamentaux qui sont à l'origine de la *Convention*, telle la Charte de Venise. Elle estime que se référer à ces textes permettra au Comité de prendre la décision la plus éclairée.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** estime que le débat porte à nouveau sur les questions de zone tampon, du développement et de préservation du patrimoine. Elle rappelle que ce dossier a déjà fait l'objet d'un débat important à St Petersburg, en 2012. Elle estime que la question porte sur le fait que certains Etats Parties se préoccupent des projets de développement et se désintéressent de l'essentiel, c'est-à-dire du patrimoine classé. Elle souligne les nombreux efforts mis en œuvre par le Panama pour la prise en charge de la ville historique et du site archéologique. Elle rappelle qu'une étude d'impact dont on ne connaît pas le résultat a été conduite sur les critères à partir desquels les sites ont été classés. La Délégation de l'Algérie souhaite savoir s'il y avait une zone tampon lors de l'inscription des deux sites (le site archéologique et la ville historique), rappelant que si c'était le cas, il est possible de se référer aux textes établis. En référence à la déclaration de la Conseillère juridique, la représentante de l'Algérie rappelle que dans son pays, les instruments internationaux se placent toujours au-dessus des instruments nationaux tout en soulignant que les instruments nationaux prévoient toujours des zones de protection. Elle déclare que si une zone tampon a été acceptée lors de l'inscription, elle est alors définie par l'article 104 et il convient de voir si le viaduc s'inscrit dans cette zone tampon. Elle invite ensuite à se pencher sur l'avis de la société civile et demande à l'Etat partie comment ce projet de développement est perçu par la population. Elle regrette qu'on se désintéresse de l'avis de la population en raison d'une vision techniciste et subjective du dossier. La Délégation fait remarquer qu'un viaduc a déjà été construit au niveau du site archéologique classé Patrimoine mondial et s'interroge sur le fait que ce viaduc n'a jamais été remis en question.

ICOMOS clarified that no buffer zone has been approved by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** noted that there are a number of different interpretations regarding whether or not the bridge was a positive development.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** propose de réfléchir sur les notions de patrimoine telles que transmises par les anciens. Elle rappelle que le patrimoine est communément défini comme ce que l'on a reçu en héritage mais que les anciens ajoutaient que le patrimoine est aussi ce qui mérite d'être transmis. Elle estime qu'en inscrivant ce site, on a choisi que la notion de tradition mérite d'être transmis mais s'interroge sur ce que sera le patrimoine demain : si ce sera la transmission de ce qu'on a reçu en héritage ou bien la somme de ce qu'on a reçu et de ce qu'on y a ajouté. Elle considère que pour assurer l'avenir de la *Convention*, il faudra articuler une gestion vertueuse de ce que l'on a reçu en héritage et une articulation harmonieuse de ce que nous apportons au patrimoine de demain. Il invite le Comité à réfléchir sur ces questions avant de prendre une décision

Le **Président** remercie le Sénégal pour avoir mis en avant une notion très importante sur la question du transfert de l'héritage.

The Delegation of **Japan** recommended further professional analysis through an environmental and heritage impact assessment, in order to facilitate a more informed decision.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que la situation économique du site a changé, comme noté par la Délégation de la Russie, que la vie de la ville a évolué et que les travaux engagés ont forgé un nouveau paysage autour du bien. Elle estime que c'est un fait dont il faut prendre acte et souscrit aux remarques faites par la Délégation algérienne. A l'instar de la Délégation sénégalaise, la Délégation française s'interroge sur la jurisprudence qu'il faut à présent mettre en place.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime qu'un problème de développement se pose. Elle souligne qu'il arrive que l'on demande le déclassement de sites archéologiques pour y lancer des projets de constructions. Elle rappelle que les sites ont été classés sur la base de critères et de textes et considère que l'Etat partie peut opérer un choix de développement au détriment du patrimoine, mais estime que si l'on veut concilier les deux approches, il convient de demander l'avis des experts pour en trouver une solution.

Le **Président** estime que trop de temps a été passé sur ce sujet et qu'il faut trouver une solution. Il ne considère pas le vote comme une solution acceptable car le vote ne renforce pas la solidarité internationale. Il indique lui préférer une solution de compromis et propose en conséquence de mettre en place un groupe de rédaction qui devra permettre de trouver un consensus. Il propose au Comité de nommer Son Exc. M. Ros Borath, Chef de la Délégation du Cambodge, Directeur Général Adjoint de l'Autorité Nationale APSARA chargée de la gestion du site d'Angkor classé patrimoine mondial, et possédant plus de 30 années d'expérience, pour présider les travaux de ce groupe qui devront débiter dès le lendemain matin.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite le choix du Président et recommande que l'ICOMOS fasse partie du groupe de travail.

Le **Président** confirme et indique que le groupe englobera les parties concernées.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C 567rev) – 37 COM 7B.92
National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180) – 37 COM 7B.98
Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129) – 37 COM 7B.99
Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) – 37 COM 7B.101
Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis) – 37 COM 7B.102

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

AFRICA

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis) – 37 COM 7B.36

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to present the state of conservation reports for cultural sites in Africa.

The **Secretariat** introduced the report and noted the recent mission to assess the state of conservation, as detailed in the document. The mission established that the risk of fire is heightened by lack of maintenance and tall grass, and which has destroyed some buildings. The mission further noted the lack of function of several buildings, and had requested a reconstruction policy. The mission established that the management plan must be updated in order to improve the overall management. A workshop on training and risks preparedness has been organized and it is hoped that the results will enable the State Party to prepare the revised management plan that will allow the property face the same problems as in the past.

ICOMOS noted that sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is largely related to maintenance of traditional practices.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.36** was adopted.

Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15) – 37 COM 7B.38

ICOMOS noted that the management plan must be drawn up and adopted, and noted the urgent need to solve boundary issues regarding the property.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.38** was adopted.

Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis) – 37 COM 7B.42

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'état de conservation et indique que depuis la publication du rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien, aucune nouvelle information n'a été reçue notamment sur les questions liées au contrôle des attributions de permis de construire pour stopper la dégradation observée du tissu urbain et de son architecture. Il indique que l'absence du gestionnaire du bien travaillant directement sur le site, même s'il a déjà été nommé, est une source de préoccupation pour le suivi adéquat de la mise en œuvre d'un développement touristique difficile. Il s'excuse auprès de la Délégation du Sénégal de l'indication erronée dans le rapport de la date de réhabilitation du pont Faidherbe, qui est de 2011 et non 2007.

ICOMOS noted a number of challenges that are unresolved and requested a mission to assess the situation regarding the Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal).

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle et salue les efforts exceptionnels mis en œuvre par l'Etat partie et mentionne le cofinancement avec la France pour la réhabilitation du pont Faidherbe pour un budget de plus de 18 millions euros. Elle souligne que la dernière expertise de la convention France-UNESCO en a fait un constat positif en 2009. Elle ajoute que la France a fortement participé au plan de sauvegarde et de mise en valeur du bien dont elle souligne l'appréciation unanime par les experts. Elle en appelle donc à l'application de ce plan. Elle recommande en outre que l'Etat

partie apporte des éléments sur les projets de réhabilitation de certains édifices, sur le programme de développement touristique et de façon générale sur tout projet important prévu dans l'île et la région de St Louis. Elle souligne que cela est d'autant plus important que l'Etat Partie a inscrit les escales du fleuve sur sa liste indicative, en vue d'une inscription au patrimoine mondial. Elle déclare qu'au vu de la convention France-UNESCO, la France reste très réservée sur une mise en péril du site qu'elle juge disproportionnée dans la mesure où l'intégrité du bien, la zone tampon et le plan de gestion sont respectés. Elle indique enfin qu'une mission de la convention France-UNESCO pourrait être menée dans ce cadre et que la France a soumis plusieurs amendements au Rapporteur.

La Délégation du **Mali** rappelle que la ville de St Louis est une ville vivante et mentionne les efforts mis en œuvre par l'Etat partie pour réhabiliter le pont de Faidherbe. Elle s'interroge toutefois sur le fait que plan de sauvegarde et de mise en valeur du bien n'est pas encore appliqué et demande si l'Etat partie peut apporter des éclaircissements sur ce point. Elle ajoute souhaiter connaître les autres projets entrepris autour de St-Louis. Elle recommande qu'une mission soit envoyée à Saint Louis avant d'envisager une inscription du bien sur la Liste en péril.

Le **Président** demande à l'Etat partie du Sénégal de répondre à la question du Mali et d'indiquer s'il accepterait d'inviter et de prendre en charge une mission de suivi.

Le Délégation du **Sénégal** dit ne pas souhaiter accabler les Organisations consultatives mais rappelle qu'elles ne se sont pas rendues à St-Louis depuis longtemps et précise que le dernier rapport soumis date d'il y a seulement quelques mois. Elle considère donc que ce qui a été dit a été fait sur la base de « l'exégèse ». Elle précise cependant reconnaître qu'il a un certain nombre de problèmes qu'elle souhaite partager avec le Comité. Comme la représentante de la France, elle rappelle que 18 millions d'euros dépensés sur le pont Faidherbe et, pour répondre au représentant du Mali, elle indique que le Sénégal a par ailleurs emprunté 24,5 millions d'euros pour la réhabilitation de St-Louis et le développement du tourisme dans la région, notamment au niveau des escales. Elle souligne que le Sénégal prend très au sérieux ses responsabilités concernant et indique accepter la mission proposée par le Président. Elle précise cependant qu'elle ne peut la financer, le Sénégal s'étant déjà endetté de 24 millions d'euros. Elle invite néanmoins la mission à se rendre sur place pour envisager ensemble les moyens appropriés qui permettront de faire face à la situation.

Le **Président** indique que si une mission est envoyée par le Comité mondial, c'est le Comité qui paiera.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que le projet de décision est prêt à être adopté en français et en anglais. Elle dit savoir compter sur la France qui s'est dite prête à apporter des éclaircissements linguistiques. Elle mentionne un petit changement au paragraphe 4, des amendements au paragraphe 5 et 6, notamment par la France, un nouveau paragraphe 7 et un nouveau paragraphe 8.

Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.42** was adopted.

Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs (South Africa) (C 915bis) – 37 COM 7B.44

Le **Secrétariat** du Centre du patrimoine mondial indique de depuis l'inscription du bien, il existe une menace potentielle provenant des effluents de mines abandonnées ou en activité dans le voisinage. Il précise que les eaux acides riches en fers et autres minéraux ainsi que les apports d'eaux non traitées provenant de mines pourraient avoir un impact sur l'intégrité du bien et du système de côtes souterraines qui sous-tendent la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Il indique qu'en janvier 2011, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a évoqué avec l'Etat partie la nécessité de mener une étude complète pour répondre à cette préoccupation. L'étude a donc été soumise par l'Etat partie au Centre du patrimoine mondial et analysée par l'ICOMOS.

ICOMOS presented the Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs (South Africa), and welcomed the impact study undertaken by the State Party, which assessed the impact of abandoned mines on the site. The study noted that one site was particularly vulnerable, and made a number of recommendations. ICOMOS suggested that action be taken to implement the report's recommendations.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime que la situation du bien a considérablement évolué et que l'esprit de la résolution proposée n'est pas en phase avec la réalité dans la mesure où l'Etat partie met en œuvre les recommandations émises en 2011. Elle rappelle que la qualité du rapport fourni par l'Etat partie a été saluée par l'ICOMOS et souligne que l'Etat partie a pris des mesures pour tenter de neutraliser les effets potentiellement négatifs des eaux de ruissellement contaminées liées à l'exploitation minière. Elle suggère en conséquence que la tonalité de la résolution soit atténuée et que les efforts de l'Etat partie y salués et encouragés. Elle pense que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle est très largement hors de danger même si des efforts sont encore à faire. Elle souhaite aussi que l'Etat partie apporte des informations complémentaires. La Délégation du Sénégal indique enfin avoir proposé un nouveau projet de résolution

The Delegate of **India** requested clarification regarding the purpose of the reactive monitoring mission proposed for 2014. The Delegate also recommended re-drafting paragraph 172.

The Delegation of **South Africa** announced that a Ministerial Committee had been enacted to deal with this issue, and noted that the state party has begun to undertake measures as a result of these recommendations.

ICOMOS responded to India's question, stating that the mission was to be undertaken with the support of the State Party, in the spirit of collaboration rather than supervision.

The **Rapporteur** introduced the amendments suggested by Senegal in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.44** was adopted.

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099) – 37 COM 7B.43

Le **Secrétariat** indique que lors de sa 36^{ème} Session, le Comité avait demandé à l'Etat Partie que l'exploitation minière de charbon à ciel ouvert n'affecte pas la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien. Il ajoute qu'un rapport remis par l'Etat partie a apporté des réponses aux demandes exprimées à ce sujet, qu'un archéologue a été

recruté et qu'un plan de gestion complet, clair et précis a été soumis au Centre du patrimoine mondial. Il encourage l'Etat partie à mettre en œuvre ce plan de gestion en impliquant les communautés locales et souligne à cet égard que le rapport mentionne la nomination d'un médiateur pour accélérer les négociations avec les propriétaires terriens auquel il est demandé d'intégrer dans la zone tampon la portion de leurs terres situées entre les limites du bien et la mine de charbon. Il indique en outre que les phases de création de la Zone de Conservation Transfrontière sont en voie d'achèvement avec la prochaine signature d'un traité entre les trois Etats parties concernés (Botswana Afrique du Sud et Zimbabwe). Il demande enfin à l'Etat partie de fournir des informations complémentaires concernant le projet d'extension souterraine d'une mine de diamant située en zone tampon, en particulier sur les infrastructures prévues et l'impact sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle.

ICOMOS welcomed the state of conservation report prepared by the state party, and noted that the text contained an error: "buffer zone" is incorrect, as the report concerned the main property. The management plan was seen as professional and reasonable, and ICOMOS agreed that a more positive notation should be included.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique souhaiter apporter des corrections au rapport dans lequel elle soulève des erreurs factuelles. Elle insiste sur l'importance des efforts engagés par l'Etat partie pour améliorer l'état de conservation et souligne que la zone minière est à environ 100 m de la zone tampon et non à l'intérieur. Elle remarque que le plan de gestion intégrée qui a été élaboré est un outil de gestion pratique qui s'intéresse aux communautés et qui prend en compte des mesures d'intégration. Elle rappelle les informations concernant la conservation des sites archéologique qui sont contenues dans le rapport de l'Etat partie, ainsi que le processus de consultation interétatique en cours concernant la zone tampon et la nomination du médiateur pour les questions foncières. Pour ce qui est du cycle de soumission des rapports de conservation, elle souligne que le bien a été suivi durant 4 années successives de 2010 à 2013. Elle demande enfin que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie pour lui permettre d'apporter des éclaircissements supplémentaires.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime que le Mali a fourni l'essentiel des informations complémentaires et salue les rapports du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS qu'elle considère comme positif. Elle souligne que l'Etat partie a signalé la présence de ressources en gaz et en charbon disponibles dans la zone tampon et estime que cela amènera le Comité à discuter un jour de la notion de valeur universelle exceptionnelle prospective. Elle précise que la distance qui sépare le bien des mines est de 100 km et non de 100 m et signale aussi qu'aucun permis ni de licence d'exploitation n'a été émis pour la zone, rappelant que la loi sud-africaine n'autorise pas les activités minières en zone classée, y compris patrimoine mondial. Elle suggère par conséquent de réviser la tonalité du projet de décision afin qu'il soit plus conforme à la réalité.

Le **Secrétariat** souhaite apporter des clarifications sur une question soulevée par la Délégation du Mali concernant le document illustré. Il précise que ce travail est mentionné dans le rapport soumis par l'Etat partie soumis mais qu'un problème de transmission électronique du document a retardé sa soumission et que l'ICOMOS prendra donc le temps de l'examiner. Il précise toutefois que des échanges ont néanmoins eu lieu avec l'Etat partie sur ce sujet. Concernant les permis d'activités mentionnés par la Délégation du Sénégal, il est rappelé que le dernier rapport de l'ICOMOS avait déjà relevé des problèmes tels que l'émission de permis en

périphérie qui pourraient avoir un impact négatif sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, déjà menacée par les projets existants, y compris par l'extension la mine de diamant à l'intérieur du site.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique avoir pris connaissance des informations complémentaires livrées par l'Etat partie dénotant sa volonté d'apporter tous les correctifs nécessaires et déclare se rallier à la proposition de la Délégation du Sénégal d'apporter des nuances au projet de décision en y intégrant ces éléments d'informations.

The Delegation of **South Africa** clarified that there is currently an MOU with neighboring states to move towards formalizing the Treaty, and that the State Party is in the process of arranging additional agreements with private properties bordering the site. The State Party noted that it has also undertaken scientific studies to identify of the distribution of the archeological sites, with a view to making a submission on boundary modifications as recommended in the decision. It reaffirmed that the mine is not in the buffer zone, or in the envisaged buffer zone of the property. The State Party further clarified that the Venetia Diamond Mine pre-dated the inscription of the site, but as a result of inscription, there are applications to move the mines underground. An impact assessment has been undertaken, which indicated that there will be no impact to the property. Finally, South African legislation excludes mining in World Heritage Sites, and has drafted a guideline to support industry in compliance.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party for progress, but indicated concern over the factual errors mentioned by ICOMOS, noting that the boundary error is a repeated factual error.

ICOMOS regretted the error, and clarified that the State Party in their letter commented about the extension of the buffer zone, as a conflict between what they said and what ICOMOS said. Protection of the property likely requires a revised buffer zone. ICOMOS was pleased to learn that an impact assessment has been taken on the mine extension.

The Delegation of **Iraq** endorsed the amendment proposed by the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments suggested to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se déclare satisfaite que l'Etat partie ait annoncé qu'il n'autorisera pas de projets miniers dans le bien du patrimoine mondial. Elle propose d'inclure dans le Projet de Décision le fait de féliciter l'Etat partie de ne pas autoriser de projets miniers dans les biens du patrimoine mondial.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.43** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Historic Town of Grand-Bassam (Côte d'Ivoire) (C 1322rev) – 37 COM 7B.37
Lower Omo Valley (Ethiopia) (C 17) – 37 COM 7B.39
Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055) – 37 COM 7B.40
Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev) – 37 COM 7B.41

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

The meeting rose at 7pm.

FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY 20 June 2013

SEVENTH MEETING

9 a.m. –12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(continuation)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565) – 37 COM 7B.46

The **Chairperson** clarified the order of the points to be discussed and requested the Secretariat to next item on the agenda, the state of conservation of the World Heritage property of the Casbah of Algiers.

Le **Secrétariat** présente les nouvelles informations relatives à l'état de conservation. En mars 2013, l'Etat partie avait demandé au Centre du patrimoine mondial l'envoi d'une mission consultative en vue d'examiner des projets d'aménagement et d'embellissement de la ville : Mémorial de la révolution et « maison d'Alger » sur la place des Martyrs, trois promenades dans et le long de la Casbah, le port et la promenade du port. Un expert de l'ICOMOS s'est rendu à Alger du 28 avril au 2 mai 2013 et a émis un certain nombre de recommandations destinées à préserver l'intégrité du bien qui pourrait être affectée par ces projets.

ICOMOS appreciated the invitation by the State Party to conduct an advisory mission to review the project of the Martyrs Square. ICOMOS had found no major problems with the proposal, but had made some recommendations regarding the treatment of the archaeological remains in the area as well as on social and human aspects that should have been given due consideration in order to ensure the sustainability of the intervention.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** souhaite entendre les informations de la part de l'Etat partie.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** explique que les travaux du métro ont été arrêtés pour permettre des fouilles archéologiques. Les rapports ont été présentés au Centre du patrimoine mondial, les dossiers techniques remis et la mission de l'ICOMOS a été

reçue. L'INRAP, en charge des fouilles, a présenté un rapport. La Délégation précise que le plan d'urbanisme a été révisé en accord avec les recommandations et que la mission de conseil du 3/5/2013 a demandé qu'il n'y ait pas de projet à l'endroit de la station de métro. Il y a eu désistement d'un des projets, et le rapport a été accepté dans son intégralité par les autorités.

At the request of the Chairperson, the Delegation of **Cambodia** stated that it was satisfied by the clarification provided by the State Party.

Le projet de Décision **37 COM 7B.46** est adopté.

Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89) – 37 COM 7B.49

Le **Secrétariat** indique que ce rapport a été ouvert par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives en raison des risques encourus par le bien. Le rapport de l'Etat partie, et les informations de l'équipe du projet UNESCO de réhabilitation urbaine du Caire, indiquent une dégradation alarmante de l'état de conservation du site, et notamment un nombre croissant de constructions illégales de grande hauteur. L'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien souffrent de cette situation, favorisée par le contexte difficile actuel. L'absence de réglementation et de mesures de gestion empêchent le contrôle approprié du bien par les autorités.

Le Secrétariat indique que, dans le domaine de la préservation, l'Etat partie reconnaît que des efforts importants ont été consacrés depuis plusieurs années à la réhabilitation de bâtiments et d'ensembles historiques, tandis que le paysage urbain, pour sa part, subissait les impacts d'un développement incontrôlé.

ICOMOS acknowledged the difficulties that the State Party was facing, including in monitoring the property, as well as the measures it had taken towards the establishment of an effective management system for its safeguarding. It also noted the challenges involved in implementing the demolition of some illegal buildings that had been constructed within the site. In this regard, ICOMOS considered that the development of an agreed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the revision of the boundaries of the property, which would reflect the alterations occurred since its inscription on the World Heritage List, would be necessary to enable its effective management and safeguarding.

The Delegation of **Iraq** requested that the State Party be allowed to intervene.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that there was an inconsistency in the harsh wording of the Draft Decision proposed by the Secretariat, on one hand, and the positive developments described in the website of the World Heritage Centre in the context of an ongoing project for the regeneration of Historic Cairo. The Delegation also noted that, according to information contained in the website of the World Heritage Centre, a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and proposed new boundaries for the property were in the process of being developed as part of the above-mentioned project. It did not understand, therefore, how the Draft Decision could regret that the State Party had not submitted these two documents. The Delegation concluded, thus, that the proposal for danger listing the property was not justified, and requested that the State Party concerned be allowed to clarify the situation.

The Delegations of **India** and of the **United Arab Emirates** wanted to know what was the cost of the conservation interventions undertaken within the property, and why the State Party could not submit the requested Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party of **Egypt** noted that its efforts for the safeguarding of the property were described in the state of conservation report presented by the Secretariat. In the context of a two-million dollar project carried out in cooperation with UNESCO, a number of activities had been planned, including the establishment of a National World Heritage Committee, the demolition of illegal buildings, the recruitment of restoration experts, the carrying out of a survey, as well as of an awareness-raising campaign. The State Party clarified that it had submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to UNESCO in 2011, but was recently requested to provide also a new map. This could not be prepared and agreed at the relevant levels of authority within a few weeks. The State Party also noted some inconsistencies in the calendar established by the World Heritage Centre for the submission of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the revised boundaries of the property, which made paragraph three of the Draft Decision inappropriate.

The Delegation of **Qatar** understood that illegal buildings within the properties had been removed, which demonstrated that commitment of the State Party towards the conservation of this property. It also wanted to obtain to know the position of the State Party on a possible mission by ICOMOS to the property.

The Delegation of **Iraq**, having heard the State Party, had two questions to address to it. First, what were its expectations from an ICOMOS mission? Secondly, what were the mission and expected achievements of the newly established National World Heritage Committee?

The Delegation of **India** shared the view of the State Party that the elaboration of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was a task that required considerable time, and wondered therefore if paragraph three of the Draft Decision should not be taken out. Moreover, the Delegation considered that since management was in place and measures were being taken to protect the property, danger listing it was not appropriate.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** noted the considerable efforts being made by the State Party and wanted to know what it expected from the World Heritage Centre.

With regard to the visit by an ICOMOS expert, the State Party of **Egypt** clarified that ICOMOS had not visited the property over the last years. The State Party would of course welcome a mission. With regard to the National World Heritage Committee, this had a broad mandate and composition. Its main function was to coordinate and implement projects. A specific sub-committee on heritage was due to meet on 21 June 2013. The State Party was looking forward to further and stronger cooperation with the World Heritage Centre. In this regard, it considered that the person coordinating the project for UNESCO should have been based in Cairo, not at Headquarters, so as to facilitate coordination with the local responsible authorities.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que, lorsque le projet de réhabilitation urbaine avait commencé, il a été considéré que l'on ne pouvait pas dissocier les limites du bien de la déclaration de VUE. L'équipe du projet UNESCO travaille sur place sur les limites du bien et sur la déclaration de VUE. Ces révisions ont été effectuées et doivent être soumises au Centre pour transmission à l'ICOMOS.

ICOMOS provided further clarifications in relation to the procedures in place for the submission of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. In this particular case, the elaboration of the Statement was supported through the above-mentioned project for the regeneration of Historic Cairo. The Statement, however, needed to be agreed by the State Party and ICOMOS recognized that this took time. What the initial results of the project showed, on the other hand, was the urgent need for an adequate management. This was why a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was necessary as a matter of priority, together with revised boundaries, since these two elements were critical to inform management strategies for the listed property.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** souscrit et respecte les rapports du Centre et de l'ICOMOS. Elle salue également les efforts que l'Etat partie a faits dans les conditions qui règnent actuellement dans le pays. Elle recommande d'accorder le temps nécessaire à l'Etat partie pour répondre à toutes les demandes.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision s with the amendments introduced by the Delegations of Iraq, India and Algeria in paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.49** was adopted as amended.

World Heritage properties of Syria (proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger) – 37 COM 7B.57

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité que de nouvelles informations ont été reçues le 13 juin 2013 de la Délégation permanente de la Syrie, et du Ministre de la culture. Il indique que l'Ambassadeur est présente dans la salle et souhaite s'adresser au Comité.

ICOMOS noted that all six properties located in the State Party could be considered in danger, either ascertained and potential, and were the subject of deep concern, particularly the old city of Aleppo. ICOMOS had carried out a distance learning course for the benefit of Syrian heritage specialists and would be ready to conduct similar activities and assist the State Party if resources were available.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** rappelle que la perte d'un site est toujours un évènement tragique, et que la destruction de la mosquée des Omeyyades à Alep avait endeuillé la communauté internationale entière. Elle précise cependant que ce site n'a pas été le seul à subir des dommages. La communauté internationale, représentée par le Comité, doit exprimer sa solidarité et prendre action.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** acknowledged that danger listing was justified in principle in this case. However, active conflict was not present in all regions of the country. Whereas Aleppo was certainly in danger, and the efforts of the State Party to restore the damage buildings should have been recognized, it

made no sense to danger list Damascus. Armed groups in Syria were using historic buildings as shelters and were destroying them. The Committee should have considered these properties individually. The Delegation asked also that the State Party be given the opportunity to express its opinion in this regard.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** partage les préoccupations du Secrétariat, de l'ICOMOS et du Comité quant à la situation dramatique pour le patrimoine syrien. Elle trouve que la proposition de mettre les sites syriens sur la Liste en péril témoigne d'une attitude responsable et éthique. Elle s'interroge sur la dimension de l'inscription des sites dans leur totalité, et demande s'il n'est pas préférable de produire des décisions pour chaque cas précis. Une telle décision individuelle serait plus indiquée surtout quand il s'agira des mesures de suivi.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que des destructions irréremédiables ont déjà été commises. Elle partage l'avis du Cambodge et souscrit à l'inscription de l'ensemble des sites syriens sur la Liste en péril.

The Delegation of **India** noted that this was a very serious matter. More information was required for the Committee to make a decision. It was more appropriate to consider the different properties of Syria one by one, based on specific information. The Delegation joined the Delegation of the Russian Federation in requesting that the State Party be allowed to intervene.

The Delegation of **Iraq**, recalling its own tragic experience in similar circumstances, expressed its gratitude to ICOMOS for the support provided to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Qatar** noted that the situation was very sad and worrying. The question for the Committee was not to blame anyone. Syria was a country dear to all Arabs and the entire world. It supported the views expressed by the Delegations of Cambodia and France.

La Délégation du **Mali** note que cette situation délicate rappelle celle du Mali l'année dernière, et que deux avis se dessinent : inscrire l'ensemble des six sites sur la Liste en péril ou se maintenir aux deux sites où les dégâts sont avérés. La Délégation a mentionné qu'il serait souhaitable que la Syrie adopte le 2^e Protocole de la Convention de La Haye (1954) et que l'Etat partie s'exprime.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the views expressed by the Delegations of Cambodia and France.

La Délégation du **Mexique** exprime sa préoccupation quant à la situation de ces sites, et se dit en accord avec les délégations du Cambodge et de la France, ainsi qu'avec la suggestion de mettre en œuvre le 2^e Protocole de la Convention de 1954. Elle demande que le Président du Comité en charge de ce Protocole, présent dans la salle, donne son avis sur comment cette Convention pourrait être mise en œuvre en Syrie.

The Delegation of **Colombia** joined previous speakers in supporting the views expressed by Cambodia and France.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the proposed Draft Decision . Clearly, all the World Heritage properties located in Syria faced danger, whether they had been

destroyed or not. It also agreed with the Delegation of Mali on the need to explore possible synergies with the 1954 Convention.

The Delegation of **South Africa** suggested that the State Party be given the floor before the Committee went further in discussing the matter.

La Délégation de la **République arabe syrienne** (Observateur) indique qu'en février 2013 le bureau de l'UNESCO en Jordanie a organisé, en collaboration avec le gouvernement suisse, un cours de formation concernant le trafic illicite. Un plan d'action a été développé avec l'UNESCO et Interpol, qu'il faut maintenant mettre en œuvre. La coopération entre l'UNESCO et le gouvernement syrien est constante, la Syrie a soumis tous les rapports demandés. Tous les sites ne sont pas menacés, mais Alep et sa mosquée ont bien été pris pour cible. Une commission pour la préservation de la mosquée des Omeyyades a été créée. Une déclaration du Ministre de la Culture de la République arabe syrienne demande qu'Alep soit inscrit sur la Liste des sites en péril. L'Etat partie souhaite accueillir une mission UNESCO/ICOMOS pour élaborer des mesures pour la sauvegarde des biens. La Syrie a établi un plan d'urgence pour la sauvegarde des musées et des sites archéologiques, tandis que des équipes ont été formées pour la protection des collections. A partir du 15 octobre 2012, une campagne de mobilisation de volontaires dans la société civile a été lancée pour protéger le patrimoine. Une coordination est établie avec la Jordanie et l'Iraq pour récupérer des pièces volées, en collaboration avec INTERPOL. La Direction générale des antiquités a organisé avec l'ICOMOS une activité de formation et de sensibilisation qui a bénéficié à 75 personnes. L'Etat partie indique qu'il a assuré une coopération constante et que des rapports sont soumis périodiquement. Il invite une mission de suivi réactif, compte tenu que les conditions de sécurité permettent la présence d'autres agences de Nations Unies sur place. L'Etat partie rappelle enfin que le gouvernement et le peuple syriens ont besoin de la coopération internationale et non pas de sanctions. Elle termine en rappelant que la Syrie est le berceau de la civilisation.

Le **Président** du Comité fait référence au site d'Angkor et la situation que ce site a connu quand il a été inscrit, en 1992, sur la Liste en péril, sur laquelle il est resté jusqu'en 2004. Il évoque l'impact négatif d'une telle inscription, notamment pour le prestige du pays, mais également l'impact positif, car la situation du site bénéficie de l'attention de la communauté internationale. Angkor est maintenant considéré comme modèle de coopération internationale dans le monde du patrimoine – et ceci est un effet positif de l'inscription sur la Liste en péril. Vingt pays ont coopéré pour la conservation d'Angkor, 250 millions de dollars EU ont été mobilisés, et grâce à cette action Angkor a pu être sauvé.

The Delegation of **Iraq**, supported by Algeria, having heard the State Party, supported the idea of a dispatching immediately a reactive monitoring mission to Syria.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** constate que le Comité est d'accord sur la gravité de la situation des sites syriens et sur leur inscription sur la Liste des sites en péril. Elle trouve cependant que le projet de décision manque de générosité, et suggère l'ajout d'une prise d'initiative pour un fonds de soutien dès que les conditions le permettent.

La Délégation du **Mali** demande s'il faut inscrire tous les six sites sur la Liste en péril, ou plutôt chercher des mesures préventives. Dans le cas du Mali, les mausolées de

Tombouctou ont été endommagés, mais pas le site de Gao. Quant aux manuscrits, ils ont pu être sauvés grâce à une action discrète. La Délégation s'inquiète des débats politico-politiciens qui reviennent toujours.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supports the proposal by the Delegation of Senegal to establish a Fund to assist in the rehabilitation of World Heritage properties when things go back to normal.

ICOMOS welcomed the initiatives undertaken by the State Party for the safeguard of the heritage. It considered that the provision of danger listing was the Convention « at its best », as a means to address difficult situations and mobilize international support, as noted by the Chairperson. The information regarding the state of conservation of the Syrian properties in the working document had been provided by the State Party from different sources, with limitations due to difficult access to the sites. In some cases, physical damage had occurred, whereas for other properties the danger was related to the disruption in the management system as a result of the conflict. With regard to the proposed mission, ICOMOS stressed that for this to be possible, the appropriate security conditions would have to be met.

La **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de Décision à la suite de cette discussion.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the adoption of the Draft Decision as shown on the screen.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se prononce pour l'option d'inscription site par site.

La Délégation du **Mexique** se prononce pour l'inscription des six sites.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that there was a consensus for having the six properties danger listed together. The Delegation was not opposed, in principle, to this solution, but wondered if drawing attention to all of these sites, some of which are less known to the public, might not in fact expose and turn them into targets of possible attacks.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Delegation of Russia for its constructive approach. It did not see how the inclusion of these six properties on the Danger List could have increased the risk to the sites and thus supported the Draft Decision as proposed.

The Delegation of **India** considered that it would have been better to adopt a site-specific approach. More information was required on the real conditions of each property before considering its inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger. The Committee was supposed to discuss technical matters, and was not a political body.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose de mettre en place un groupe de réflexion pour ce projet de décision.

La Délégation de la **France** salue les débats mais souscrit à la proposition originelle du projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stated that the purpose of the Committee in its deliberations was not to blame anyone, but to contribute to the protection of heritage. The images shown on the screen were very eloquent of the threats facing these sites. The Delegation considered that there was no need for a working group to further discuss the matter, which could be resolved « here and now ».

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** s'interroge comment il faudra procéder, sur le plan administratif et opérationnel, quand il faudra sortir ces sites de la Liste en péril.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** soutient l'inscription des six sites ensemble.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime son accord, d'autant plus que les références au fonds et à l'application de la Convention de 1954 concerneraient l'ensemble du patrimoine culturel du pays.

The **Chairperson** requested the members of the Committee to express their views with regard to the two options that is danger listing of the six properties together or individually. He noted that eight members of the Committee were in favour of the danger listing of the six properties together, whereas only three supported an case-by-case approach.

The Delegation of **India** requested a clarification on how one would proceed, eventually, to remove individual properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **South Africa** reiterated the point raised by the Delegation of India, stressing that the Committee was to consider heritage matters, not to make political statements. It supported the proposal to allow a small group to consider the information available more in detail and make a suggestion.

ICOMOS recalled that the information available was provided by the State Party and had been included in the working document presented to the Committee. Photographs revealing the extent of the damage were provided for all the properties, with the exception of Damascus, where according to the State Party repeated explosions had occurred. The training course ICOMOS had helped organizing was a distance course, given the limitations in conducting missions to the country.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** réitère sa demande sur le processus qu'il faudra suivre lors de l'enlèvement de ces sites de la Liste en péril.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that this should be a sovereign decision and it is not for UNESCO, but rather the State Party, to decide.

The Delegations of **India, Qatar and Algeria** stated that the amendment was diluting the Draft Decision .

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la position de la Russie et de l'Inde. La Délégation estime que ce n'est pas le rôle du Comité d'encourager un Etat souverain à ratifier une Convention. La Délégation revient sur le point 6 de la décision et demande s'il est du ressort de la *Convention* de 1972 de lancer cet appel à la coopération internationale pour lutter contre le trafic illicite de biens de Syrie.

Le **Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture** souligne que le verbe « encourager » n'est pas très fort, en comparaison avec d'autres mots employés dans le projet de décision. Le Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture ajoute qu'il est pertinent de parler de la Convention de 1954 dans cette situation de conflit, mais rappelle aux membres du Comité que la décision leur appartient.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recommended deleting references to neighboring countries, and reiterated that the decision to ratify or not ratify a protocol belongs solely to the State Party.

La Délégation du **Mexique**, soutenu par la délégation de l'**Allemagne**, estime que le Comité a l'obligation de prendre des mesures plus directes dans ce cas extrême. Il ne s'agit pas d'obliger l'Etat partie à ratifier le 2^e protocole de la Convention de 1954 mais le Comité peut l'inviter à le faire en vue de la meilleure conservation possible des biens du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Iraq** implored the Committee to appeal to the community to protect Heritage.

The **Secretariat** noted previous language relating to the decision on international cooperation in protecting properties in Mali at the 36th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** suggested removing the list of neighboring countries.

The **Chairperson** suggested a small Working Group to produce an appropriate text.

La Délégation du **Mexique** propose la formulation : « invite l'Etat partie à envisager la ratification ».

The Delegation of **India** suggested that this is an issue of mandate-creep. It is for the State Party to determine whether or not to ratify the Protocol.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** propose la formulation : « suggère l'Etat partie d'envisager la ratification ».

La Délégation du **Mali** considère qu'encourager l'Etat partie à signer la Convention de 1954 n'est pas une atteinte à sa souveraineté, ce serait positif pour tous les Etats parties puisque les biens qui se situent en Syrie concernent toute l'humanité.

La Délégation de la **France** propose la formulation : « lance un appel aux Etats voisins de la Syrie et à la communauté internationale pour coopérer à la lutte contre le trafic illicite des biens culturels provenant de la Syrie ».

La Délégation du **Mali** réitère sa proposition de mettre en place un groupe de travail.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that a Working Group was unnecessary; the wording should be acceptable to all parties now. The Delegation suggested that the Draft Decision was ready for adoption.

The Delegation of **India** supported the recommendation of the Russian Federation.

Le **Président du Comité** décide de revoir le projet de décision paragraphe par paragraphe.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de Décision.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rappelle que sa remarque ne portait pas sur la rédaction mais sur une question de principe, à savoir la souveraineté de l'Etat partie. La Délégation demande de biffer le paragraphe 11 et précise que l'Etat partie a déjà signé le 1^{er} protocole de la Convention de 1954 et qu'il lui appartient de signer le 2^e.

Le **Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture** souligne que dans cette situation de conflit militaire, il est pertinent d'encourager l'Etat partie à ratifier le 2^e protocole de la Convention de 1954 et qu'il ne s'agit en aucun cas d'une obligation. Le Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture rappelle également que l'UNESCO a pour tâche de diffuser les normes internationales.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne que s'il s'agit d'une situation de conflit militaire, il relève de la Convention de 1954 que l'Etat partie a déjà signé.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite inviter l'Etat partie à ratifier le 2^e protocole de Convention de 1954, précisant que ce protocole a permis la prise en compte d'une composante patrimoine dans le cadre du règlement du conflit au Mali.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** reiterated the recommendation to adopt mild wording.

La Délégation de la **France**, soutenu par la délégation du **Qatar**, précise que si le Comité doit retenir ce paragraphe, elle a une préférence pour le terme « invite ».

The **Chairperson** noted that it was appropriate in these circumstances to recall the 1954 Convention.

The Delegation of **India** recommended leaving the text as “suggests”, since it is not possible to invite a State party to a Convention not administered by the Committee.

The **Representative of the Director-General** suggested a different formulation such as “the creation of a special fund to support the cultural heritage of Syria”.

The Delegation of **India** noted that this decision must be confined to States Parties of the Convention, and also suggested that the Secretariat should not modify the Draft.

La Délégation du **Mali** précise qu'il conviendrait de préciser que les biens du patrimoine mondial concernés par le trafic illicite sont des biens culturels.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose une formulation plus nuancée pour le paragraphe 12, concernant la création d'un fonds destiné à la préservation des biens du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that despite the factions in the conflict, there is a state party to the Convention, and that it is that state party that we are to assist. A practical approach is required.

La Délégation du **Mexique**, soutenu par la **Colombie**, propose d'ajouter au projet de décision un thème qui lui semble fondamental: la protection, précédant la réhabilitation et la restauration.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the original text and the comments of India and the Russian Federation.

The Delegations of **Qatar, Estonia, Russian Federation** supported the wording proposed by France and supported by Germany.

The Delegation of **India** noted that these issues are arising as a result of mission-creep and extending the acceptable boundaries of the Committee's mandate.

Le projet de décision **37 COM 7B.57** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) – 37 COM 7B.58

Le **Secrétariat** présente les nouvelles informations relatives à l'état de conservation du bien. L'Etat partie a envoyé un rapport le 28 avril 2013, décrivant les difficultés auxquelles il est confronté et leur impact sur le patrimoine mais souligne que des mesures législatives ont été prises au niveau national. Le rapport annonce également la formation d'un groupe de travail entre la municipalité de Sana'a et l'organisation des villes historiques en vue d'identifier et de documenter les constructions illégales ainsi que de documenter les bâtiments historiques qui ayant besoin de restauration urgente. Enfin, l'Etat partie indique son besoin pressant d'aide internationale, financière et technique.

ICOMOS noted that a mission was impossible these last years due to security conditions. The approval of the law for the protection of cultural heritage is a positive step, and welcomed the measure.

The Delegation of **Iraq** invited the State Party to provide an overview of the situation.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** announced that it had proposed an amendment that will be discussed later.

The Delegation of **Yemen** noted the unstable security situation and the impact on cultural sites in Yemen. Despite these conditions, the Yemeni Government has undertaken measures to protect these properties. A joint task force has been formed, and has begun developing a strategic plan to tackle the situation. The Delegation invited the WHC to provide its technical expertise and support in developing the plan.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de Décision.

Le Projet de Décision **37 COM 7B.58** est adopté tel qu'amendé

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ARAB REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193) – 37 COM 7B. 45

Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192bis) – 37 COM 7B. 47

Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87) – 37 COM 7B. 48

Petra (Jordan) (C 326) – 37 COM 7B. 50

Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093) – 37 COM 7B. 51

Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299) – 37 COM 7B. 52

Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190) – 37 COM 7B. 53

Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287) – 37 COM 7B. 54

Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750) – 37 COM 7B. 55

Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073) – 37 COM 7B. 56

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted.

The Chairperson gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Sudan**.

The Delegation of **Sudan** clarified that it remains committed to the protection of World Heritage sites. It noted the recent peace agreement and the Transitional Constitution in Sudan. The Government also provided authority over archeological sites to the federal states. The Delegate noted 5 areas of concern: 1. Environmental degradation; 2. Encroaching urbanization; 3. An asphalt road; 4. The presence of a high tension electrical wire; and, 5. the construction of a hotel. The Delegation addressed these in turn and noted that the State Party welcomes collaboration on how to develop sustainably while maintaining adequate protection of WH sites, such that the needs of the citizens are considered in tandem with the needs of protecting the sites.

Omnibus Decision - 37 COM 7B.103

The **Secretariat** presented the new concept of the Omnibus Decision which aims at phasing out properties that are no longer under threats. The Secretariat indicated that the Committee is invited to take note of the measures taken by the States Parties concerned to address its previous requests to mitigate the threats on the Outstanding Universal Value of the following World Heritage properties:

- Old Town of Lijiang (China)
- Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)
- San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia)
- Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic)
- Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary)

- Taj Mahal (India)
- Agra Fort (India)
- Fatehpur Sikri (India)
- Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India)
- Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia)
- Monte San Giorgio (Italy / Switzerland)
- Vilnius Historic centre (Lithuania)
- Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia)
- Historic centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico)
- Camino real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico)
- Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru)
- City of Cuzco (Peru)
- Churches of Moldavia (Romania)
- Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation)
- Island of Gorée (Senegal)
- Works of Antoni Gaudi (Spain)

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.103** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed this approach to reduce the workload of the Committee.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 21 June 2013

EIGHTH MEETING

9 a.m. –12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(*continuation*)

Before starting the morning session, the **Chairperson** indicated that he understood there were some misunderstanding regarding the composition of the drafting Group on Draft Decision 7B 100 concerning Panama Viejo. He reminded that this group has been set up with the aim to help in the drafting of a decision that would be acceptable to everyone, in a spirit of consensus and cooperation.

The Chairperson indicated that he recalled this morning in the Bureau meeting that this drafting group is composed of Committee Members that may wish to attend. Other States parties can attend the drafting Group as Observers.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8A TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF 15 APRIL 2013, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/8A

Decision: **37 COM 8A**

The **Secretariat** introduced briefly the Document 8A which presents the Tentative Lists of all States Parties submitted in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* as of 15 April 2013.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8A** was adopted.

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/8B

WHC-13/37.COM/8B.Add

WHC-13/37.COM/8B.Add.2

WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B1

WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B1.Add

WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B2

Decisions: 37 COM 8B.1 to 8B.7

The **Chairperson** opened item 8B regarding nominations to the World Heritage List, and provided guidance on the various documents pertaining to this item, indicating that all factual errors letters had been reviewed, and noting that only those that were considered as dealing with ascertained factual errors had been retained.

FACTUAL ERROR LETTERS

The **Chairperson** indicated that Document **INF.8B4** presents Factual Errors identified by States Parties in the Advisory Body evaluations. In accordance with paragraph 150 of the Operational Guidelines, he stated that he had carefully reviewed all letters received and together with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat retained only those letters, or those parts of it, dealing with factual errors. He informed that these Factual Errors were distributed to Members of the Committee in the form of this information document in the two working languages. The Chairperson mentioned that they will be announced by the Secretariat before the presentation of the concerned nomination and answered by the relevant Advisory Body after the presentation.

The Secretariat indicated that that the full versions of all these letters had been uploaded on the same web page related to the nominations and read out the list of factual errors received.

Factual Errors Letters received:

- Canada, Pimachiowin Aki
- Canada, Red Bay Basque Whaling Station
- China, Xinjiang Tianshan
- Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong
- Germany, Water features and Hercules within the Bergpark Wilhelmshöhe
- India, Great Himalayan National Park
- India, Hill Forts of Rajasthan
- Iran (Islamic Republic of), Cultural Landscape of Maymand
- Iran (Islamic Republic of), Golestan Palace
- Japan, Fujisan
- Poland, Wieliczka and Bochnia Royal Salt Mines
- Portugal, University of Coimbra – Alta and Sofia
- Russian Federation, Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex
- Australia, Tasmanian Wilderness

CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the item on proposed name changes to World Heritage properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Secretariat** presented the following 7 proposals:

- Old Havana and its Fortification, Cuba
- Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne, Ireland
- Wooden Churches of Southern Little Poland, Poland
- Cracow's Historic Centre, Poland
- Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs, South Africa
- Convent of St Gall, Switzerland
- Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Draft Decisions **36 COM 8B.1 to 8B.7** were adopted.

NOMINATIONS WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE STATE PARTY

The **Chairperson** came to the matter regarding withdrawals of nominations at the request of the State Party and invited the Secretariat to read the list of such withdrawals.

The **Secretariat** stated that a total of **6 nominations** were withdrawn before the commencement of the session.

Croatia – Sacral Complex on the remains of the Roman Forum in Zadar

Japan - Kamakura, Home of the Samurai

Netherlands – Teylers, Haarlem

Russian Federation – Sviyazhsk Historical, Architectural, Natural and Landscape complex

Turkey - Historic city of Alanya

Viet Nam – Cat Tien National Park

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

The **Chairperson** recalled two essential procedures concerning nominations to be examined.

He indicated that firstly, the Committee is requested to examine the recommendations and Draft Decisions presented in the relevant Documents, and, in accordance with paragraph 153 of the Operational Guidelines, take its Decisions following four categories:

- The Committee may decide to **inscribe** a property on the World Heritage List (paragraph 154 of the *Operational Guidelines*);
- The Committee may decide that a property should **not be inscribed** on the World Heritage List (paragraph 158 of the *Operational Guidelines*);
- The Committee may decide to **refer** back a nomination to the State Party for additional information (paragraph 159 of the *Operational Guidelines*);
- The Committee may decide to **defer** a nomination for more-in-depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision by the State Party (paragraph 160 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The Chairperson underlined in particular that, nominations which the Committee decides to **refer back** to the State Party for additional information may be resubmitted to the following Committee session for examination. He indicated that, for a referred nomination there is no new nomination file to be prepared and there is no evaluation mission of the relevant Advisory Body foreseen to the property.

The Chairperson mentioned that if the Committee decide to **defer** a nomination: an in depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision of the nomination file by the State Party is needed. Therefore a new nomination should be submitted by 1 February, which will be re-evaluated by the relevant Advisory Body during the full year and a half evaluation, cycle according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168 of the Operational Guidelines.

Secondly, on the specific issue of **submission of additional information** on nominations, the Chairperson recalled point **H** of paragraph **148** as well as the nomination timetable of paragraph **168** of the Operational Guidelines, which establishes the deadline for the submission of additional information on nominations and says:

*“The evaluations and presentations of the Advisory Bodies should not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after **28 February** in the year in which the nomination is considered.”*

The Chairperson then proceeded with the examination of Nominations indicating that he will begin with the natural nominations, followed by mixed and then cultural, nominations. He added that the Advisory bodies will proceed with a brief presentation of their Evaluation Process before the examination of nominations.

IUCN presented with a short explanation on how IUCN carried out evaluations of nominations, relying on a network of IUCN experts and volunteers throughout the world. It presented the team involved in dealing with World Heritage properties, along with an update on the work it had done in the past year regarding World Heritage Committee decisions made in previous years. It emphasized the introduction of additional consultation processes with indigenous and community groups related to World Heritage matters, noting the improved integration of cultural heritage matters when dealing with natural heritage considerations. IUCN closed by announcing various global events concerning natural heritage, and invited Committee members to participate in them. It also announced an IUCN side event for later during the Committee meeting.

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1. AFRICA

A.1.1. New Nominations

Property	Namib Sand Sea
Id. N°	1430
State Party	Namibia

IUCN presented its evaluation of the nomination. It explained that the property was characterized by sand dunes, clear air and exceptional aesthetic qualities, and that it included the world's most extensive dune systems, with unique and unusual arrays of endemic species and intact desert ecosystems.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to make comments.

The Delegations of **Colombia, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Malaysia, Mali, Qatar, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa and Switzerland** took the floor to express their support for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List under the four natural criteria and congratulated Namibia for the quality of the nomination dossier, which relates to an underrepresented type of heritage and an underrepresented country:. In particular, several speakers congratulated IUCN for its evaluation, and highlighted the success of the upstream process and the support provided by the African World Heritage Fund. They also highlighted that this nomination demonstrates the expertise which exists in the region. Speakers further highlighted the efforts deployed by the State Party in protecting the flora and fauna of the area, putting in place a strong management planning and involving local communities. The extinction of a mining license in this area was also mentioned.

The Draft Decision **37COM 8B.8** was adopted.

The State Party of **Namibia** expressed its happiness at the inscription of the property, noting that the work had been a collective achievement, noting the support from the German Heritage Foundation and the German Commission for UNESCO. It trusted that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN benefitted from the process as much as Namibia had in carrying out the upstream work. It also thanked the African World Heritage Fund, and expressed its gratitude to all who were involved in making this happen. A few words were expressed in a native language of Namibia.

A.1.2. Extensions of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Lewa Wildlife Conservancy and Ngare Ndare Forest Reserve [extension of “Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest”, (vii)(ix), 1997]
Id. N°	800 Bis
State Party	Kenya

IUCN presented its evaluation of this request for an extension of this property, indicating that the extension would incorporate lower lying foothills, and semi-arid grasslands and savanna for a more intact property.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed support for the extension, but asked the State Party if the corridor for the elephant movement would be eventually included in the property.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party of Kenya, explaining that a serial approach could be useful in enhancing protection, further noted that a variety of governance model can also be considered under the World Heritage inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle que le Kenya est un bon leader dans le domaine du patrimoine. Elle félicite l’Etat partie d’avoir établi, avec beaucoup d’intelligence, un continuum entre les parties du site.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated the State Party of Kenya for its extension proposal, noting that it had been doing a very good job at managing this property already, and supported the extension.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** responded to the question from the Delegation of **Japan** concerning the elephant corridor. It recognized the need to include this corridor in a future extension, but explained that it would be premature at the current stage as the consultations with the stakeholders were still going on.

La Délégation permanente de l'**Algérie** félicite le Kenya pour la proposition d'inscription, ainsi que l'UICN pour son travail.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated Kenya for its further improvement of the management of Mount Kenya National Park.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its congratulations to Kenya and its support for the extension proposal.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.9** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the World Heritage Committee for its decision, and also thanked the Government of Cambodia for having hosted the meeting. It also thanked IUCN. It referred to the original 1997 inscription, and how the local people considered the property as a sacred site, adding that it was among the most impressive landscape in Africa. The Delegation thanked all the stakeholders who had agreed to work as a team in preparing this extension.

A.2. ASIA / PACIFIC

A.2.1. New Nominations

Property	Xinjiang Tianshan
Id. N°	1414
State Party	China

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual errors letter was received by the WHC.

IUCN informed that it is a serial site with 4 components, which meets criteria (vii) and (ix), which contains a scenically beautiful series of areas.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated China for this exceptional and unique site, as well as it congratulated IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation hoped that in the future this nomination could be complemented by parts of the mountain chain in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated China and supported the Russian proposal that the neighbouring countries could take similar steps concerning this site.

The Delegation of **India** complimented the Chinese authorities and noted that, in the present climate change situation; this nomination could help to protect the site.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** et la délégation de la **France** félicitent l'Etat partie et soutiennent l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Serbia** also congratulated China, noted that this was a good site with different habitats, and underlined the importance of having a qualified management system and capacities.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated China for this important nomination.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that the nomination was very well prepared and congratulated the authorities for the timely reaction to the suggestion of boundary modification made by the Advisory Body.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère de très bonne qualité le dossier proposé par la Chine et considère cette nomination de bonne augure pour développer la coopération dans cette région.

The Delegation of **Thailand** commended China for its great efforts on the serial property and the large buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Qatar** commended China for the outstanding site and views and hoped all the success for the management and conservation of this site for generations to come.

La délégation du **Sénégal** partage les déclarations précédentes et félicite la Chine pour la qualité du dossier soumis.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** and the Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** also congratulated China. The Delegation of the United Arab Emirates called the neighbouring State Parties to also inscribe the correspondent part of this site on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Kirghizstan** congratulated China and informed that since 2005 Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan are working on the preparation of a transboundary nomination. It confirmed that Kirghizstan would be cooperating with China in the joint management of their sites located in Western Tianshan.

Le **Mali** félicite la Chine pour sa proposition d'inscription et fait remarquer que les déserts sont donc de plus en plus représentés sur la Liste.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated China for the nomination of this enormous site.

The Observer Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated and thanked IUCN for the detailed report which underlines the complexity of this mountain system. It noted that since 2005 this site was in the Tentative List for Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan, and that these three State Parties will submit a nomination to the World Heritage Centre later this year. It asked to the Secretariat why China was not recommended to invite the other State Parties for this nomination, and why the above mentioned three State Parties were not informed that China was working on this nomination. It requested that the nomination for Western Tianshan will be considered and treated as an independent nomination.

The Decision **37 COM 8B.10** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated China and gave the floor to the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **China** extended its sincere thanks to the Members of the Committee. It reported on the measures applied for the conservation of the site, including national and international experts involved in the process. It also noted that local communities had been actively involved in the preparation of the file. It emphasized that efforts would continue in order to safeguard the site for future generations. It underlined that the Delegation would be interested in collaborating with neighboring countries, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to evaluate the possibility of a transboundary nomination.

Property	Great Himalayan National Park
Id. N°	1406
State Party	India

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual errors letter was received by the WHC.

IUCN informed that this nomination concerned the Western part of the Himalayan Mountains, including 2 separate components, with a buffer zone.

La délégation de **Suisse** souligne que si le bien remplit le critère de bonne gestion de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, d'autres aspects comme l'intégrité du bien et sa délimitation doivent être précisés. Pour donner le temps à l'Etat partie d'améliorer son dossier la Suisse recommande de différer.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** noted the work done by Indian authorities to nominate a large part of the mountain system. It considered that there were some contradiction in the analysis of this nomination and considered that the site meets all the requirements to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

IUCN explained that the discussion about this nomination was not so much about the values, but about the integrity of the proposed site.

The Delegation of **Serbia** noted that this site was a part of a larger mountain system. It asked for clarification from the State Party on how to manage this large site, in order to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value and the biodiversity.

The Delegation of **Qatar** asked the same question as Serbia and requested to give the floor to the concerned State Party to make comments on the management system for the site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** added the question whether the issues with the local community had already been solved.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** informed about an amendment submitted by its Delegation.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered the nomination as interesting and reminded the Members of the Committee that there are three pillars for the Outstanding

Universal Value. It supported Switzerland's intervention. It noted that the site does not match the requirements now, but could match them with some more efforts. It also noted that the boundaries are not the correct ones, as IUCN said in its report. Therefore, it considered that integrity needs to be reviewed before qualifying for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **South Africa** requested some clarification from IUCN, concerning the consideration of the site as a serial nomination in the technical evaluation, since the State Party did not submit the proposal as serial site. It asked whether the establishment of the Outstanding Universal Value follows a different procedure when it is a serial site. It considered that deferral is not justified, since as a single site the proposal meets criterion (x)

IUCN noted that the nomination was officially registered as serial site, but the evaluation made it clear that the State Party does not consider it as serial.

La Délégation de la **France** souscrit à la position suisse et allemande.

The Delegation of **Estonia** considered that there is a great potential for the nomination, but that it requires more work. Deferral is justified and it can be a useful tool for the State Party to work on this nomination.

The Delegation of **Colombia** joined France, Switzerland and Germany on their comments, but also asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the concerned State Party for clarifications.

The Delegation of **India** thanked IUCN and the Members of the Committee for their comments and analysis. It noted that in relation to the evaluation made by IUCN, the process had been remarkably inclusive, including many discussions. It underlined that India is an inclusive democracy and that local issues had been addressed, including economical support to the families. The Outstanding Universal Value is demonstrated for the site, and the key question is just a small part that IUCN would like to have included in the proposal. It informed that India is working on that. It added that a participatory Management Plan has been formulated and that there are six protected areas around the site, which work as a buffer zone. Therefore, there is a comprehensive management system and strong policy to maintain the OUV in the future. Concerning the rights of local communities, it reminded that no local communities were living inside the boundaries, but they used the area for grazing. It expressed that all rights are assured and local development plans are into force.

The **Rapporteur** informed that amendments were received from the Russian Federation and read them out. Main change referred to the proposal for referral instead of deferral, in paragraph 2.

The Delegation of **Germany** showed concerns about the property and requested the Russian Federation for some clarifications on the changes proposed to the Draft Decision. It considered important to keep the deleted part from the original Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** defined the site as a true diamond, with the richest biodiversity ecosystems in the Himalayan chain, adding that it fully corresponds to criterion (x). The Delegation reported that India is working on the

connexion of the 2 parts of the site and that it had no doubt that the State Party will be able to submit all the needed information in a short time. Therefore, it considered the nomination for referral. Concerning the erased part of paragraph 2D, the Delegation informed that India cooperates already very closely with ICIMOD (International Centre for integrated Mountain Development), so there is no need to reflect this cooperation in the decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** reaffirmed that if good cooperation existed, there was no reason to erase that part of the original Draft Decision. It recommended to leave the paragraph 2D as it was in the original Draft Decision before amendment.

The Delegation of **Iraq** noted that there is an integrated management plan, and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained that it suggested to erase the last part of paragraph 2D because the State Party was already working on extensions.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** reconnaît que le site a de nombreux atouts et ajoute que l'Himalaya revêt une importance toute particulière dans la mentalité collective. Il concède que l'IUCN a soulevé des éléments pertinents et appuie notamment le point important sur le développement modulaire pour renforcer la configuration du bien. Le Sénégal loue l'expertise indienne en termes de gestion de patrimoine et demande à l'Etat partie si un renvoi lui donnerait suffisamment de temps pour soumettre un dossier irréprochable.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the proposal of Senegal to ask the State Party for further explanations.

La délégation de **Suisse** estime qu'il reste beaucoup de travail à faire. Référer la décision peut être une possibilité surtout en ce qui concerne le point D. La Suisse s'étonne par ailleurs de la volonté de biffer la recommandation de coopération entre l'Etat partie, l'IUCN et l'ICIMOD. Elle souligne par ailleurs l'importance de l'approche en série qui mériterait d'être soulignée dans la dernière partie du paragraphe.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande le point de vue de l'IUCN sur la proposition de la délégation Russe et son incidence sur les évaluations présentées.

IUCN noted that it retains its recommendation for the reasons mentioned before. It considered that there is potential to meet criterion (x), including the surrounding areas, but that the nomination was premature. It mentioned that if the Committee adopted the decision for referral, IUCN would be happy to work with the State Party on this nomination.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient les remarques de l'Allemagne et la Suisse, afin de renforcer la coopération entre l'Etat partie et l'IUCN.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that a number of things had been made and that the State Party was therefore capable to achieve the goals. Concerning paragraph 2D, it wanted to support Russian amendment for removing the first part.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that generally speaking it supported the amendment of the Delegation of the Russian Federation, but that concerning paragraph 2D it support Germany, France and Switzerland.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** mentioned that in the nomination dossier there is the list of scientific collaborators and assistants. Therefore it did not consider that any specification should be listed in the decision.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported the amendment submitted by Russia. It supported the proposal for referral and urged the State Party to submit an integrated report for the forthcoming year, to have an in-depth analysis of the situation.

IUCN highlighted that there was a positive process of discussions between the State Party and IUCN, and mentioned the strong cooperation with India. Therefore it considered not necessary to include in the Draft Decision the list of ICIMOD and IUCN. Concerning the second erased part of the amendment on paragraph 2D, it considered that it was a question on use of language.

The Delegation of **Thailand** considered that, after listening to India, it supported the nomination for referral. It also considered that the Himalayan mountain is a very important area for its country and that it should be included on the World Heritage List as soon as possible.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** noted that the Himalayan chain is a very important site and that the report was comprehensive. It added that India is able to complete the missing points, so it supported the proposal from Russian Federation.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked IUCN for the explanation and accepted the erased first part of the paragraph 2D, due to the already existing good cooperation. Concerning the second deletion of the paragraph it reaffirmed that it is important to keep it.

The Delegation of **India** reconfirmed that there is good cooperation with ICIMOD and that the work requested to be done in the second part of the paragraph 2D is already done. Therefore it did not consider it as a major issue to be discussed.

The **Rapporteur** noted that there was consensus for the deletion of the first part of paragraph 2D, as suggested by Russia. Concerning the second part of the same paragraph, the Rapporteur suggested adding “contemplate potential serial nominations and/or extensions”.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted a discrepancy on the added part. It considered that if India had submitted a single site, it should not be treated as a serial site, because it completely modified the proposal.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** reconnaît l’ouverture de l’Inde aux discussions régionales et propose de conserver la proposition du Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Thailand** supported the deletion proposed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that there was a problem with the translation and English version was stronger than French, which was the original language for the additional part.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** underlined that there were more problems with the two language versions, since the word “proposal” is missing in the English version. It mentioned that it would agree with the added part by the Rapporteur once it is included as “eventual proposals of serial nominations/extensions”.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** suggested changing the word “eventual” by “possible”.

The Delegation of **Germany** mentioned that the importance of the last sentence of the paragraph 2D was the context, not the inclusion of potential serial nominations, since it is already addressed in the part 2E of the paragraph.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked the Chairperson to give the floor to India for clarifications.

The Delegation of **India** reminded the Members of the Committee that the recommendation from IUCN was to have a management system for all the property, not a serial nomination. It noted that India was trying to insert all the sites into one unit, in order to avoid a serial site.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.11** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 21 June 2013

NINETH MEETING

2.30 pm. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES (*continuation*)

A.2. ASIA / PACIFIC

A.2.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary
Id. N°	1403
State Party	Philippines

IUCN presented the information on the nomination to the Committee. IUCN considered that the nominated property did not met the conditions of integrity, protection and management requirements as outlined in the *Operational Guidelines* given concerns regarding boundaries and unresolved land claims by indigenous peoples, which required further consideration.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted that the site had a strict protection regime and a management plan. It stated that the concerns raised by the Advisory Bodies have been already addressed by the State Party and proposed some amendments to allow for the inscription on the property on the List.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked for a clarification by the State Party on the buffer zone and on the measures to protect the flora and the fauna within the property including the habitat of eagles.

The Delegation of **Thailand** went along with Malaysia and Japan requesting to recognize the achievements of Philippines and wished to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stated that, after having listened to the very positive presentation by IUCN, the deferral recommendation seemed surprising and that the information provided by the State Party on the site was not taken into account. Therefore, it supported the Malaysian text.

The Delegation of **Serbia** acknowledged the memorandum of agreement of the State Party which will contribute to the management of the property in the future. It requested a statement by the State Party on the management of nesting places for eagles.

The Delegation of **India** underlined that local communities have entered into agreement with the government and that Philippines' law addressed already this issue, and asked the State Party to confirm.

La Délégation du **Mali** note qu'il s'agit d'un site exceptionnel comprenant une forêt, 957 espèces et une forte concentration d'eau. Elle note également les efforts de l'Etat Partie avec un plan de gestion pratique, une participation locale et un cadre juridique opérationnel. Elle soutient donc le texte de la Malaisie et salue l'UICN dans son accompagnement de l'Etat partie.

La délégation d'**Algérie**, comme l'Iraq, note le caractère positif de l'évaluation de l'UICN et suggère que l'Etat partie pourrait donner plus d'informations.

La délégation de la **Suisse** se félicite du mémorandum d'entente avec les communautés locales mais relève que le périmètre proposé ne permet pas une protection de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Iraq** underlined that this is an important site in terms of fauna and flora and that the commission addressed the issue of inhabitants and therefore it recommended to give more time to the State Party for allowing it to provide more information.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** noted the importance of the remarkable biodiversity. It also noted the efforts of the State Party in cooperating with the Advisory Body and the local community. It declared that the remaining concerns could be taken on board by the State Party but that they should not stop the inscription. Therefore it supported the Malaysian text.

The Observer Delegation of **Philippines** confirmed the Memorandum of agreement signed with the indigenous people and all the stakeholders. It stated to have addressed the issue of the fragmentation of the property by including the eagles' nests as part of the buffer zone and called for an inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Germany** recognised the importance of the site for its biodiversity; however it underlined the needs of a serious evaluation, in particular on the integrity issue that a deferral could permit.

IUCN explained that the rationale of the deferral is the need to expand the buffer zone and overlapping land claims, so that a field mission to evaluate properly is required.

La délégation de la **France** note les efforts mais suggère que l'on accorde plus de temps pour que l'Etat partie apporte les corrections nécessaires. Elle soutient donc les commentaires de l'Allemagne et de la Suisse.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

IUCN made a comment on the amendments proposed noting that some elements are not in the current nomination file and asked the Secretariat to confirm it.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that, following the procedure, it is not possible to add a part that is not in the information received by 28 February 2013 without proper evaluation.

The Delegation of **Germany** confirmed to be for a deferral.

La délégation du **Sénégal** est prête à soutenir la proposition d'inscription mais les échanges précédents ont tout changé. Elle reconnaît désormais combien le problème des cartes est critique et on ne peut inscrire un site dont les limites ne sont pas définies.

The Delegation of **Estonia** declared to support the referral.

La Délégation de la **France** salue les efforts de l'Etat partie. Si toutes les conditions ne sont pas encore réunies, un renvoi permettrait de les réunir.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** explique les raisons pour lesquelles on ne peut se décider aujourd'hui sont tant logiques que procédurales. Il reste encore beaucoup à faire, il convient donc de différer.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the State Party had already dealt with the issue by signing the agreement with the local communities and therefore, irrespective of the fact that the information came later, it should not be a reason for excluding it for the consideration by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** commended the State Party for the efforts made after the mission of IUCN and withdrew the amendment from inscription to referral as proposed by Germany.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated Philippines and subscribed to the proposal to give the State Party more time to work on the nomination file.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** agreed for a referral.

The Delegation of **Qatar** agreed for a referral as the nomination presented already a number of criteria but required more time to finish up. Therefore it supported Germany and Malaysia.

The Delegation of **India** raised a question for IUCN whether it would be able to assess very quickly the two issues of indigenous people and boundaries in order to give the possibility to the State Party to come back next year with a new nomination.

IUCN recalled to have had already good opportunity to discuss the two points and stated to need more time to speak with all the associations involved.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to go back to the original Draft Decision of the Secretariat instead of going point by point and slightly modify the wording in order to change it from deferral to referral.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose de féliciter l'Etat partie pour son mémorandum d'entente avec les populations autochtones permettant d'obtenir leur coopération en matière de gestion et de protection du site.

La Délégation de la **France** demande si le fait de ne pas soumettre le mémorandum d'entente ne relève pas d'une question d'ordre juridique interne.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** noted some ambiguity in the amendments and underlined the need for the State Party to provide the new information in a more structured way, taking into account the concerns expressed by IUCN.

The **Secretariat** recalled that the information was received informally and, in any case, after the deadline.

The Delegation of **India** wanted to keep the sentence commending the efforts made by the State Party.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenu par les délégations de **l'Allemagne et de la France** demande à l'Etat partie de soumettre par écrit les informations au Centre du patrimoine mondial dans les plus courts délais.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.12** was adopted as amended.

A.2.2. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Tajik National Park (Mountains of the Pamirs)
Id. N°	1252 Rev
State Party	Tajikistan

IUCN presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegations of **Estonia, Japan, Germany, the United Arab Emirates, the Russian Federation, Algeria, Cambodia and France** appreciated the huge work done by the State Party after the deferral process and congratulated the State Party for this nomination.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.14** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated **Tajikistan** on behalf of the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Tajikistan** thanked the Committee for the international recognition of this unique landscape, as well as its fauna and flora. It stated that tourism will improve life standards of the local communities. It underlined that the park is more than 20% of the entire country surface and finally reassured the

Committee that Tajikistan will make all the necessary efforts to conserve this exceptional landscape together with UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre.

A.3. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

A.3.1. New Nominations

Property	Mount Etna
Id. N°	1427
State Party	Italy

IUCN presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegations of **France, Japan, France, Germany, Mexico, Colombia, Serbia, Qatar, Cambodia, the United Arab Emirates, South Africa, Algeria, Mali, Switzerland**, supported the inscription including paragraph 9 regarding thematic studies on volcanoes and it congratulated Italy for a successful nomination.

IUCN indicated that the large framework for geological heritage needed indeed to be updated.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.15** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Italy on behalf of the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** declared being touched by the Committee's decision and thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the cooperation, precious suggestions and evaluation. It warmly thanked the Cambodian authorities for their hospitality and organisation of the session. Mr Di Bella from the Ministry of Environment recalled that the nomination file was on-going since 1997 and thanked the Committee for its decision.

A.4. LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

A.4.1. New Nominations

Property	El Pinacate and Gran Desierto de Altar Biosphere Reserve
Id. N°	1410
State Party	Mexico

IUCN presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegations of **Colombia**, the **United Arab Emirates**, **Germany**, the **Russian Federation** **France**, **Malaysia**, **Cambodia**, **Algeria**, **Qatar**, and **Mali** congratulated the State Party for the exceptional nomination and supported the inscription.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.16** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Mexico on behalf of the Committee for the inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie le Cambodge pour son hospitalité ; le CPM pour le soutien tout au long du processus et l'UICN pour l'excellent travail, qui a amené à la recommandation d'inscrire la réserve de biosphère ; qui fête ses 20 ans.

The **Chairperson indicated** that, prior to moving to the consideration of nominations of Mixed Properties, he received a request from India and Poland/Ukraine to have their cultural nominations discussed today. It was agreed by consent.

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

C.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.2. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Hill Forts of Rajasthan
Id. N°	247 Rev
State Party	India

The **Secretariat** indicated a factual error as contained in the document WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B.4.

ICOMOS presented the nomination for the Hill Forts of Rajasthan (India), a serial nomination of 6 sites.

The Delegation of **Qatar** recommended amendments to the Draft Decision. ICOMOS stated that it preferred Amber Fort to be included; however, the Fort is private property and the government is unable to evict the owners. Indian legislation prevents such expulsion. The Delegation therefore recommended the Decision be amended accordingly.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked for clarification and noted that it is Jaigarh Fort that is privately owned.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the nomination dossier for inscription and commended the efforts made after the referral back last year.

The Delegation of **Germany** also congratulated India for the beautiful nomination, and supported the comments of **Qatar and Russia**.

The Delegations of **Colombia, the United Arab Emirates, Ethiopia, France, Algeria, Cambodia, Mali, Serbia and Switzerland** congratulated India on the nomination and supported the listing of the property. ICOMOS also received congratulations for the quality of its work.

The Delegations of **Malaysia, Iraq, Russia and South Africa** congratulated India; supported the listing and also the comments of Qatar regarding removing Jaigarh Fort.

ICOMOS offered a correction: the recommendation was not to expel the private owners from the property, but rather to recommend that the State Party consider extending the boundaries in the future if and when the owner might be amenable. ICOMOS welcomed the cooperation with the State Party on this dossier.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de décision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.31** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated India on behalf of the Committee.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the community, including the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS and WHC for their support and work.

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations

Property	Wooden Tserkvas of the Carpathian Region in Poland and Ukraine
Id. N°	1424
State Party	Poland / Ukraine

ICOMOS presented the serial nomination, which included 16 selected components: 8 in Poland and 8 in Ukraine.

The Delegations of **Estonia, France, Germany, Malaysia, Algeria, Serbia, the Russian Federation, Qatar** congratulated Poland and Ukraine for preparing in cooperation the submitted nomination and supported the inscription of the sites on the World Heritage List.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.37** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Poland and Ukraine on behalf of the Committee for the inscription of the property.

Poland and **Ukraine** expressed special gratitude to the World Heritage Committee and thanked the community for their support.

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis) (*Continuation*)

The **Chairperson** noted that the Drafting Group set up regarding the drafting of Decision **37 COM 7B.100** concerning the state of conservation of the Archeological site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá had completed its work and that a Draft Decision was to be presented by the Chairperson of the Drafting group. It was proposed to adopt the Draft Decision by consensus.

La Délégation du **Cambodge**, en sa fonction de Président du Groupe de rédaction, informe le Comité que le groupe de rédaction sur la décision **37 COM 7B.100** a réussi, aux termes de 3 sessions, à élaborer un texte de consensus soumis pour

adoption sans débat. La Délégation remercie les membres du groupe de rédaction pour leur participation active, et l'excellent esprit de coopération et d'ouverture.

The **Rapporteur** introduced the Draft Decision as proposed by the drafting group.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.100** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Panama** thanked the Committee and the drafting group in particular for their efforts, and noted the lesson learned regarding ongoing communication. The Ambassador noted that the State Party intends to comply with the recommendations of the Committee.

B. MIXED PROPERTIES

B.1. AFRICA

B.1.1. New Nominations

Property	Bijagós Archipelago – Motom Moranghajogo
Id. N°	1431
State Party	Guinea Bissau

ICOMOS presented the property for nomination and recommended that the examination of the nomination be deferred on the basis of cultural criteria in order for the State Party to deepen the comparative analysis to ascertain whether the property might be considered to have the potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value for cultural criteria.

IUCN found that the property does not currently meet the integrity or protection management requirements, and recommends the deferral of the examination of the nomination. Additional efforts might result in IUCN's future support of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note que les îles Bijagós sont un écosystème complémentaire à celui du Sénégal avec des migrateurs fréquentant les espaces. La Délégation du Sénégal a la conviction que ce bien remplit au moins les critères liés à la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE), citant le rapport de l'ICOMOS, qui montre l'association des îles Bijagós et les paysages, dont certains sont d'une conservation exceptionnelle, et soulignant que pour les valeurs naturelles le potentiel est existant. Cependant, il existe des problèmes de gouvernance, de pilotage et d'administration du dossier, qui doivent être réglés. La Délégation du Sénégal demande au Comité de traiter ce dossier avec diligence compte-tenu des risques pour la VUE, et demande que l'Etat partie soit aidé à mieux maîtriser les limites du bien et à renforcer la législation existante. Les recommandations des Organisations consultatives doivent être suivies, mais la Délégation du Sénégal appelle la Communauté à mobiliser des ressources pour la protection des îles Bijagós et pour que les valeurs identifiées soient renforcées.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.17** was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.30 pm.

SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY 22 June 2013

TENTH MEETING

9 am. – 12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Emerging trends and General issues

The Chairperson announced that the Working Group established to discuss the Draft Decision **37 COM 7** finished his work and that a new proposed Draft Decision has been distributed to the Members of the Committee. It is proposed to adopt this Draft Decision by consensus.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 7** is adopted.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

B. MIXED PROPERTIES

B.1. AFRICA

B.1.1. New Nominations

Property	Sehlabathebe National Park [extension of “uKhahlamba / Drakensberg Park”, South Africa, (i)(iii)(vii)(x), 2000]
Id. N°	985 Bis
State Party	Lesotho

ICOMOS and **IUCN** presented information regarding the proposed extension. The mountainous area covers 6500 hectares.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que le bien présente un paysage culturel et naturel intéressant et rappelle qu'il s'agit de l'extension d'un bien déjà connu. Ayant écouté les exposés des Organisations consultatives, elle pense que ce bien offre un témoignage sur les modes de vie et croyances d'un peuple mais aussi qu'il s'agit d'un bien qui existe et fonctionne déjà dans les « conditions » du patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle a été prouvée sur la base des critères vii et x ainsi que i et iii. Elle souligne que l'UICN a insisté sur l'existence de limites et d'une zone tampon reconnues. Elle rappelle qu'un cadre juridique et institutionnel approprié est déjà en place, que des lois et déclarations existent au niveau national depuis de nombreuses années et que les parties culturelles et naturelles sont par conséquent déjà protégées, que des outils pratiques de gestion existent déjà et qu'ils peuvent être actualisés. Elle souligne également que les deux Etats Parties collaborent entre eux puisqu'un Comité de Gestion conjoint a été créé, et elle rappelle l'existence d'études comparatives bien élaborées. La Délégation du Mali estime donc que le bien fonctionne déjà dans les normes du patrimoine mondial, tout en étant d'accord avec le fait qu'il faut apporter des précisions et des améliorations à l'inventaire. Elle recommande que les compétences sud-africaines soient être mises à la disposition du Lesotho qui pourrait ainsi capitaliser et profiter de cette expérience. Elle suggère un inventaire, une identification et également une zone tampon qui couvre l'ensemble du périmètre proposé au classement.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the state party on the nomination, and noted the extension could play an important role in conservation. The Delegation further noted that the extension does not require proper cultural criteria, as the natural values are impressive. The Delegation supported the extension solely on the basis of natural criteria.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** insiste sur deux points qu'elle considère avoir été soulevés dans l'argumentaire des précédentes interventions. Elle estime qu'il faut parfois s'habituer à ignorer une frontière qui est transcendée par l'information géologique et l'écosystème. Elle précise qu'il y a un continuum du point de vue de la biodiversité et des éco-facteurs et souligne que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle est déjà bien établie en Afrique du Sud et qu'elle trouve son prolongement naturel au Lesotho. Elle déclare partager l'avis du Mali et de l'Allemagne et demande en conséquence que l'extension de la totalité des critères au Lesotho soit approuvée sans tarder.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** apprécie l'intention de créer une extension sur une base transfrontalière mais souligne qu'il reste une question ouverte, celle de l'absence d'informations relatives aux éléments culturels. Elle indique qu'on ne sait pas précisément où se trouvent ces biens culturels, que les inventaires sont incomplets ou qu'ils datent d'il y a longtemps. La Délégation de la Suisse approuve la déclaration du Mali selon laquelle une meilleure identification des biens est essentielle pour approuver l'extension mais aussi pour la future gestion du bien. Elle estime que l'Etat Partie a besoin d'un peu de temps supplémentaire pour améliorer les connaissances et donc la gestion des biens et recommande donc le report de la décision à l'année prochaine.

The Delegation of **India** indicated its support for the nomination, noting that this would be the state party's first site. The Ambassador stated that the problem remains on the cultural side, as the extent of the Rock Art remains unknown. The Ambassador suggested that ICOMOS should have covered this. The delegation

stated that the nomination should not be held up as a result of financial issues. The Delegation urged the Committee to approve the extension today.

The Delegation of **Lesotho** noted that they are already dealing with Rock Art issues raised by ICOMOS, and noted the trans-boundary cooperation.

The Delegation of **South Africa** corrected an error, where it had mentioned IUCN rather than ICOMOS yesterday. The Delegation urged the Committee to pay special attention to the extension, and noted that the natural OUV has been justified. The Delegation stated that the Rock Art is similar on both sides and thus the Lesotho pictures could be considered complete. The site is situated in the same mountain range, and should therefore be considered as one site. The Delegation was therefore of the view that the application was complete. The Delegation further noted that the site existed long before the colonial border was drawn. Finally, the Ambassador noted that there is a working group in place to consider trans-boundary conservation, with a 5-year plan. ICOMOS' concern will therefore be addressed. The Delegation reiterated that the property has demonstrated integrity, and supported the request to approve this extension.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** noted that after listening to the discussion, Ethiopia would support the extension.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** noted that ICOMOS has its own stringent criteria, and stated that Russia supported the inscription.

ICOMOS noted that it would like the opportunity to investigate the rock art further, and noted further that sites of equal significance may be in buffer zone, making a decision difficult. ICOMOS noted that it would be prepared to cooperate to identify cultural components.

La Délégation de la **France**, rejoint par la Délégation **d'Estonie**, soutient l'avis proposé par les Organes consultatifs pour envisager dès aujourd'hui une inscription au titre des critères (vii) et (x).

La Délégation du **Sénégal** a le sentiment, après avoir écouté à nouveau la représentante de l'ICOMOS, que le problème ne se pose pas au niveau de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle mais simplement que l'ICOMOS veut s'assurer qu'elle a une vision globale de toutes les valeurs culturelles. Elle souscrit à cette préoccupation mais rappelle que dans le domaine des inventaires, on ne peut pas tout savoir d'un seul coup. Elle estime que l'important est qu'une extension crédible a été acceptée et suggère qu'il faut accepter les valeurs culturelles et naturelles et continuer à travailler avec l'Etat Partie pour consolider et fortifier la valeur culturelle du bien.

Le **Rapporteur** présente le projet de décision amendé par la Délégation du Mali qui reflète les discussions et propose d'accepter l'extension du bien

ICOMOS noted that regarding criteria (i), given the general lack of information on Rock Art, ICOMOS did not define any criteria.

La Délégation de la **France** demande à l'ICOMOS de donner des précisions sur l'application des critères dans la constitution du dossier.

The Delegation of **Germany** suggested striking through criteria (i).

La Délégation de la **Suisse** partage le souci de l'Allemagne, elle souhaite qu'on distribue les décisions longues par écrit pour qu'on sache ce qu'on est en train d'adopter et pour éviter la confusion totale.

La Délégation de la **France**, au vu des confirmations données par les Organisations consultatives, soutient la proposition faite par l'Allemagne de se référer au critère (iii), le critère (i) étant d'usage exceptionnel.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the draft resolution is now slightly bigger than the extended property, although short and less detailed draft resolution would make things easier.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** pense comme l'Allemagne et la France qu'on peut se passer du critère (i) et conserver le critère (iii).

Le **Rapporteur** continue la lecture du projet de décision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle qu'il a été suggéré de supprimer le critère (i).

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle qu'à son avis on ne peut pas changer les critères lorsqu'il s'agit d'une extension et considère donc cette discussion inutile. De plus, elle note que l'objectif de la nomination est de maintenir et de renforcer la coopération entre les deux Etats parties. Elle indique qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de rappeler dans le nom du site qu'il est transfrontalier puisque de nombreux sites transfrontaliers existent déjà sans cette appellation.

The **IUCN** noted that, regarding the outstanding universal value of the property, there was a version of the statement in the IUCN report which has sections that might be reconsidered; furthermore, the States parties had themselves proposed a new name, and the Committee might consider adopting it. Finally, as a trans-boundary property, the Committee might consider either "States Parties" or the "State Party of Lesotho".

The **Rapporteur** noted the statement regarding outstanding universal value would be inserted, and announced the name change to: Maloti Drakensberg Trans-boundary World Heritage Site. If there are no questions regarding the name, we could proceed to adoption.

The Delegation of **South Africa, in response to the comment of IUCN** noted the preference for it to read the "State Party" of Lesotho.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande si un rapport conjoint doit être soumis par les deux Etats parties pour un site transfrontalier.

The **Secretariat** indicated that it would become a mixed trans-boundary site and the state parties should present the report jointly.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.18** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Lesotho** thanked the Committee and the international community for their support.

B.2. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

B.2.1. New Nominations

Property	Pimachiowin Aki
Id. N°	1415
State Party	Canada

ICOMOS and IUCN presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** of the Committee opened the floor for comments.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that the people and their interaction with nature is the basis for proposing the site as a mixed property. However, the process is insufficient as it stands. The Delegation recommended that the advisory bodies make joint recommendations on issues where culture and nature must be so fully interconnected.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by the Delegation of **Colombia** noted that this is a new type of nomination, linking natural and cultural components. Further consideration is needed on these types of sites, and this can only be partially accomplished by the examination of the nomination. The Delegation asked the state party to clarify the reason for the boundary of the site.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** responded indicated that the boundaries incorporate the defined boundaries of 5 community planning areas and provincial parks. The boundaries existed at the time of nomination. The boundaries were largely directed by First Nations peoples in collaboration and provincial governments, and the First Nations communities have allocated the majority of their lands for protection. The Delegation noted the vast size of the property, as approximately the size of Belgium, and suggested that the site more than supports the operation of natural ecological processes.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked whether extending the territory of the property by IUCN would be appropriate.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted the difficulties of the Advisory Body evaluations in dealing with mixed properties.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** note que le site est un cas intéressant entre nature et culture et que de nombreuses questions pourraient être discutées sur cette catégorie de nomination. Elle ajoute qu'il faut revoir les limites du bien et demande pourquoi les forêts boréales ne sont pas incluses.

La Délégation du **Mexique** constate la difficulté rencontrée par les Organisations Consultatives pour l'évaluation des biens mixtes. Elle ajoute qu'il sera inadéquat

d'appliquer uniquement les critères naturels pour ce bien et souhaite qu'on demande l'avis de l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Canada** responded to the question, noting that all 5 First Nations supported the inscription of the site under criterion (ix).

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated the unique nature of the nomination and requested a clarification from ICOMOS regarding whether *exceptionality* is a necessary criterion in spite of the political sensitivity the state party is facing.

ICOMOS noted that the words “exceptional” and “outstanding” are both in the Convention. For the properties to have OUV, they need to be exceptional.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by the Delegation of **Switzerland**, supported the Draft Decision with three additional paragraphs which capture the dilemma faced by State parties and the Advisory Bodies in dealing with such mixed properties. The Delegation suggested that it is necessary to improve the evaluation process for such sites.

La Délégation de la **France** note avec appréciation le caractère constructif du débat sur les critères. Elle appuie le commentaire du Japon et rappelle qu'il y a une différence entre les critères (iii) et (v).

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed changes to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.19** was adopted as amended.

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES (*continuation*)

C.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1. New Nominations

Property	Cultural Landscape of Honghe Hani Rice Terraces
Id. N°	1111
State Party	China

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegations of **Japan, Senegal, Estonia, Cambodia, Algeria, France, Mali, Qatar, Switzerland, Malaysia, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, Mexico, Ethiopia, Germany, Serbia, Colombia, Russia and India** congratulated the State party on the nomination and supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** noted the impressive land management system and hoped that other states would learn from the experience.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that one the challenges of sustainable management of such sites is the decline in the local population, and wondered if the Delegation of China could comment on this. The Delegation noted that the response would not change their support for the inscription, but hoped to hear China's comments on this issue.

The Observer Delegation of **China** responded with information regarding the strong cultural and historical connection of the local people to the terraces, and that the local government put in place a strong management system. China further noted the efforts of the local government to assist the local population in maintaining the traditional system while improving the lives of the local populations, suggesting that the population was in strong support of the terraces and the attachment to the property would suggest that a population decline is not likely to occur.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.24** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Delegation of China for the inscription of Cultural Landscape of Honghe Hani Rice Terraces in the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **China** thanked the Chairperson, the Committee and the international community for their support.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY 22 June 2013

ELEVENTH MEETING

2.30 pm. – 7 p.m.

**Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia) and Mr. Francisco J.Gutierrez
(Colombia)**

**ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE
LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)**

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES (*continuation*)

C.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Fujisan
Id. N°	1418
State Party	Japan

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual errors letter was received by the WHC.

ICOMOS explained the beauty of the solitary, often snow-capped volcanic Mount Fuji, which had inspired artists and poets and been the object of pilgrimage for centuries.

The **Secretariat** called the attention of the Committee on the fact that following a recommendation from ICOMOS, Japan and ICOMOS agreed on a change of name for the property, which would read “Fujisan, sacred place and source of artistic inspiration”.

Requested by the Chairperson, the Delegation of **Japan** confirmed that the new name had been agreed.

The Delegation of **Germany, supported by the Delegation of Qatar, Estonia, Switzerland, Mali, Algeria, Iraq, Ethiopia and Serbia** congratulated Japan for the convincing nomination of this iconic site and fully supported the inscription. It did not agree with the exclusion of the Mihonomatsubara element and consequently proposed to change the decision on this sense.

La Délégation du **Mexique** s'associe à la Délégation de **l'Allemagne**. Elle félicite par ailleurs l'Etat partie pour sa proposition audacieuse ainsi que l'ICOMOS pour son rapport nuancé. Le Mexique ajoute qu'il soutient l'inscription du site annexe de Mihonomatsubara et demande l'avis du Japon à ce sujet.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime qu'il faut inclure le site hors noyau puisque c'est la station depuis laquelle les artistes ont représenté le mont Fuji. Cette station est donc essentielle à l'intégrité culturelle du bien. Le Sénégal s'en réfère à la décision de l'année 2012 sur le Mont St Michel durant laquelle les débats avaient porté sur l'impact d'éléments exogènes sur la vision que les pèlerins avaient du bien.

The Delegation of **Thailand** was pleased with the proposal made by Japan, and considered that, apart from the beauty and majesty, its symbolic inspiration and religious attributes are out of question. It added that Fujisan and its components were truly worthy to be on the List.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** stated that it was surprising that the Fuji Mountain was not inscribed until that day. It congratulated Japan and ICOMOS, and explained that it considered the Mihonomatsubara component as part of the site, because of its important relationship to Fujisan, noting that it is one of the 2 important viewpoints where artists were inspired. Therefore, it proposed an amendment for this element to be part of the inscribed property.

La Délégation de **Cambodge** comprend les raisons de l'ICOMOS pour la proposition d'exclusion du site de Mihonomatsubara mais soutient l'inclusion comme les délégations précédentes, car elle la considère indissociable de la VUE.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated Japan for an effective nomination and supported the inclusion of Mihonomatsubara in the inscribed site, as well as the change of name.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la position des délégations précédentes en ce qui concerne Mihonomatsubara, puisqu'elle considère que cela renforce la valeur paysagère et artistique du site, en citant la description allégorique du Fuji de Paul Claudel (écrivain français et ambassadeur au Japon).

The Delegation of **India** congratulated Japan for the nomination and also congratulated ICOMOS for their comprehensive work. It supported the proposed amendment, because it considered that there is no culture without faith. It noted that the excluded area represented spiritual and visual relation to the site. It also welcomed the use of criterion (vi), because it will enrich the List, by underlining the importance of intangible values. Therefore, it supported Malaysian amendment.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** noted the importance of the site and supported previous interventions. It congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS and recommended for the inclusion of all the parts of the serial site into the inscribed site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted the iconic world reference of this site, source of inspiration for creativity. It congratulated ICOMOS and Japan, and joined previous interventions concerning the inclusion of the Mihonomatsubara part.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.29** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Japan and gave the floor to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its sincere appreciation to all the Members of the Committee and all the experts of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. It noted that for all the Japanese people, Fujisan is a very symbolic and spiritual mountain, with especial significance for them. It was confident that they will work together to ensure the conservation of the site, including local authorities, by promoting this landscape and environment for future generations.

C.2. ARAB STATES

C.2.1. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Al Zubarah Archaeological Site
Id. N°	1402 Rev
State Party	Qatar

ICOMOS presented the nomination and noted that this is a referred back nomination from the 36th session of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Mexique** qualifie le site d'Al Zoubarah d'exceptionnel. Elle rappelle aussi ce que le Qatar représente pour la Convention. Ayant ratifié la convention en 1994 comme le Mexique, le Qatar siège pour la première fois au comité en 2011 et propose sa première inscription en 2013 après le renvoi de la 36^e session. Le Mexique salue la révision du dossier qatari et soutient l'inscription.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates, supported by the Delegations of India, Iraq, the Russian Federation Ethiopia, Estonia, Japan, France, Colombia, Algeria, Senegal, Malaysia, Serbia and Thailand** congratulated the State Party and considered the inscription of this site as a gift for future generations, which would help to establish a link with the past for the new generations.

La délégation du **Cambodge** appuie l'inscription en soulignant qu'il s'agit-là d'une implantation urbaine reflétant les échanges entre l'Asie, l'Afrique et l'Europe, entre la mer et le désert.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported this first nomination of Qatar, and considered that, since all recommendations had been addressed, this was an example of the correct use of the tool of referral for improving a dossier.

Le Délégation du **Mali** félicite l'Etat partie et soutient l'inscription. La délégation fait remarquer qu'une fois de plus un bien dans un désert est inscrit. Le Mali espère que les recommandations de l'ICOMOS concernant la conservation et les mesures d'impact seront suivies.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.23** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Qatar and gave the floor to the Delegation.

The Delegation of **Qatar** thanked UNESCO and ICOMOS, and the Committee for the inscription on the List, by recognising the important economic and social role of the site. It noted that this was a way of recognizing all the efforts made to conserve and protect the site.

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations

Property	University of Coimbra – Alta and Sofia
Id. N°	1387
State Party	Portugal

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual errors letter was received by the WHC.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered surprising that this university had not been yet inscribed, and recommended the site for inscription.

La Délégation du **Mexique** reprend la position colombienne et demande l'inscription du bien. Elle souligne d'une part l'évidence de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, l'université de Coimbra étant un lieu emblématique de la pensée et des valeurs lusophones, et les efforts réalisés par l'Etat partie à travers divers projets de préservation, citant notamment le plan de conservation municipal en cours. Le Mexique réclame par ailleurs l'inclusion du critère (vi) en raison du rôle joué par l'université dans la pensée et l'âme portugaise depuis des siècles.

The Delegation of **Serbia** congratulated the State Party for the presentation of this excellent dossier, and thanked ICOMOS for confirming the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. It supported the inscription of the site, and added some questions about the management system and the heritage impact assessment for future developments and constructions. It requested the Chairperson to give the floor to Portugal, in order to get the answers.

The Delegation of **India** noted the extremely strong relation of Portugal and India, and considered that the site was ready to be inscribed. It requested to give the floor to Portugal for clarifications and proposed an amendment.

La Délégation de la France estime que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien est évidente et que le Portugal a répondu aux remarques de l'ICOMOS. Elle suggère l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked Portugal for this contribution, and noted that it expected the site to be inscribed on the List. It also requested the State Party to be given the floor to clarify whether there was updated information concerning the recommendations of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** welcomed the efforts made by the State Party and considered the site as a symbol between the universities and the population surrounding them. It would like to give an important place to universities on the List. It also recommended giving the floor to the State Party to provide information on the concerns raised by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Thailand** considered that the site should be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested the State Party to respond to the recommendations made by ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien est incontestable. La délégation est ouverte à l'inscription du bien. Elle doute néanmoins de la pertinence du critère (iv), réservé au cas exceptionnel des associations ayant une portée universelle.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated Portugal, by noting that it is an important monumental ensemble. It considered that the site meets the criteria and supported its inscription. It also mentioned the importance of paragraph (vi), following the intervention by the Delegation of Mexico.

The Delegation of **Estonia** welcomed the inscription, and stressed a peculiar aspect of the nomination, concerning architecture dating from the Second World War years, which is not well represented on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se prononce en faveur de l'inscription étant donné que les procédures législatives en cours permettent de protéger la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Members of the Committee for their support. It considered that, even if ICOMOS had accepted some factual errors, some of them were still present in the presentation. It noted that the authorities had promoted numerous activities in order to pursue all the recommendations; all necessary measures to protect the site were being addressed and it had been created a team of 3 members for this particular objective. Taking into account the current legislation, it mentioned that no building could be built if the height of the surrounding buildings was not respected. In addition, it underlined that all the buildings on the core zone were considered as national heritage from the legal point of view. It informed the Committee that a revised version of the management plan had been approved and will be implemented in November 2013, reinforcing all the legal aspects of the site. The special protection zone is reinforced for more than 3 years now, and will be included in the new master plan. Heritage impact assessments are mandatory according to cultural heritage in Portugal. It also reiterated its interest in including criteria (vi), by emphasizing the uniqueness of the University of Coimbra.

The Delegation of **Iraq** noted that, once heard the measures taken by the State Party and its commitments, it supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked the State Party for the clarifications and considered that Portugal would be able to manage the recommendations. Therefore it supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked Portugal for the explanations and declared to have no objection for inscription.

ICOMOS explained that criterion (vi) was carefully considered during the evaluation process, but that it considered it could not be demonstrated.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended Draft Decision and noted that 15 Delegations supported the inscription of this site. The only doubt concerned the acceptance of criterion (vi). The Rapporteur noted that Switzerland disagreed with including criterion (vi), so suggested the Members of the Committee to explain positions about criterion (vi).

La Délégation du **Mexique** estime que l'Université de Coimbra a été le berceau d'une pensée et que le critère (vi) est donc justifié.

The Delegation of **India**, supported by the Delegation of Qatar, considered the strong influence of this University even in India and other countries. Therefore it noted that there was no doubt that criterion (vi) is inseparable to this inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** fully supported inscription, with the addition of criterion (vi).

Pour la Délégation de la **Suisse**, le critère (vi) doit être associé aux valeurs intangibles. Néanmoins, comme ici le critère (vi) vient en ajout à d'autres critères, la Suisse est disposée à l'inclure.

The **Chairperson** noted that no Delegation was objecting to the inclusion of criterion (vi).

The **Rapporteur** read out the Draft Decision , as amended, and explained that the SOUV should be added later.

The Delegation of **Estonia** asked whether ICOMOS had a sort of Statement of Outstanding Universal Value prepared for the site.

Le **Rapporteur** confirme que les organismes consultatifs ont une déclaration de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle déjà préparée et présente les amendements au Projet de décision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.38** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Portugal and gave the floor to the Delegation.

The Observer Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Members of the Committee for their support and explained that this University had been reference for generations of people, including the students' way of life and cultural environment and scientific research and production. After the inscription, it considered that the responsibility to protect and preserve this site is even higher, in order to allow the University to be also of importance for the future societies.

C.1. AFRICA

C.1.1. New Nominations

Property	Isandra Zoma
Id. N°	1428
State Party	Madagascar

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee, which was recommended for deferral.

La Délégation de la **France** reconnaît que le dossier contient certains atouts, mais souligne qu'il mérite d'être revu et approfondi comme le recommande l'ICOMOS. La Délégation de la France exprime sa disponibilité pour apporter son soutien à Madagascar dans l'élaboration de ce dossier.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne les efforts de l'Etat partie dans les documents soumis au niveau de l'analyse comparative, dans la campagne de fouilles archéologiques, dans le travail sur le plan de sauvegarde et de conservation pour 2012-2016, dans la mise en place d'une cellule de gestion opérationnelle, dans la prise des instruments normatifs pour encadrer la gestion du bien, et demande par conséquent que le dossier soit renvoyé à l'Etat partie pour que ce dernier, avec l'aide de la France et du Fonds Africain pour le patrimoine mondial, puisse retravailler sur le dossier afin qu'il remplisse toutes les conditions.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** noted the efforts of the State Party to take into consideration the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and therefore supported Senegal's proposition for referral.

La Délégation du **Mali** retient le riche potentiel du dossier quant à ses valeurs culturelles, souligne également les efforts substantiels fournis par l'Etat partie et le soutien exprimé par la France, et s'aligne sur les délégations du Sénégal et de l'Ethiopie pour demander un renvoi.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par l'**Estonie**, la **France** et la **Colombie**, remercie la délégation de la France pour son soutien à l'Etat partie et partage les points de vue exprimés par la délégation du Sénégal, mais attire l'attention du Comité sur les conséquences pour l'Etat partie d'un changement d'un différé à un renvoi. La Délégation pense que les limites du bien doivent peut-être être changées sur la base de l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, ce qui ne serait pas possible (ou très difficile) avec un renvoi. L'expérience montre que différer un dossier donne plus de possibilités à l'Etat partie de le remanier. La Délégation de la **Suisse** invite le Comité à considérer un différé pour ce site.

Le **Rapporteur** présente le projet de décision tel qu'amendé par la Délégation du Sénégal, note que 3 membres du Comité sont pour que le dossier soit différé et que 3 membres du Comité sont pour son renvoi, et demande donc au Comité d'en discuter davantage.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie afin qu'il dise s'il est capable de tenir les délais dans le cadre d'un renvoi ou s'il préfère que son dossier soit différé.

The Delegation of **South Africa** highlighted the importance of this site and also noted the efforts of the concerned State Party to meet the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and therefore supported the proposal by Senegal for referral but would prefer to hear if the State Party could meet the requirements for the referral option.

La Délégation du **Mexique** note que, selon l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, le site remplit les critères d'authenticité et rappelle l'exemple du dossier de nomination du Qatar discuté auparavant pendant la session. La Délégation du **Mexique** indique l'importance de permettre à l'Etat partie de renforcer le dossier d'inscription, salue le soutien de la délégation de la France, et demande plus d'informations de la part de l'Etat partie sur le plan de gestion et l'analyse comparative.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) remercie le Comité et l'ICOMOS d'avoir considéré son dossier de proposition d'inscription et fournit les précisions suivantes : la délimitation du site sera terminée d'ici à la fin de l'année, une cellule de gestion est opérationnelle sous la direction régionale de la culture et du patrimoine, l'analyse comparative sur le plan national a été effectuée et insérée dans le DVD, mais pas dans le format papier (erreur factuelle). Cependant, l'Etat partie souligne qu'il n'a pas reçu de demande d'informations complémentaires après le dépôt du dossier, ni après la mission d'évaluation. Compte-tenu des pratiques sociales, il n'est pas possible d'inclure certains attributs dans les éléments du bien, et l'Etat partie préfère les retenir dans la zone tampon. L'Etat partie s'engage à envisager une éventuelle extension dans le futur et dit se conformer à un renvoi.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** s'inscrit dans l'option d'un renvoi du dossier après avoir entendu l'Etat partie pour exprimer son encouragement aux progrès de Madagascar.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee to find a consensus and turned to the Delegations of Switzerland, Colombia, Estonia and France to comment having listened to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported by the Delegations of **Switzerland, France, Germany, Cambodia and Mexico** maintained that the option for deferral would be more helpful for the State Party taking into account that a mission could take place.

The Delegation of **India** supported the referral affirming its confidence in the State Party, supported by the Delegation of **Qatar**.

ICOMOS informed that some important steps for the nomination file still need to be taken.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stated that after the comments from the Advisory Bodies, it supported the referral as it and trusted that the concerned State Party will be able to make these necessary steps, supported by the Delegations of **Thailand, Iraq** and the **Russian Federation**.

The Delegation of **Japan** reminded the Committee about the difference between the option of the referral and deferral, the latter of which allowed more time and cooperation to improve the nomination file. According to the Delegation deferral would be the preferred option citing past nomination file examples from Japan and

the nominated site “Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong” from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea inscribed at this session.

La Délégation de la **France** regrette de ne pas être en mesure d'apporter cette aide à l'Etat partie sans la durée nécessaire et compte-tenu de ce qu'il reste à faire pour la préparation du dossier, parce que beaucoup d'éléments sont à revoir, notamment sur le périmètre et les limites.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite apporter la confiance à l'Etat partie, qui a décidé de prendre ses responsabilités, de se donner les moyens de répondre aux interrogations de l'Organisation consultative et de tenir ses engagements.

The **Chairperson** summarized the discussion and stated that there are eight Committee Members in support of deferral and eleven Members for referral.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the Committee members that one of the key differences between the two options is the question of timing. As the Advisory Bodies recommended that more time be given to the State Party, it proposed to follow the recommendation of the Advisory Bodies and appealed to the Committee to find a consensus.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** explique que le renvoi donne à l'Etat partie la possibilité de travailler sur trois ans et, réitérant sa confiance à l'Etat partie, en appelle aux autres membres du comité afin qu'ils reconsidèrent leur position.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the pace in the preparation of the nomination file depends to a large extent on the concerned State Party but it also depended on the Advisory Bodies as well as UNESCO. It reminded the Committee that UNESCO is committed to the priority of Africa. Noting that only six percent of all nomination files received a positive evaluation between the African and Arab States Parties, it therefore proposed to make it a collective imperative to encourage the States Parties from the Africa region in view of a balanced World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Mali** tient compte de l'engagement de l'Etat partie et soutient le renvoi, ce qui demande un travail à court terme.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** partage l'avis de la Délégation de l'Inde de voir davantage de candidatures de l'Afrique et ce plus rapidement. C'est pourquoi la meilleure option doit être choisie, c'est-à-dire différer la candidature, qui permet à l'Etat partie de revenir avec une candidature valable et d'accueillir une mission des Organisations consultatives qui est une garantie pour une évaluation complète et que la nomination puisse être inscrite dans relativement peu de temps, ce que ne garantit pas un renvoi.

The **Chairperson** reminded that a consensus has to be found and asked the Members if after hearing the discussion they were inclined to change their position.

The Delegation of **Colombia** reminded that the Committee is a consensus- building body and maintained that the majority should go with the amendment of Senegal.

After consultation of the Members of the Committee, the **Chairperson** noted that the consensus now lies with the referral option and proposed to adopt the decision as amended in favour of referral.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.21** was adopted as amended.

Property	Agadez (Historic Centre of Agadez)
Id. N°	1268
State Party	Niger

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee, which was recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted the site had received International Assistance in 2002 and was included on the Tentative List of Niger in 2006. It thanked ICOMOS for the excellent evaluation, fully supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party on this inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party on this well-prepared and convincing nomination file and supported the nomination and inscription of another African site to be inscribed.

La Délégation de la **France**, soutenue par la Délégation du **Sénégal**, félicite l'Etat partie pour la grande qualité de son dossier, très bien préparé en étroite coopération avec l'ICOMOS, et salue cette proposition d'inscription d'Agadez au patrimoine mondial, signe d'espoir pour cette région.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** congratulated the State Party for this beautiful site and commended the capacities for the conservation of the site in such difficult conditions in order to preserve this gem of culture and civilization. It further thanked the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for the support.

La Délégation du **Mali** salue le travail accompli pour ce dossier, rappelant l'implication du programme « Africa 2009 » et la persévérance de l'Etat partie, signale la proximité avec Tombouctou sur le plan architectural et par rapport à son rôle dans le commerce trans-saharien et termine son intervention en racontant la légende de la croix d'Agadez.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that the site is located at an exceptional crossroad for the caravan trade and welcomed the addition of the gem to the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Estonia** welcomed the inscription of the property as a huge achievement for the African region.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the State Party on the inscription. It further stated that the nomination file should serve as an inspiration that it is possible to prepare a successful nomination file with relatively little means.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated the State Party for the inscription and highlighted the spiritual dimension of the property. It added that the property is a marker of time and a symbol of the interaction between man and nature.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated State Party and the Advisory Bodies on their work and likened the property to a jewel on the crown.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat partie pour la proposition d'inscription du magnifique Centre historique d'Agadez sur la liste du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS pour la qualité du dossier, bien documenté et argumenté. La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie cette inscription, mais regrette que le critère (i) ne soit pas retenu malgré ce que l'Etat partie a essayé de mettre en relief, notamment le minaret, la plus haute construction au monde, dont la structure porteuse est faite exclusivement en terre cuite, et demande à l'ICOMOS de fournir des précisions.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party for the property as an outstanding example for the earthen architecture.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to respond to the question by the Delegation of Algeria.

L'**ICOMOS** considère que la hauteur du minaret exprime une performance technique et qu'elle témoigne d'une maîtrise de bon niveau dans l'usage de l'adobe. Toutefois, les éléments stylistiques et l'ensemble formé par le minaret, la mosquée et ses dépendances n'atteignent pas par eux-mêmes et en tant qu'ensemble monumental complet le niveau d'un chef d'œuvre à caractère unique. Les arguments avancés ressortent plus du critère (iii), déjà retenu, que du critère (i).

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.22** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Niger on behalf of the Committee for the inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Niger** remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS, ainsi que le Cambodge. L'Etat partie mesure les enjeux liés à cette inscription, qui appelle à la réalisation des actions concrètes en faveur de la conservation durable du bien inscrit, et réitère son engagement à contribuer davantage et efficacement à la préservation de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle pour laquelle le site vient d'être inscrit et à mettre en œuvre les recommandations formulées, ainsi qu'à transmettre un rapport de mise en œuvre au Centre du patrimoine mondial en 2014.

C.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Levuka Historical Port Town
Id. N°	1399
State Party	Fiji

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee, which was recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegations of **Japan, Cambodia, Estonia, South Africa, France, Ethiopia Malaysia, the Russian Federation, Algeria, India, Switzerland, Senegal** supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party on this exceptional site.

The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the inscription stating that it contributed to the filling the gaps on the World Heritage List. It further proposed to include reference to a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** félicite l'Etat partie pour sa première proposition d'inscription sur la liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Mali** félicite l'Etat partie pour la qualité du dossier, mais surtout l'ICOMOS, car au-delà du dossier présenté par l'Etat partie, il y a aussi les compétences de l'ICOMOS.

Upon the request of the **Chairperson**, the **Rapporteur** read out the Draft Decision , and the amendments proposed.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.25** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Fiji on behalf of the Committee for the inscription of Fiji's first property on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Fiji** noted the happy, special and historical occasion and the honour brought by the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. It expressed its utmost appreciation to the Chairperson and to the World Heritage Committee for the invaluable recognition and also thanked the local community for its support and all partners, who assisted the State Party, particularly ICOMOS. 1. The World Heritage draft degree has gone through several rounds of consultation and shall be taken for the Government's approval and soon be promulgated and implemented. 2. A conservation fund has been established for the rehabilitation of the structures that are in poor conditions within the nominated property boundary. The State Party is engaging with several relevant stakeholders to support an organized capacity-building programme for professional development of expertise in conservation. 3. With regards to historical and archaeological sites, a list is being compiled for their inclusion in the national heritage register, and to ensure the

sustainable management. 4. The maximum building height will be maintained, the relevant amendments have been incorporated in the provisions of the revised town planning scheme for Levuka, which will be in place by August 2013. The Observer Delegation of **Fiji** thanked again the Chairperson and the World Heritage Committee, as well as the Kingdom of Cambodia and people for their warm hospitality.

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations *(continuation)*

Property	Red Bay Basque Whaling Station
Id. N°	1412
State Party	Canada

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee Members that a factual error was received for this nomination item (Reference made to Document WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B.4, p. 13).

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee, which was recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Delegations of the **Russian Federation, Germany, France, Cambodia, Switzerland and Germany** commended the State Party for the marvelous nomination file.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.32** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Canada on behalf of the Committee for the inscription of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** thanked the World Heritage Committee for their support to the nomination. The Mayor of Red Bay thanked the Kingdom of Cambodia for its hospitality and spoke on behalf of their partners who helped to prepare the nomination file to thank the members of the World Heritage Committee for the decision, ICOMOS for their expert review and favourable recommendation, Parks Canada for their leadership, advice and support, governmental institutions and departments, the regional partners who form the steering committee to oversee the development of this nomination for their invaluable support and assistance, as well as the Residents of Red Bay, a community of less than 200 people, for their outstanding work, dedication and commitment to ensure that the remains of the Basque Whaling Station are cared for and recognized.

The meeting rose at 7 pm.

SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 23 June 2013

TWELFTH MEETING

9 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia) and Mr. Francisco J.Gutierrez
(Colombia)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE
LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

The Chairperson informed the Members of the Committee that he requested consultations to be held regarding the nomination of **Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex, Russian Federation, Draft Decision 37 COM 8B.43**. He indicated that this process was currently ongoing involving all the parties concerned.

The **Delegation of Qatar** took the floor to confirm that the State of Qatar has decided to host the 38th Session of the World Heritage Committee in 2014.

The **Chairperson** recalled that according to the Rules of Procedure, the Committee needed to elect the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for the next session, as well as five Vice-Chairpersons. He confirmed that this was the subject of a specific Item on the Agenda that the Committee will deal with at a later stage.

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES (*continuation*)

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Ancient City of Tauric Chersonese and its Chora (5th century BC – 14th century AD)
Id. N°	1411
State Party	Ukraine

L'ICOMOS présente les informations relatives à la proposition d'inscription.

The **Delegations of the Russian Federation, Germany, Mali, Qatar, Serbia France, Cambodia, the United Arab Emirates**, congratulated Ukraine for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The **Delegation of Estonia** welcomed the nomination and congratulated ICOMOS for the quality of the evaluation. It nevertheless considered that the result of the evaluation was too generous. However, they expressed support to the nomination.

Le projet de décision **37 COM 8B.40** est adopté.

Le **Président félicite l'Ukraine et** donne la parole à la Déléation qui remercie les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS pour leur décision.

C.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Golestan Palace
Id. N°	1422
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)

L'ICOMOS présente l'évaluation de la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the State Party and underlined that ICOMOS has accepted the OUV statement for the property. The Delegate insisted on the fact that the comparative analysis was impressive and that the sections on authenticity and integrity were very well appreciated. It added that the building is one of the oldest in Tehran and that the protection measures are in place. The Delegation asked the State Party to clarify the situation with regard to the setting of the Buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the site for inscription and requested the State Party to provide clarification on the management arrangements foreseen.

La Déléation de la **France** félicite l'Iran pour cette proposition d'inscription. La Delegation demande à l'ICOMOS les raisons du retrait du critère iv. La France souhaite que l'Etat partie puisse répondre aux mesures prises pour la zone tampon

The Delegation of **Germany, Algeria, Malaysia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, the Russian federation, Serbia, Qatar, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, and Thailand**, considered that the property met the Outstanding Universal Value requirements and underlined that the ensemble is classified as national monument. Therefore it considered that the nomination should be inscribed and that if the State Party was ready to enlarge the buffer zone, the property should be recommended for inscription in 2015.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Iran

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** explained that additional information was provided for the nomination. With regard to the Museum of the Qajari era, it informed the Committee that the historical complex continues to function. In response to ICOMOS evaluation, Iran clarified two issues: the extended buffer zone as provided by the additional information already exists and the extended area was already included in the Master Plan which was distributed to the Members of the Committee for information. With regard to management issues, the issues raised are already included in the measures foreseen in the Master Plan of the city.

L'ICOMOS informe le Comité sur les raisons pour lesquelles elle considère que le bien proposé ne peut pas être inscrit sous le critère (iv).

The **Delegation of Japan** thanked ICOMOS for the explanation on criterion (iv) and the architectural fusions and asked if this aspect of the evaluation should fall on criterion ii or iv.

ICOMOS replied that in this particular case there was no new creation, but the combination and remarkable fusion that justified the use of criterion ii which reflects in a more appropriate way the inscription of the property

The **Delegation of Iraq** supported the inscription of Golestan Palace on the World Heritage List

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements proposés au Projet de décision. Le Rapporteur indique qu'une majorité du Comité est en faveur de l'inscription.

La Délégation de **France**, soutenue par **l'Algérie et l'Inde**, propose que le site soit inscrit aussi sur le critère (iv).

Le projet de décision **37 COM 8B.26** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

The Observer **Delegation of Iran** extended its thanks to Cambodia for the hospitality and thanked the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their Decision. It expressed the pride of the Iranian people for the inscription of this first property in Teheran on the World Heritage List and announced that this inscription will be received with great joy and enthusiasm by the people of the city. The Delegation also expressed the commitment of his government to safeguard and protect this heritage of humanity.

Property	Cultural Landscape of Maymand
Id. N°	1423
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination and the relative recommendation, for deferral.

The Delegation of **Iraq** noted the great significance of the property through its various attributes. It congratulated the State Party for the new concept proposed and requested that it be allowed to provide more information on the characteristics of the site.

The Delegation of **Estonia** congratulated Iran for nominating a cultural landscape, considering that all the World Heritage properties located in its territory until now concerned architectural sites. The Delegation concurred with ICOMOS that more time was needed to strengthen management and further explore the OUV.

La Délégation du **Mexique** se déclare surprise par cette proposition d'inscription. Elle y voit une série d'éléments qui enrichiraient la Liste et salue le fait que celle-ci puisse être améliorée par de nouvelles inscriptions. Elle estime qu'il s'agit ici d'un paysage culturel extrêmement complexe par sa nature, une zone où des moyens de subsistance anciens persistent en dépit des changements amenés par le développement. Elle suggère de prendre cela en compte lors de l'examen du dossier pour inscription mais avant de prendre toute décision sur ce bien qu'elle considère comme extrêmement important, elle demande à l'Etat Partie de communiquer davantage d'informations notamment par rapport aux recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS. Elle estime que si l'Etat Partie pouvait communiquer plus d'information au Comité, il serait alors possible de dire si l'Etat Partie peut se conformer aux recommandations où s'il a besoin de plus de temps pour le faire.

The Delegation of **India** noted how the present session of the Committee had recognized various sites associated to deserts. It was astounded by the exceptional quality of the property, a complex system expressing the relationship between humans and a harsh environment that should have been long recognized. The Delegation considered that even if the ways of life underpinning this cultural landscape were at risk of disappearance, the property needed to be inscribed immediately.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** partage les points de vue sur le fait que cette nomination est importante et intéressante et porte sur un paysage culturel particulier. Elle indique que si elle a souscrit à l'inscription du Palais du Golestan, elle estime en revanche que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien n'est pas établie à ce stade. Elle considère donc qu'il manque les bases qui permettraient de prouver en quoi les modes de vie de ce groupe de population relativement restreinte vivant dans une zone relativement petite de la région sont de valeur exceptionnelle et universelle. Elle précise qu'il ne s'agit pas de la question de la spécificité, qui est évidente, mais qu'il y a d'autres groupes de population qui ont des modes de vies particuliers dans la région. Elle souscrit donc à l'avis de l'ICOMOS sur le besoin de preuves qui

permettront de démontrer qu'il s'agit véritablement d'un site exceptionnel et universel.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que la session de 2013 est celle du désert, faisant référence aux dossiers de la Namibie, du Qatar et de la Chine. Elle considère que ce dossier présente un paysage culturel vivant mais menacé, un mode de vie troglodyte existant depuis des millénaires mais qui subit la pression du tourisme. Elle rappelle que l'exposé de l'ICOMOS a fait part de la manière dont ce bien est protégé et demande à en savoir plus sur les erreurs factuelles mentionnées. Elle souligne que le bien se rapporte à des modes de vie millénaires en disparition et qu'en l'inscrivant, le Comité contribuerait à participer à la préservation de ce mode de vie exceptionnel.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat Partie et l'ICOMOS pour ce dossier. Elle se dit particulièrement intéressée par ce dossier dont certains aspects rappellent ce que l'on connaît dans les régions sahariennes de l'Algérie. Elle souligne l'intérêt que représente l'association originale entre plusieurs éléments culturels, des pratiques humaines et des éléments naturels et elle remercie l'ICOMOS pour avoir relevé tous ces éléments dans un rapport détaillé. Elle estime cependant que de son point de vue, et sur la base de son expérience propre, l'évaluation semble catégorique, voire géométrique, car portant uniquement sur des entités et des catégories et non sur des interactions multipliées. Elle suggère de déterminer l'interaction et l'indissociabilité qui existe entre les éléments culturels et naturels dans le sens du critère (v). Elle souligne qu'une telle interaction ne se déroule qu'en ce lieu et estime qu'une étude thématique internationale sur la transhumance telle que celle qui est recommandée n'apporterait rien de plus. Elle déclare que les informations données par l'Etat Partie semblent rejoindre son point de vue et conclut qu'elle ne pourrait adhérer à l'option du différé en l'état.

The Delegation of **Qatar** noted how the nominated site expressed the relationship between people and the harsh desert environment. In addition, the property was emblematic of a new way of living and provided a vision for States of the region to apprehend deserts, building on a tradition that went back thousands of years. The Delegation considered that it would be important to explore further desert landscapes within the framework of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Serbia** wondered what the view of the local communities was, and whether they were ready to continue their traditional ways of life and maintain the property. The Delegation requested that the State Party clarify this point.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** reiterated the characteristics of this cultural landscape and the reasons why it considered that it possessed Outstanding Universal Value. With regard to the question posed by the Delegation of Mexico, the State Party explained that the government supported an existing traditional management at the property.

ICOMOS recognized that agro-pastoralism played a very important role in global terms, and was perhaps the type of land-use which had the greatest impact on landscapes worldwide, as shown also by the thematic study conducted by ICOMOS for the Mediterranean region. ICOMOS therefore welcomed nominations concerning agro-pastoralist sites. The problem with this proposal was that it concerned a relatively small area and community and did not sufficiently explained its universal dimension.

Le **Rapporteur** présente le projet de décision et les amendements qui y sont proposés, elle note qu'au vu des discussions menées dans la salle, il serait souhaitable de poursuivre la discussion car les opinions exprimées à ce stade ne peuvent pas être conciliées dans une proposition de décision.

Le **Président** donne la parole aux membres du Comité pour que le Rapporteur puisse saisir les différentes opinions et pour faciliter le processus de décision.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** déclare qu'après avoir écouté les déclarations de l'ICOMOS, elle souscrit à l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted the unique habitat represented by the property being nominated, and supports the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stressed the exceptional character of the property. Having listened to the State Party, it considered that the concerns expressed by ICOMOS could be addressed in due time and that there was no reason to withhold inscription, without which, on the contrary, the site could be at risk.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne le très grand intérêt du dossier mais estime que des études comparatives doivent être complétées. Elle déclare donc soutenir les propositions de l'Estonie et de la Suisse.

The Delegation of **Estonia** raised the issue of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation recalled that this is prepared by the Advisory Body when a site is recommended for inscription or referral, but was not available when deferral was recommended, precisely because in this case the OUV had not been demonstrated. The Delegation wondered therefore how it would be possible in this case to inscribe the property without a properly drafted Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which could obviously not be elaborated on the spot. It also recalled that the Audit carried out recently had recommended that the Committee should refrain from listing properties without a finalised Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the site had certainly a potential to demonstrate outstanding universal value, but considered that more time was necessary to enable the State Party to further strengthen the nomination. Therefore, the Delegation was in favour of deferral.

Le **Président** indique souhaiter trouver un compromis qui pourrait être celui du renvoi du dossier.

Noting the complexity of the case, the Delegation of **Colombia** wished to emphasize the great importance of this property and the threats to which it was exposed. It conceded that some slight adjustments were probably necessary to improve the nomination.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** déclare rejoindre la position de la Colombie pour le renvoi de l'inscription.

The Delegation of **India** had no doubt that the site being nominated possessed an Outstanding Universal Value. Any delay in its inscription could endanger the property. The Delegation could agree to a referral, however this should be accompanied by a very strong endorsement of the proposal by the Committee as well as by a request to ICOMOS to work closely together with the State Party so that, within one year, the nomination could come back to the Committee. The Delegation requested that the State Party be allowed to comment on this solution.

Le **Président** remercie la Délégation de l'Inde pour son intervention et sa proposition mais invite d'abord les autres Etats Partie qui le souhaitent à prendre la parole avant de donner une nouvelle fois la parole à l'Iran.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note la divergence des positions en présence et soutient l'Inde qui souhaite donner la parole à l'Etat Partie.

Le **Président** demande si des membres du Comité s'opposent au renvoi.

La Délégation du **Mexique** aimerait réitérer sa position qui va dans le fil de ce qu'a dit le représentant de l'Inde. Elle estime que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site extraordinaire et unique est manifeste dans le document soumis par l'ICOMOS. Elle déclare que pour résoudre le problème auquel le Comité fait face, elle est prête à souscrire au renvoi avec un engagement pour une inscription future et pour un accompagnement de l'Etat Partie.

The Delegation of **Qatar** concurred completely with the position expressed by the Delegation of India. Qatari people used to live in the desert, but had abandoned this way of life. This however had survived in Iran and needed to be conserved and promoted.

Le **Président** demande s'il y a une opposition au renvoi et n'en voyant aucune, suppose que c'est un compromis possible. Il invite l'Etat Partie de l'Iran à prendre la parole.

The Observer delegation of **Iran** reiterating its commitment to the spirit of the Convention, expressed its agreement to the proposal for referral.

Le **Rapporteur** souligne que d'après la discussion des délégués, il y a une valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle qui peut être soulignée dans le paragraphe 2. Le nouveau projet de décision renvoie à l'Etat Partie et reconnaît l'importante valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle. Elle indique qu'il est possible de barrer le terme « potentiel ».

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande au Comité de prendre une décision. Elle estime que si on renvoie à l'Etat Partie, cela signifie que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est avérée. Elle pense que cette décision semble avoir été prise.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the point made by the Delegation of Switzerland. The Committee had agreed that the property possessed Outstanding Universal

Value. As for the elaboration of a statement with the appropriate technical terms and details, this could be left to the State Party with the support of the Advisory Body.

ICOMOS stated that it would be ready to work closely with the State Party in relation to the establishment of the OUV. The Committee was of the view that this property could demonstrate OUV. The question, however, was exactly how. ICOMOS wondered if the Committee had any suggestions in this regard and if these could be captured in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** repeated that OUV was demonstrated. As to how to articulate this, the Delegation was of the view that this should have been done over the coming months with the support of ICOMOS thanks to its “vast experience”.

The Draft Decision **37 COM B.27** was adopted.

Le **Président** remercie l'Etat Partie de l'Iran pour avoir facilité le travail du Comité. Il invite le Vice Président, le représentant de la Colombie, à venir le remplacer.

C.3.2. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong
Id. N°	1278 Rev
State Party	Democratic People's Republic of Korea

L'**ICOMOS** présente le dossier d'évaluation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that this nomination had been in preparation since the year 2000. It congratulated the State Party for the improvements made to the original proposal.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated the State Party for the exceptional site being nominated.

Les Délégations de la **France**, de l'**Algérie**, des **Emirats Arabes Unis**, du **Qatar**, de la **Serbie**, de la **Malaisie**, de l'**Inde**, de la **Thaïlande** et de l'**Inde**, du **Mali** félicitent l'ICOMOS et l'Etat Partie et salue cette proposition d'inscription.

The **Rapporteur** read out the Draft Decision with the amendments proposed.

Le projet de décision **37 COM 8B.30** est adopté.

The Observer Delegation of the **Democratic People's Republic of Korea** thanked the Government of Cambodia, the members of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies as well as UNESCO for the overwhelming support received in the preparation of this nomination. The State Party stated that all Koreans, and indeed all peoples of the

world, should take pride at the inscription on the World Heritage List of the “Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong”, which is the second site to be recognized in the DPRK. It committed to protecting this important property, notably by enforcing soon appropriate legal measures and guidelines, as part of wider efforts to build a thriving state. Last year, for example, the Pyongyang Folklore Park was inaugurated, a grand open-air museum on the time-honoured history of Korea, which is playing an important role as a centre of cultural and historical education. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will strive to further strengthen the friendly and cooperative relations with the member states of UNESCO, while fulfilling its responsibilities and obligations to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

The meeting rose at 12.30 pm

SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 23 June 2013

THIRTEENTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES (*continuation*)

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Water features and Hercules within the Bergpark Wilhelmshöhe
Id. N°	1413
State Party	Germany

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that a factual error letter in regards to this nomination had been received.

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** had no other comments than support for this wonderful proposal.

The Delegation of **Estonia**, supported by the Delegation of **Mexico**, congratulated the State Party of Germany for finding new ways of expressing values in modern European heritage.

La Délégation de la **France** note que ce remarquable jardin mérite l'entrée sur la Liste ; elle félicite l'Allemagne pour l'excellente proposition, et l'ICOMOS pour la recommandation favorable.

The Delegation of **Colombia** joined the previous speakers in their support for this nomination. However, it asked Germany why it had referred to criteria (ii) and (vi) and why ICOMOS did not endorse these two criteria.

The Delegations of **India, Mali South Africa, Cambodia, United Arab Emirates Qatar, Ethiopia**, commended the State Party and agreed that the property deserved to be on the World Heritage List.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.33** was adopted.

The Chairperson congratulated the State Party.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Committee members for having supported the nomination. The representative of the State of Hessen expressed his gratitude to the Committee and explained that the property had been on the Tentative List since 1986. He explained how it had taken many years to prepare the nomination, and thanked the World Heritage Centre for support during that time. It also thanked ICOMOS for its favourable report and professional dealings. It finally thanked the Committee in the name of the minister of Culture and Science.

Property	Medici Villas and Gardens
Id. N°	175
State Party	Italy

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party of Italy for the excellent nomination, thanked ICOMOS for the excellent evaluation, and expressed its support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated Italy for presenting this file and recognized the valuable contribution of ICOMOS. It stated that these villas are not only important for Europe, as several models also came to South America, such as Calla Cortez in Mexico, providing a series of architectural references to the Medici villas.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** félicite l'Italie pour cette proposition et appuie l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite l'Italie qui a montré qu'elle est un réservoir inépuisable des éléments du patrimoine de grande valeur. Elle félicite également l'Italie pour ses contributions importantes pour le bon fonctionnement de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de la **France** présente ses félicitations et suggère que le nom du bien soit modifié pour lire *Villas et jardins de Médicis en Toscane*.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that it had been led to believe that traditional European architecture had been exhausted for potential World Heritage Listing material, but noted that clearly this was not the case and expressed its understanding that the Papal Villas might be next in line.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that Italy is an endless fountain of contributions to unique architecture and landscape nominations. It congratulated the State Party for another property.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** congratulated Italy for the inscription of this exceptional site, and was not surprised to see so many Italian sites inscribed, as this country is an inexhaustible source of treasures, and stated that the file presented was excellent.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remarque que l'Italie a fait encore une fois un cadeau magnifique au monde, et félicite ce pays pour ce nouveau site inscrit.

L'ICOMOS souscrit à la demande de la France pour une précision géographique dans le nom du bien.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** est d'accord avec la proposition de changement de nom.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.34** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) remercie le Comité pour l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste. Elle remercie particulièrement le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS pour l'expertise et l'évaluation du bien. Elle remercie également les autorités et le peuple cambodgiens de leur accueil. L'Italie se dit heureuse et fière de cette inscription. Ce paysage étalé sur quatre provinces a été une inspiration pour les artistes de la Renaissance à nos jours, et ses valeurs correspondent aux valeurs de la paix et de l'harmonie avec la nature qui sont chers à l'UNESCO. Mme Scaletti, Conseillère pour la culture de la région de la Toscane, remercie l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour leur contribution à cette importante inscription, et le Gouvernement du Cambodge pour son accueil. Elle espère que cette inscription soit entendue comme une invitation de visiter la région de la Toscane, pour sentir l'expression de vivre en harmonie avec la nature, chère aux Médicis.

Property	The Town and the Castle of Vianden
Id. N°	1420
State Party	Luxembourg

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité d'un échange de courrier avec les autorités du Luxembourg et cite la réponse du Luxembourg datant du 17 juin 2013 : « Le paragraphe 153 des Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial prévoit explicitement la possibilité pour le Comité de différer l'examen du dossier de candidature. Le paragraphe 160 en fixe les modalités : « Le Comité peut décider de différer une proposition d'inscription pour effectuer une évaluation ou une étude plus approfondie, ou demander une révision substantielle à l'Etat partie ». La lettre de la Délégation du Luxembourg auprès de l'UNESCO explique que c'est cette lecture, ainsi que les circonstances en cause, qui les ont amenés à opter pour le report offert au paragraphe 160. La Délégation espère que

les membres du Comité pourront favorablement examiner leur demande et différer l'examen du dossier jusqu'à la prochaine session du Comité.

Le projet de décision **38 COM 8B.35** a été adopté.

C.4.2. Extensions of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Wieliczka and Bochnia Royal Salt Mines [extension of "Wieliczka Salt Mine", (iv), 1978/2008]
Id. N°	32 Ter
State Party	Poland

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that a factual error letter had been received regarding this site. It explained that the content of the letter may have some implication on the text of the Draft Decision .

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed amendments to the Draft Decision .

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.41** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Poland** expressed its appreciation for the Committee's approval for the requested extension. It explained that it provided a new dimension to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.3. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex
Id. N°	981 Rev
State Party	Russian Federation

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to present the evaluation of the nomination "Bolgar Historical and Archeological Complex".

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that a factual error letter had been received regarding the nomination, included in Document WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B.4.

ICOMOS presented an overview of the nomination. It made reference to the factual error letter that corrected factual errors regarding wrong date attributions and an incorrect attribution of the reconstruction of the roof of the Black Chamber which in fact had not been replaced since the 19th century. It recalled the meeting of experts between the Russian Federation and ICOMOS that took place in Paris at the end of May 2013 and expressed its appreciation for the constructive atmosphere of the respective exchange of perspectives. ICOMOS reminded the Committee, that the respective nomination was deferred by the Committee at its 24th and 25th session (2000, 2001). At the time, ICOMOS had recommended the inscription under criterion (iii). Due to concerns about the authenticity of the site, the Committee had decided to defer the nomination in order to allow the State Party to refocus the nomination and to organize workshops on the question of authenticity.

ICOMOS further presented briefly the geographical, historical and archeological profile of the site. ICOMOS pointed to the fact that it just learned from the factual error booklet that the structure of the “Eastern Chambers”, which it considered in its evaluation in need of cautious consolidation had in the meantime been consolidated. In ICOMOS’ view, like earlier conservation activities, this consolidation has been carried out by far too extensively. It stated that the State Party is in the process of undertaking a number of constructions in and around the property. It further stated that the number of 50.000 pilgrims arriving in the pilgrimage season at the site is expected to multiply several times in the near future. ICOMOS expressed its consideration that the focus of the management of the property would be oriented towards the religious significance of the site and the development of tourism infrastructure at the expense of historic materials and archeological layers. Despite its previous recommendation for inscription in 2001 ICOMOS explained its conclusion that the significant changes to the historic substance in both consolidation and reconstruction measures as well as the construction of new developments had reduced the capacity of the site to provide credible testimony to the historic periods it is affiliated with. It stated that in particular authenticity could no longer been met. It underlined that in ICOMOS view the focus of the financially well-equipped management of the site would clearly not be the protection of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. Having taken into account the discussions at previous Committee sessions, the material provided by the State Party and the present state of conservation of the site, ICOMOS recommended that “Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex” should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Bureau had decided to set up a working group on the issue moderated by the Delegation of Senegal. The Chairperson invited the Delegation of Senegal to inform the Committee about the work by the group.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se réfère aux discussions difficiles menées dans le groupe de travail qu'elle a présidé. Les positions d'ICOMOS ainsi que la position de l'Etat partie soumettant la proposition ont été entendues. Deux documents sont présentés : le projet de décision proposé par le Secrétariat et le projet de décision proposé par un certain nombre de pays demandant l'inscription du site, les deux étant radicalement opposés. Le mandat du groupe était avoir une proposition consensuelle, pas unanime. Cette proposition est la suivante : Demander le renvoi

du dossier à l'Etat partie afin qu'il puisse ; à la prochaine session, avec l'aide de ICOMOS prendre des mesures correctives pour consolider le critère (iii). Si, en revanche, le critère (vi) est inclus, un temps plus long serait nécessaire afin que ICOMOS puisse évaluer ce critère.

The **Chairperson** thanked Senegal and invited other Committee members to express their views.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the photograph being displayed in the meeting room demonstrated the interfaith dialogue currently taking place at this particular place. It thanked ICOMOS for its good work, and noted that in 2000 and 2001, ICOMOS had twice recommended inscription, but that the Bureau had recommended a workshop to obtain additional information. It suggested that ICOMOS's current recommendation not to inscribe the property was likely due to a change in personnel. It suggested that an open and complete discussion take place to further investigate this matter. It remarked that nothing has changed since ICOMOS's evaluation in 2000 and 2001. It asked what aspects of this site should be recognized by the Committee. The Delegation noted that the growing and different concepts of heritage does not allow for a non-inscription, but that the discussion have as a starting point, the referral of the nomination, as suggested by the working group. It presented a member of the Indian delegation as an expert in heritage conservation and asked that they be given the chance to comment on the technical matters of the nomination. It also noted that for structures across the world, the permanence of materials was not uniform. It reminded the Committee that the environment was harsh here, and should thus be considered differently. It suggested that criteria (vi) should be considered by the Committee, emphasizing that the importance of faith, of Islam as a movement, should be respected.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Delegation of India seemed to query the advisability of setting up a working group and asked the Legal Advisor to clarify the issue.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that the matter was about an informal drafting working group that was constituted by the Chairperson to assist the Committee to reach agreement. It further stated that the Chairperson consequently informed the Committee and invited all Members to participate in the Working Group. The Legal Advisor declared that the setting up of the Working Group was totally within the mandate of the Chairperson.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie l'ICOMOS et le groupe de travail. Elle souligne la concordance du Comité sur l'importance de la proposition d'inscription car elle couvre en partie le vide de ce genre de biens culturels qui ne sont pas actuellement suffisamment représentés sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle considère que l'Etat partie est tout à fait conscient du respect de l'authenticité du bien. La Délégation se réfère au Document de Nara concernant l'authenticité.

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported the Delegation of India. It underlined its appreciation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site due to its significance as a cradle of Islam in Russia, noting that pilgrimage to the site was complementary to the pilgrimage to Mecca. The Delegation stated that both its cultural and religious components proved the suitability of the site as a candidate for inscription and supported the addition of criterion (vi).

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted how the site was an important testimony of an extinct empire. It pointed to the fact that it had visited the property recently and underlined that recent interventions on the site had been focused rather on reconstruction than on cautious restoration and conservation, thus seriously undermining its authenticity. It pointed further to the commonly shared objective of the Committee to strengthen the role of the Convention as a flagship for the highest standards of conservation. It expressed its concern that the Committee seemed to rebel against its own principals. The Delegation concluded that it could not support the inscription, as it did not meet the criteria as established under the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Qatar** pointed to the unique value of the site as a meeting place between North, South, East and West. It mentioned that the property was documented in ancient scripts and travel logs. It noted the extensive efforts of the government of Tartastan to preserve the site. The Delegation underlined the significance of the property as a symbol for peaceful coexistence of religions and expressed its support for the position of India.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stated that the item was different from other cases. It expressed its appreciation for the efforts of ICOMOS. Even though the site might not meet all criteria, the Delegation pointed to the spiritual significance of the site and insisted on the recognition of its value as testimony of interfaith dialogue.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its thanks to the Working Group. It noted the dedication of the Russian Federation to the nomination. It stated that the main issues of the nomination consisted in the admission of factual errors in regard to authenticity as well as the support for criterion (vi). The Delegation expressed its support for the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its support for the position taken by the Delegations of India and Iraq and stated that it would support the inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the property was nominated as an archaeological site. It requested information from ICOMOS regarding the extent of reconstruction and the potential for future excavations. Further it requested information about the possibility to reverse the recent reconstruction.

La Délégation de la **France** salue les efforts du groupe de travail et remercie l'ensemble des participants et son Président de leur contribution. Elle soutient la proposition consensuelle.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** avoue que l'examen de ce dossier l'interpelle, non pas sur la forme, mais par la philosophie de l'ICOMOS, notamment la détermination de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Elle est surtout intéressé par la dimension religieuse, de l'Islam, de ce bien, tout en soulignant que le bien transparait dans ses attributs civilisationnels, et non pas ceux de la religion islamique. Elle n'est pas d'accord avec l'ICOMOS sur la signification religieuse de ce bien. De plus, ce site est le point d'aboutissement de l'extrémité orientale de l'influence de la culture musulmane, donc le critère (iii) est largement suffisant. Ces éléments plaident en faveur de l'inscription de ce site sur la liste.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique ne pas manquer de sympathie pour inscrire ce site. L'Etat partie a eu douze ans pour se conformer aux décisions du Comité. Or, pendant douze ans les mesures prises ont plutôt porté atteinte à l'authenticité du site. Le Délégation constate que le nouveau rapport de l'ICOMOS est plutôt négatif suite à une reconstruction intempestive. Il est difficile pour le Comité de procéder à une inscription contre l'avis de évaluation par l'Organisation consultative. Elle se dit en accord avec la position de la Délégation de l'Estonie et salue les travaux du groupe de travail, bien menés par le représentant du Sénégal. Dans cet esprit, elle serait d'accord pour proposer un renvoi et l'envoi d'une mission qui pourrait contribuer à une réorientation du développement du site par les autorités, car les atteintes à l'authenticité risquent de continuer, notamment aussi pour le critère (vi).

The Delegation of **Malaysia** underlined the uniqueness of the nominated site, in particular due to its relevance for spirituality as living tradition. It expressed its support for the inscription of the site with the request that the State Party would report back at the next Committee meeting.

The Delegation of **Thailand** pointed on the remarkable enduring efforts of the local communities to ensure coexistence of different religions. It expressed its support for the inscription.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** recalled the arguments by the Delegations of India, Iraq, Qatar and gave its consent to the inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its appreciation for the efforts of the chairperson and the Working Group to find a consensus. It announced that in a spirit of compromise, Germany could associate itself with the proposal of the Working Group as it had been mentioned by France and Switzerland.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** pointed out, that by giving the State Party time to redefine the values that were lost in the last ten years a middle course could be adopted. It gave its consent to a referral of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Mexique** indique qu'il est nécessaire de prendre en compte la question du Document de Nara. Elle souligne que la question de l'authenticité n'est pas une question fermée mais plutôt une question qui est toujours débattue. Elle considère que cette question implique aussi la signification spirituelle.

The **Chairperson** noted that members of the Committee had expressed the hope to hear the State Party as requested notably by the Delegation of India.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to take the floor.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** thanked the Committee for the active consideration of the file. It pointed to the Outstanding Universal Value of the site was an outstanding junction between Asia and Europe that linked Bagdad to Scandinavia as a part of the silk route.

It underlined that considerable work had been carried out to implement the decision of the 24th and 25th session of the Committee. After the 24th session the construction of an electric plant that had been planned in a distance of 150 km from the site had been halted.. Regional and federal communities have been involved with the

appropriate funding, scientific seminars were organized in order to resolve the issues connected with authenticity and integrity, a special council of experts was set up, including international specialists and with participation of ICCROM. In order to solve the issues related to the development of the site, a special fund was set up for the rebirth of historical monuments.

It pointed out that in order to resolve the issue of authenticity, restoration cement used earlier in 20th century had been removed, concrete covering had been dismantled and hydro-isolation and hydraulic protection have been strengthened. New Units have all been constructed over and beyond the boundaries of the site. Furthermore, constructions at the riverside were set up to bolster the riverbanks and to avert landslides to preserve the integrity of the site. The Delegation underlined that most of the efforts had been aimed at maintaining the integrity and authenticity of the property. It noted that up to 60.000 pilgrims came to the site on national Islam day and the site therefore needed comprehensive protection. Only five percent of the territory under consideration has been the object of archeological excavations. It stated that most part of the territory was not covered by any structures.

The Delegation announced that the advice of the members of the scientific council of experts regarding the authenticity of the site and the construction of new structures would be followed. It pointed out that the project was supported by many national, local and native stakeholders. The Delegation of the Russian Federation expressed thanks to ICOMOS for its work and stated that scientific experts that were part of the joint mission in October 2012 had supported the nomination.

Regarding the percentage of reconstructions, or new constructions on the territory in comparison to the percentage of the coverage of the surface with archeological treasures; **ICOMOS** stated that it did not have exact statistics with regard to this matter. It pointed to the fact that usually the Committee was not judging the impact of reconstruction and new construction on the basis of its surface coverage, but on the nature of the respective project that had taken place. Nonetheless, the provided maps showed that there were several areas of archeological potential to be excavated in the future. It stated that these might be easily larger than the five percent that had been excavated yet.

Concerning its conclusiveness of judgment of authenticity; **ICOMOS** stated that authenticity in material, substance, craftsmanship and setting had been compromised through the measures and projects undertaken. However, ICOMOS concluded in its report that the only information sources which retained authenticity were location, spirit and feeling in relation to the fact that Muslim pilgrims continued to venerate the site as the origin of Islam in this region and conduct their annual pilgrimages.

Le Délégation du **Mexique** remercie l'ICOMOS pour ses précisions et considère que le site a toutes les conditions pour être inscrit. Néanmoins, elle accepte de se rapprocher des conclusions du groupe de travail pour un renvoi de la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the fact that only five percent of the coverage was excavated compromised the ability to judge on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. It asked ICOMOS if the remaining 95 percent could be considered as intact.

ICOMOS underlined that it was not possible to assume, that 100 percent of the site within the boundaries had potential for future archeological excavations. Maps received from the State Party indicating the areas of archeological potential showed that the areas of archeological potential were potentially slightly larger than the five percent that had already been excavated.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its support for the recommendations made by the Working Group.

The Delegation of **Japan** gave its consent to the proposal prepared by the Working Group.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** highly valued consensus and expressed full respect for the work performed by the Working Group. It noted that nonetheless the site had been waiting far too long. It stated that the State Party was able to fill in all gaps that had been identified and expressed its support for the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **India** insisted that the Nara Document on authenticity should be considered. It noted that the cultural context of the property had been misremembered in the debate. Criterion (vi) should be accepted by all Member States of the Committee. It proposed that the issue of authenticity should be resolved through an international workshop as it was proposed earlier.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Mali to express its position.

The Delegation of **Mali** expressed its support for the conclusions of the working group.

The **Chairperson** recalled that Member States that had not yet expressed their position should take the floor.

To clarify, the Delegation of **Senegal** pointed out that it was supporting a referral of the nomination. It underlined that consensus was in the highest interest of the Committee for maintaining and safeguarding its credibility.

It was decided to suspend the session to allow consultations among Members of the Committee.

After the suspension, and with a view to maintain a spirit of consensus and in order to avoid a vote of this matter, the Chairperson encouraged the Members of the Committee to reach an agreement and suggested to adopt the decision to refer back the nomination.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Chairperson for its wise guidance. It expressed its thanks to all States Parties due to their active participation in the process. Invoking the traditions of consensus and recognizing the role that the Russian Federation had played the Delegation proposed to refer the nomination, but to recognize the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. The Delegation further proposed to give the floor to the respective State Party.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its sincere thanks to the Committee members that supported the nomination. It stated that it would accept the decision for a referral on the basis of the proposal made by India. The Delegation announced an extensive work and an enhanced cooperation with ICOMOS regarding the property in the next years. It expressed its confidence that the site would subsequently be inscribed on the World Heritage List under criterion (vi). It invited ICOMOS to review and discuss the situation of the property as soon as possible and assist the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to read through the Draft Decision on the screen.

The Delegation of **India** insisted that the draft decision should include explicitly the approval of criterion (vi).

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.43** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7A. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER *(continuation)*

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev) 37 COM 7A

The **Chairperson** informed that intensive negotiations were held on the state of conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls throughout the session, but no consensus was reached.

A Draft Decision was presented by the Delegations of **Algeria, Qatar, UAE and Iraq**.

A first request was put forward to vote on the adjournment of the debate and another request for closure of the debate was introduced.

The Committee decided to vote by a roll call rather than by secret ballot on the motion of adjournment of the debate. The Committee by simple majority voted against the adjournment of the debate.

Subsequently, it decided by consensus to close the debate and to proceed to a vote on the Draft Decision.

Following a vote by a roll call, this Draft Decision was adopted by a majority of the Committee members present and voting.

The **Chairperson** delivered a statement which is included in Annex VII to the present document.

The Observer Delegations of **Israel, Jordan and Palestine** made statements after the adoption of the Decision. These statements can be found in Annex VIII, IX and X of the present document.

EIGHTH DAY – MONDAY 24 June 2013

FOURTEENTH MEETING

9 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

7A. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (*continuation*)

The **Chairperson** opened the Session and announced the need to close Item 7A. It requested the **Centre** to present the list of State of Conservation reports from the Arab region not open for discussion.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ARAB REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Assour (Qal'at Sherqat)- (Iraq) – 37 COM 7A.24,
Ville archéologique de Samarra (Iraq) – 37 COM 7A.25
Lieu de naissance de Jésus : l'église de la Nativité et la route de pèlerinage Bethléem (Palestine)¹ – 37 COM 7A.27
Ville historique de Zabid (Yémen). – 37 COM 7A.28

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

8C. UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/8C

Decisions: **37.COM 8C.1, 37.COM 8C.2, 37.COM 8C.3**

¹ The Delegation of Germany requested that the following be inserted in the present document "With regard to the denomination of "Palestine": the Delegation of Germany refers to its Explanations of Vote in the UNESCO General Conference on 31 October 2011 and in the UN General Assembly on 29 November 2012."

The **Chairperson** moved to Agenda Item 8C and requested the **Secretariat** to orally present the updated list of sites on the In Danger List.

The Secretariat outlined the decision taken concerning new inscriptions on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that 19 new properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List, 5 being natural and 14 being cultural. It added that 3 properties previously inscribed on the List were extended and that following the debate of Agenda Item 8B, 5 properties were referred and 3 deferred. It mentioned that the Committee changed the Advisory Bodies' recommendations for 8 cases, in which 2 referrals became inscriptions, 4 deferrals became referrals, 1 deferral became an approved extension and 1 non-inscription became referral. The Secretariat stated that the overall figure on the List is 981 sites, being 759 cultural, 193 natural and 29 mixed, and that the total of 1000 might be reached in the following 38th Session. It remarked that the breakdown of inscribed properties in the 37th Session by region is 2 properties in Africa, 1 in the Arab region, 8 in Asia and Pacific region, 7 properties in Europe and North America and 1 in Latin America and Caribbean region. It pointed out that the State Parties of Fiji, Lesotho and Qatar had their first properties inscribed on the List and that the Committee allocated approximately 22 hours of discussion to examine 30 nominations. The Secretariat specified the 7 properties which were inscribed on the In Danger List as being East Rennell in the Solomon Islands and all the properties located in the Syrian Arab Republic (Ancient City of Damascus, Ancient City of Bosra, Site of Palmyra, Ancient City of Aleppo, Crac des Chevaliers and Qalât Salah El-Din, and Ancient Villages of Northern Syria). It made reference to the removal of Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) from the In Danger List and indicated that 44 properties are in the In Danger List.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se souvient des débats et du choix de présenter la liste des sites inclus dans la même décision. C'est le cas mais ils sont listés un par un. Elle propose donc que l'on écrive « la république syrienne :... le nom des sites » et entre parenthèses la référence d'une unique décision.

Le **Président** prend note de cette décision et indique que ce sera reflété dans le texte de la décision concernée.

The Draft Decisions **37.COM 8C.1**, **37.COM 8C.2**, **37.COM 8C.3** were adopted.

EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

B. MIXED PROPERTIES

B.1. ASIA / PACIFIC

Property	Tasmanian Wilderness
Id. N°	181 Quinquies
State Party	Australia

ICOMOS stated that the minor boundary modification was nominated under natural criteria only and that there were no details on the cultural assets. It understood the need to approve the modification for protection purposes but added that the reasons for not including cultural attributes or consulting Aboriginal communities are unclear. It asked the State Party to consider cultural attributes and to strengthen cultural heritage capacity. It added that consultations have been made and that sites are being inventoried but that ICOMOS cannot comment on the way cultural attributes might support the Outstanding Universal Value, nor on the protection and management of the assets without a formal submission. It recommended the referral of the Minor Boundary Modification and requested for further studies and consultation with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community in order to provide information on cultural value and how it relates to the Outstanding Universal Value. It also requested for information to be provided on the legal provisions and management rangeness for cultural heritage, particularly in relation to the control of access to the archaeological sites and sites of cultural significance for the local community.

IUCN added that the proposed modification includes areas along the northern-eastern boundary of the property, which encompasses several types of natural environments. It showed concern for the eastern boundary since the extension of the property and mentioned the past decisions in which this was shown. In relation to the natural criteria, it concluded that the extension would add to the integrity of the property and improve protection and management. IUCN recommended the Draft Decision to be approved.

La délégation du **Sénégal** souhaiterait entendre l'Etat partie avant de prendre une décision.

The Delegation of **Germany** made reference to the article in the Operational Guidelines referring to Minor Boundary Modification and stated that they need not be evaluated as a new nomination. It commended the State Party for extending the boundaries and added that this modification was requested by the Committee. It appealed for the approval of the Minor Boundary Modification as an urgent need to ensure the integrity of the property.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** recommended acting on the opportunity to protect the values of the property and supported the approval of the extension.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Delegations of **Germany** and **Malaysia** and endorsed the approval of the Minor Boundary Modification.

The Delegation of **Serbia** welcomed the efforts from the State Party to address the threats of logging and supported the solution of modifying the boundaries. It mentioned the adoption of the Tasmanian Forestry Agreement Act and strongly supported the approval of the Minor Boundary Modification.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie l'Allemagne et la Malaisie sur le commentaire concernant la proposition d'adopter la décision.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** thanked and clarified that the State Party has managed the mixed property considering both cultural and natural values and has undertaken the process of the protection under the Tasmanian Forestry Agreement Act and the Tasmanian Forestry Protection Act. It added that a statement from a Tasmanian aboriginal was going to be read. The Observer Delegation read a statement of a Tasmanian aboriginal peoples which indicated that heritage is of crucial importance but that much has been destroyed and cannot be restored. It remarked that if aboriginal heritage is destroyed there will be no evidence of their culture nor will people be able to visit the special places. It stated that heritage helps the wider community to understand past and present so as to allow people to go forward together and that heritage left by the aboriginal people directly connects to their ancestors. The statement concluded with the support for the extension of the boundaries of the property as being critical for ensuring the protection of culture and for the future.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.44** was adopted as amended.

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

C.1 ARAB STATES

Property	Tyre
Id. N°	299 Bis
State Party	Lebanon

L'ICOMOS indique qu'en 1995, un rapport fait état d'un projet de modernisation du Vieux Port qui menace les vestiges sous-marins. Une protection est demandée ainsi qu'une carte archéologique. En 2010, une déclaration rétrospective de VUE ainsi qu'une clarification des limites du site sont présentées. Le Comité demande à l'Etat partie d'établir une zone de protection maritime. En 2011, le Comité encourage la création d'une Zone tampon. En 2012, le Comité demande de compléter la définition de la zone tampon et une déclaration de modification mineure des limites. En 2013, l'Etat partie soumet une nouvelle clarification des limites du bien inscrit en 1984 et

retire la carte soumise en 2010 ; il apporte une modification mineure des limites qui comprend une partie seulement des vestiges sous-marins et indique la création d'une zone tampon comprenant les deux communes voisines. L'ICOMOS recommande de renvoyer la proposition à l'Etat partie afin de lui permettre d'inclure la zone archéologique sous-marine plus les vestiges de la tour d'Amra + la basilique byzantine + l'aqueduc et une carte. Elle recommande également la création d'une zone tampon maritime, la préparation d'une carte du district de Tyr comprenant les 2 communes ayant un potentiel archéologique et la préparation d'informations sur le fonctionnement détaillé de la zone tampon.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.45** was adopted.

C.2 ASIA/PACIFIC

Property	Royal Tombs of the Joseon Dynasty
Id. N°	1319 Bis
State Party	Republic of Korea

ICOMOS stated that the Minor Boundary Modification was proposed for one property of the serial nomination of 18 sites and its buffer zone in order to correct a cartographic error made at the time of the inscription and added that the size or buffer zone of the inscribed property will not be changed. ICOMOS recommends the approval of the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.46** was adopted.

Property	Town of Luang Prabang
Id. N°	479 Bis
State Party	Lao People's Democratic Republic

ICOMOS informed that a reactive monitoring mission visited the property in 2007 and that the mission recommended an immediate moratorium of some of the most problematic development projects, the revision of the urban plan, the establishment of a buffer zone and the redefinition of the property's boundaries. The Minor Boundary Modification responded to the requests made and increased the size of the property and of the buffer zones. **ICOMOS** recommended the approval of the Minor Boundary Modification.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.47** was adopted.

Property	Baroque Churches of the Philippines
Id. N°	677 Bis
State Party	Philippines

ICOMOS stated that when the 4 Baroque Churches were inscribed there were no clear buffer zones. A definition of the boundaries of the properties was later requested in the retrospective inventory exercise. It described the 4 buffer zones proposed for all the components of the property as well as the two boundary expansions. It added that for the Church of Nuestra Señora de la Asunción no justification was provided for the unbalanced buffer zone distribution. It remarked that for the Church of San Agustín (Paoay) the expanded boundaries have included the convent ruins not mentioned in the initial nomination dossier and requested for further information as to how this component contributes to the Outstanding Universal Value of the series. It mentioned that no changes were made to the boundaries of the Church of Santo Tomás de Villanueva but recommended the establishment of a buffer zone encompassing the entire property, given that none was created for the Southwest area. It approved the Minor Boundary Modification for the Church of the Immaculate Conception of San Agustín (Manila) and referred the modification presented for the Church of San Agustín (Paoay) back to the State Party to justify the contribution of the convent. It also referred the boundary modification of the Church of Santo Tomás de Villanueva and of the Church of Nuestra Señora de la Asunción.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.48** was adopted.

C.3 EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

Property	Amiens Cathedral
Id. N°	162 Bis
State Party	France

ICOMOS gave an overview of how the property was inscribed without a buffer zone and of how it became surrounded by a protection perimeter stipulated by French Law. At the 35th session of the Committee, the State Party was requested to clarify the boundaries in response to the retrospective inventory and the State Party proposed a 115 ha buffer zone incorporating the existing previous protection perimeters as well as a protective mechanism regarding construction works within the field of visibility of the monument. ICOMOS recommended the approval of the buffer zone.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.49** was adopted.

Property	Bourges Cathedral
Id. N°	635 Bis
State Party	France

ICOMOS gave an overview of how the property was inscribed without a buffer zone and how it was protected by a 500 meter perimeter stipulated by the French law. At the 35th Session of the Committee, the State Party was requested to clarify the boundaries in response to the retrospective inventory and the State Party proposed a buffer zone of 105 ha which incorporates and merges two existing legal protection

zones, one regarding the safeguarding sector and the second referring to a protection perimeter. ICOMOS recommended the proposed buffer zone to be approved.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.50** was adopted.

Property	Aachen Cathedral
Id. N°	3 Bis
State Party	Germany

ICOMOS indique qu'en 1978, le site ne comprenait pas de zone tampon. En 2009, l'Etat partie a fait une demande de modifications et de changement mineur du nom du site. Le Comité a approuvé l'impact négatif sur la VUE. En 2012, une clarification des limites est faite. En 2013, la proposition de création de la zone tampon comprend la zone médiévale pour une protection de l'intégrité du bien inscrit. Mais la documentation n'est pas fournie dans l'une des deux langues de travail de la Convention ce qui ne donne pas la possibilité d'étudier et d'évaluer les informations. L'ICOMOS recommande donc de renvoyer le dossier afin de permettre à l'Etat partie d'expliquer les modifications comprenant l'inclusion de certaines rues et de certains monuments, d'expliquer le mécanisme de protection de la zone tampon, le fonctionnement de sa protection et l'autorité en charge de la zone.

La délégation de la **France** propose de demander à l'Etat partie de fournir les explications manquantes puisqu'il y a un système de traduction dans la salle et d'adopter la décision.

The Delegation of **Germany** apologised for being brief in filling in the format requested for the implementation of a buffer zone. It stated that the concept for the buffer zone of the property is one of the best among German World Heritage sites and added that it was accepted at different levels and took into account the view axis and history of the property. It mentioned the buffer zone as a protection area and made reference to the regulations being implemented. It commented on the comprehensive statute for the conservation and informed that a summary will be submitted.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.51** was adopted as amended.

Property	Historic Centre of Warsaw
Id. N°	30 Bis
State Party	Poland

ICOMOS le site comprend la vieille ville à l'intérieur des fortifications mais la ville extra muros subit une forte pression de l'urbanisation. Il n'existe pas de zone tampon ni de plan d'aménagement pour préserver la vue sur et depuis les remparts. La zone tampon clairement délimitée de 660 ha permettrait de protéger le panorama mais la

proposition n'est pas assortie d'une protection légale de l'ensemble. L'ICOMOS recommande donc le renvoi pour permettre à l'Etat partie de soumettre des informations détaillées sur la protection de la zone tampon, sur la protection légale dans l'ensemble par une inscription au registre du patrimoine national.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.52** was adopted.

Property	Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications
Id. N°	1367 Bis
State Party	Portugal

ICOMOS indique qu'il s'agit d'un ensemble de grande ampleur du 17^e siècle. En 2012, les vues étaient vulnérables et l'intégrité visuelle menacée. Une zone tampon élargie et un contrôle plus adéquat sont nécessaires. L'extension proposée est conforme; l'ICOMOS recommande donc l'approbation.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.53** was adopted.

Property	Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments
Id. N°	540 Bis
State Party	Russian Federation

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the proposal for boundary modification of the property as well as its recommendation, for approval.

The Delegation of **Estonia** commended the State Party for clarifying this very complicated situation in terms of boundaries, with the assistance of experts from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It requested however ICOMOS to clarify the question of the two phases of this boundary modification.

ICOMOS explained that a further proposal for a boundary modification was awaited in relation to other components of the property, which were extensive.

The **Secretariat** noted the great complexity of this serial property, which was inscribed in 1990 without a clear identification of its boundaries and components. The State Party had been requested to clarify these and a working group had been established for this purpose. A first proposal was thus submitted by the State Party concerning the Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg, while a second was expected in the future concerning other components of the property.

The State Party of the **Russian Federation** wished to thank the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their support through this process.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.54** was adopted.

Property	Burgos Cathedral
Id. N°	316 Bis
State Party	Spain

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the proposal for boundary modification of the property as well as its recommendation, for referral.

The draft decision **37 COM 8B.55** was adopted.

STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE OF FOUR PROPERTIES INSCRIBED AT THE 36TH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE AND NOT ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Documents: WHC-13/37.COM/8B.Add and WHC-13/37.COM/8B.Add2

Decision 37 COM 8B.56

The **Secretariat** presented the item noting that some changes were proposed to the Draft Decision in relation to the section on integrity for the World Heritage property of Lena Pillars (Russian Federation). All Statements of OUV had been elaborated in agreement with the concerned States Parties.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the Draft Decision which addresses important issues, and indicated that it will be voting in favour. With regard to the denomination of "Palestine", it referred to its Explanations of Vote in the UNESCO General Conference on 31 October 2011 and in the UN General Assembly on 29 November 2012.

La Délégation de la **France** ne s'oppose pas à la décision mais exprime sa déception quant à la qualité de la rédaction des déclarations de valeur universelle exceptionnelle et à leur manque de concision.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8B.56** was adopted.

8D. CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE INVENTORY

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/8D

Decision: **37 COM 8D**

The **Secretariat** explained that the retrospective inventory was an initiative established in 2004 to address gaps in documentation concerning listed properties. The project, which was not completed, was suffering from the current financial crisis and for this reason any support from the States Parties was very welcome. The Secretariat noted that 35 clarifications were presented in the document to be examined by the Committee.

Noting that there were no objections, the Draft Decision **37 COM 8D** was adopted.

8E. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/8E
WHC-13/37.COM/8E.ADD
Decision: **37 COM 8E**

The **Secretariat** introduced the item, noting that the document contained in its Annex 196 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, submitted by 58 States Parties. The Secretariat also informed the Committee that by letter dated 20 June 2013, the Indian Government had requested to the Secretariat to withdraw the proposals related to five Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for as many Indian properties. With the agreement of the Committee, therefore, reference to these properties would be removed from the Draft Decision. Finally, the Secretariat emphasized the very high number of Statements of OUV which it had received and the challenges it faced for their translation, due to budgetary constraints, and called once again for support from States Parties.

The **Rapporteur** drew the attention of the Committee to the amendment to the Draft Decision to reflect the withdrawal of the five Indian Statements of OUV.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 8E** was adopted as amendment.

ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST: PROGRESS REPORT ON THE UPSTREAM PROCESSES

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/9
Decision: **37 COM 9**

The **Secretariat** recalled that the reflection on the Future of the Convention had resulted in a recommendation to provide upstream support to States Parties in the preparation of their nominations for World Heritage inscription, and to test this on an experimental basis for a period of time. It was therefore decided to apply such an approach to two nominations within each region, for a total of ten files. The support provided by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre was not limited to these ten nominations, but extended to numerous other initiatives for the preparation of nomination files, such as the complex serial projects for the Qapaq Nan in Latin America and the Silk Roads in Asia. One of the ten sites which received support under the upstream process was actually inscribed by the Committee on the World Heritage List at the present session (from Namibia). The main challenge with the upstream process was related to the lack of resources. The Secretariat, in this regard, called for the States Parties' support.

IUCN welcomed the upstream process as a more transparent and results-oriented approach to nominations, and recalled the positive example of the Namibian site just inscribed. The question was one of the resources and associated capacity building within the States Parties. IUCN reiterated its support to this process and noted that this should in due time be reflected in the Operational Guidelines.

ICOMOS commented that the upstream process appeared to have become "mainstream". An increasing number of requests had been addressed to it in this regard. Advisory missions provided opportunities for support to nominations, as well as to tentative lists. Thematic studies were also helpful. The lack of resources was

the limiting factor, which called for establishing priorities. Would the Committee want to focus on thematic studies and gap analyses or rather concentrate on specific site-based support? At any rate, ICOMOS welcomed the upstream process as this had brought more dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties without compromising the quality of the results.

The Delegation of **India** welcomed the efforts made by the Advisory Bodies. It also noted an asymmetry between IUCN, a well-resourced inter-governmental organization with a presence in the region, and ICOMOS, an NGO with less capacity to provide support. The Delegation also stressed that in the current juncture when International Assistance was not available to States Parties as a result of budget constraints, it was necessary to find ways of providing support to the preparation of nominations through a more intense dialogue with the Advisory Bodies. These should look carefully into this issue at their meeting foreseen next September. The truth is that part of the work of the Advisory Bodies is not in the public domain and more transparency was needed. In addition, the Delegation of India requested ICOMOS to clarify the status of the initiative to support a nomination from the State Party of the Maldives.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that the elaboration of a nomination file was a very complex undertaking. Upstream support should have come at a very early stage, notably when preparing Tentative Lists, where the potential for OUV was established, and through building the capacities of the States Parties, as demonstrated by the problems encountered in some of the ten cases presented. The Delegation stressed the need to establish a link with the budget to provide the necessary support to the upstream process.

In relation to the project being carried out in the State Party of Uruguay, the Delegation of **Colombia** asked ICOMOS to clarify the results of its visit to the property.

La Délégation du **Mexique** estime que la collaboration avec les Organisations consultatives est importante car elle permet de savoir si un site présente une valeur universelle exceptionnelle ou non. La Délégation souligne cependant les difficultés de mise en œuvre des Processus en amont au niveau régional ; cela dépend de la volonté des Etats parties. La Délégation conclut en rappelant l'importance de ce travail conjoint malgré les obstacles financiers.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que les Processus en amont doivent être développés dans le cadre national et régional ; la présence sur le terrain de bureaux des Organisations consultatives est donc un atout. La Délégation ajoute que les études d'impacts menées dans le cadre du montage des propositions d'inscription doivent porter non seulement sur les aspects naturels et environnementaux, comme c'est déjà le cas, mais aussi sur les aspects culturels.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** salue les résultats des Processus en amont et appuie la position de l'Estonie pour étendre ces processus à l'élaboration des listes indicatives. La Délégation, affirmant que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE) est parfois remise en question au moment de l'examen de la proposition d'inscription, demande quelle est la part de responsabilité de l'expert qui décide, lors de l'élaboration des listes indicatives, qu'un bien possède une VUE, lorsque que l'examen de la proposition d'inscription ne confirme pas cette VUE.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that upstream support should start at the stage of Tentative Lists. At the same time, it stressed that the inclusion of a site in the tentative list of a country could not have been taken to mean that this possessed OUV, which remained to be demonstrated through appropriate comparative analysis and in-depth studies in the process of developing the actual nomination file, for which specific resources needed to be allocated.

La Délégation de la **France** souscrit aux préoccupations exprimées par l'Inde et le Sénégal et soutient le développement d'un dialogue plus facile, ouvert et transparent avec les Organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **Germany** stressed that there was a significant difference between a Tentative List and a nomination. The support provided by the Advisory Bodies should have focused mainly on methodology and processes, as well as on building the capacities of the State Party concerned, rather than on specific knowledge of the site in question.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** comprend les Processus en amont au sens large, incluant l'élaboration des listes indicatives. La Délégation considère qu'il s'agit d'un instrument important pour améliorer le dialogue et la transparence et qu'il peut permettre aux Etats parties de réaliser des économies. La Délégation souligne cependant que le renforcement des Processus en amont aura des incidences budgétaires qui nécessiteront des mesures appropriées.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** had recently expressed a wish to see a strengthened dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. It also noted that some countries were in a position to pay for the professional services of the Advisory Bodies, whereas others were not.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite une meilleure représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et pour cela estime que l'élaboration des listes indicatives doit être facilitée, puisqu'il s'agit d'une pré-condition à l'inscription. La Délégation souhaite dans ce cadre que les Organisations consultatives et les Centre de catégorie 2 disposent de davantage de ressources pour encourager le dialogue avec les Etats parties.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted the importance of the upstream process in the broadest sense, that is, including by supporting the development of Tentative Lists. Resources were the main issue. The question of how States Parties could be assisted in preparing better tentative lists had begun at the meeting of the Committee in 1994 (Pukhet, Thailand) yet the Committee had not been able to identify a better process.

The Delegation of **India** started by noting that the gap analysis carried out by ICOMOS had not been updated since 2004. The distribution of World Heritage properties across the regions continued to show a serious unbalance in favour of Europe, which needed to be addressed, including by exploring new types of properties. If ICOMOS did not have the capacity to support this work, perhaps other sources of expertise could have been looked at. If ICOMOS were to continue to be the only source of technical support, however, it needed to transform itself and reach

out to new expertise which is present in the region, including within UNESCO Field Offices and the World Heritage Centre.

La Délégation du **Mexique** appuie la position des Emirats Arabes Unis, du Mali et de l'Inde. La Délégation estime que la question du renforcement des capacités techniques est très importante, mais que les Organisations consultatives doivent capitaliser sur ce renforcement des capacités, afin de poursuivre la coopération avec les experts formés sur le long terme. La Délégation souligne par ailleurs l'importance du renforcement du comportement éthique des comités nationaux de ICOMOS parce qu'il peut y avoir des contradictions très fortes entre les comités nationaux et les Etats parties et également entre les comités nationaux et le siège de ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne l'importance de garantir l'indépendance des Organisations consultatives. La Délégation ajoute que le renforcement des capacités, qui sous-entend qu'il y a déjà capacité. La Délégation propose par exemple le développement de cursus universitaires ou de centres de recherche axés sur le patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Qatar** agreed with the Delegation of India that there were issues to be addressed in relation to the capacity of the Advisory Bodies to support States Parties in the preparation of nomination files, for example by ensuring a better regional representation among their experts. The Arab States, for example, were the cradle of civilization but had few sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, possibly due to the lack of experts from that geo-cultural region. Capacities needed to be built among the experts of the Advisory Bodies, so as to enable evaluations that the Committee could trust.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique que la notion de patrimoine mondial est parfois difficile à saisir pour les Etats, surtout les pays en développement. La Délégation souligne la nécessité de travailler à l'information et à la sensibilisation des institutions et des gestionnaires au patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique que ICOMOS et IUCN ne sont pas présents dans tous les pays et propose de dresser une liste d'experts régionaux classés par spécialité.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se réfère au programme du patrimoine mondial pour le renforcement des capacités adopté à la dernière session du Comité et dans lequel la Suisse s'est engagée pour la promotion de l'expertise à l'appui du patrimoine de chacun et du patrimoine mondial.

On the question of the nomination from the Maldives, **ICOMOS** confirmed that the initial problem of miscommunication with the State Party had been resolved, and a mission was planned. Concerning the question posed by the Delegation of Colombia, it stated that a second visit was required, before a report would be made available. In relation to the gap analysis, ICOMOS noted that also IUCN's analysis dated from 2004 and that the urgency to update these studies had been highlighted repeatedly by ICOMOS, together with the need for the related resources. ICOMOS also noted that perhaps it had less visibility than IUCN, but could count nevertheless on 10,000 members worldwide. There were two dimensions in the upstream process: on one hand, support could be provided to specific nominations; on the other hand, generic capacity building was also very important. With regard to Tentative Lists. ICOMOS

recalled that the gap analysis it had conducted in 2004 had revealed that, even if all the sites included in all the tentative lists had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, this would have not redressed the unbalance in representativity of the List. This showed how important it was to start engaging with States Parties at the earliest possible stage.

ICCROM took the floor to recall States Parties that they could benefit from its capacity building programmes. Indeed, regional training workshops had been organized by ICCROM, including on preparing nominations, which were an important complement to direct dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. ICCROM also noted that work was ongoing to strengthen the capacities and networks of the Advisory Bodies within the regions, notably as part of the Capacity Building Programme that the Committee had adopted at its 36th Session (Saint Petersburg, 2012), for which support was needed.

IUCN agreed with ICCROM and recalled its own capacity building initiatives, notably focusing on the application of criteria (vii), (ix) and (x). Another important challenge was to ensure that support was provided equitably, taking due account of the relative capacities of the States Parties.

The Delegation of **India** asked the Secretariat to reflect the debate into a revised Draft Decision during the break.

The **Chairperson** asked whether any Committee member wanted to provide drafting suggestions in that regard.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the discussion had produced a very clear and strong message, which the Secretariat had heard. It was up to the Secretariat to integrate this into a new text, for the consideration of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** reiterated his request to Committee members to provide their ideas in writing to the Rapporteur.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose que le Secrétariat synthétise les commentaires des membres du Comité sur les Processus en amont.

The **Secretariat** reassured the Committee that the discussions would be faithfully reflected in the summary records. As for the Draft Decision, it proposed to include in it a paragraph whereby the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would be asked to take due note of the debate held in view of the elaboration of its report at the next session of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** agreed to this approach and asked the Secretariat to prepare a revised Draft Decision which would be submitted to the consideration of the Committee after the lunch break.

The meeting rose at 12.30 pm.

EIGHTH DAY – MONDAY 24 June 2013

FIFTEENTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia) and Mr. Francisco J. Gutierrez (Colombia)

ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST: PROGRESS REPORT ON THE UPSTREAM PROCESSES *(continuation)*

The Draft Decision **37 COM 9** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 9.

ITEM 10 PERIODIC REPORTS

10A. FINAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/10A

Decision: **37 COM 10A**

The **Secretariat** explained that the Periodic Reporting exercise was launched in order to identify the status of the implementation of the Convention in the Region and reported on a series of regional workshop on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Latin America and the Caribbean starting with the preparatory one in Buenos Aires in 2009. It also reported on the sub-regional meetings in Zacatecas (6-8 September 2010), Rio de Janeiro (7-10 December 2010), Bridgetown (6-8 April 2011), Ouro Preto (9-11 February 2011), Santo Domingo (15-17 February 2012) and in Zacatecas (12-17 March 2012). Up to date the Secretariat mentioned that the final regional meeting in Santiago de Chile was held in December 2012 and that 129 sites from the Latin America and the Caribbean region had been inscribed. Five countries from the Region had created tentative lists. A total of 28 States Parties submitted the questionnaire for the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise concerning 122 sites.

The Secretariat reported on the progress on the establishment of inventories, underlining that Member States of the Region confirmed the usefulness of inventories for the identification of sites for their tentative lists. Five States Parties had put into place tentative lists as a result of the periodic reporting exercise. According to the findings of this exercise, the benefits of the inscription in the World Heritage Lists lied in the protection and conservation of the heritage as well as an enhancement in prestige and tourism. It became evident that the legal framework was not adequate and that national protection laws needed to be put in place. Management plans to

maintain the Outstanding Universal Value were in most cases only partially implemented. The Secretariat explained that the international cooperation and capacity building were identified as a driving force in the Region and that in the framework of the retrospective inventory, 24 States Parties had submitted clarification maps and 67 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Negative impacts on the heritage of the region lied in local fabrics, pollution, climate change and severe weather events. Another negative impact was fire as result of traditional agricultural practice.

The Secretariat pointed out that all documents on the first and second cycle had been accumulated on an online platform and that cultural landscapes represented a big potential of the region. The number of mixed sites inscribed in the World Heritage List should be increased. The activity of the Slave Route and slave route memorial sites offered possibilities for transcontinental collaboration. The Secretariat presented several activities such as on the Maya sites in order to ensure their preservation, the emergency activities after the earthquake in Haiti and the theme of World Heritage and extreme poverty as well as the question on specific social role that influences World Heritage.

La Délégation du **Cuba** présente le thème de la Route de l'Esclave, intitulé « Résistance, Liberté et Mémoire ». Un ensemble de 15 mesures ont été considérées essentielles en vue de la préparation d'une inscription en série. Ces mesures sont encadrées dans un plan d'action et de gestion sur 5 ans. Le dossier serait déposé en 2014, date significative puisque c'est celle de l'anniversaire de la révolution haïtienne et des 20 ans du projet.

La Délégation du **Mexique** insiste sur quelques points développés par le Secrétariat dans son rapport préliminaire. Tout d'abord, il souligne la nécessité d'une bonne mise en œuvre de la Convention et des plans de gestion et pour ce faire, il suggère d'amplifier les réseaux de formation existants et de multiplier les approches innovantes. Ensuite, le délégué cite deux réunions régionales, la réunion sur le Tourisme, le Développement Durable et le Patrimoine ainsi que la réunion pour le Plan de conservation international des sites mayas inscrits au Patrimoine de l'Humanité. Le délégué rappelle qu'une autre réunion se tiendra bientôt sur les biens mixtes du Patrimoine Mondial, pour une meilleure mise en œuvre de la Convention. Le délégué rappelle aussi les multiples ateliers pluridisciplinaires réalisés en faveur de la conservation du Patrimoine. Enfin, il termine son intervention en soulignant la demande croissante de formation des Etats parties adressée au CPM et aux organisations consultatives.

The Observer State of **Jamaica** underlined that the periodic reporting exercise in Latin America and the Caribbean contributed in the building capacities in the Region, but pointed out the issue of lack of financial resources. The needs of the Latin America and the Caribbean Region concerned mainly capacity building and institutional continuity in order to understand the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity. The region needed recommendations for adequate World Heritage policies, advise on the institutional framework, alternative sources for expertise and the best use of universities. It stated that the Slave route project was one of the priorities, but that the process of this ongoing initiative had not accelerated much. The Observer State underlined that the alleviation of poverty and a strong focus on natural heritage should be priorities for the region.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** souligne quatre points. Tout d'abord la délégation souhaite un plan d'action réaliste étayé d'actions concrètes. Ensuite ce cycle de rapport périodique doit déboucher sur des groupes thématiques spécifiques, notamment sur la Route de l'Esclave (cite John Elliott), le Patrimoine mondial et l'extrême pauvreté. Elle souligne aussi le travail législatif en cours dans la région pour une meilleure protection du Patrimoine. Finalement elle fait référence à un projet emblématique pour la région, celui du Chemin Andin (Qhapaq Ñan), qui sera examiné au prochain comité et qui a constitué un moteur d'intégration régional pour les Etats parties (Chili, Colombie, Equateur, Argentine, Bolivie, Pérou).

L'Etat observateur du **Brésil** rappelle son rôle actif dans ce processus de rapport périodique dont la fin marque une nouvelle étape dans la gestion du Patrimoine régional. La délégation revient sur la réunion finale de décembre 2012 et estime qu'il faut revenir sur la définition des groupes thématiques qui ne tiennent pas compte de sujets importants comme les biens naturels, le changement climatique, la connectivité, les sites d'architecture moderne, ou bien la relation entre les sites du Patrimoine mondial et les peuples autochtones. En ce qui concerne le projet Route de l'Esclave, le délégué considère que le réseau de sites de mémoire déjà établi peut constituer une base de travail, mais que son intitulé doit être modifié.

The Observer State Party of **Venezuela** stated that the title of the Slave route did not correctly reflect the idea of the initiative that dealt with the memory and identity of a rich cultural mix.

The Observer State Party of **Barbados** stated that the periodic report exercise pointed out the importance of continuity and networking and criticized that natural sites had not received as much recognition as they should.

L'Etat observateur de l'**Argentine** estime que le déroulement du rapport périodique témoigne de la bonne volonté des participants dans l'application de la Convention et la bonne interaction avec les organisations consultatives. La délégation fait allusion au projet majeur du Chemin Andin (Qhapaq Ñan) qui regroupe six pays. Comme l'expert cubain, elle estime que les états devraient recevoir davantage d'appui et de formation. L'Argentine considère en effet la Culture comme un formidable outil d'inclusion sociale.

ICOMOS pointed that the key for a balanced World Heritage list lied in capacity building and the transmission of knowledge. The region had made progress in preparing tentative lists and the periodic report had given a perspective on the challenges. The challenges are the limit of resources, the pressure by the political situation, the conservation of the heritage, social inclusion and better participation of social groups. There was a need for a better coordination of the needs and interest of indigenous groups. The decentralization and evolution was identified as a challenge. ICOMOS underlined its willingness to assist in the work to develop an action plan, to strengthen cooperation and to enhance strategic activities. The region needed the right conditions for conserving its heritage and on the same time, the living conditions of people should be improved.

The **Secretariat** highlighted the side event to take place during the session to improve cooperation. This meeting would reflect more in detail the activities to be undertaken within the framework of the Action Plan in the region, including activities on natural heritage.

The **Rapporteur** presented the decision.

Le **Rapporteur** lit l'amendement proposé par la Colombie au paragraphe 9 et évoque sa proposition de reporter la 2e partie du paragraphe dans un 9e paragraphe. Elle soulève un élément portant à confusion, il n'y a pas lieu de demander au Comité l'élaboration du plan d'action.

La Délégation de **Colombie** reconnaît l'erreur, les pays de la Région devraient s'en charger avec l'accompagnement du CPM et des organisations consultatives et non pas le comité.

Le **Rapporteur** procède au changement de termes et passe à l'amendement du paragraphe 13 et en appelle à la délégation française pour proposer une formulation. La France proposera une formulation sous peu au rapporteur.

The Observer State of **Brazil** took the floor to ask if the States Parties were supposed to develop such an action plan and suggested that the Centre should develop such a plan in collaboration with the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies.

La délégation du **Pérou** considère que le paragraphe 9 devrait refléter la position de la Colombie, les Etats de la région devraient établir le plan d'action.

La délégation du **Mali** souligne une question de style au paragraphe 16 et propose de supprimer le mot « développer » et de conserver seulement «mettre en œuvre».

The Draft Decision **37COM 10A** was adopted as amended.

10B. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/10B

Decision: **37 COM 10B**

The **Secretariat** presented the Progress report on the Periodic Reporting exercise and explained that due to the great number of countries and sites, the exercise was divided into groups according to countries. It thanked Germany and Georgia for having organized training session for the National Focal Points in Berlin, 24-26 September 2012 and in Tbilisi 14-16 November 2012. It also thanked Italy for hosting the upcoming meeting for Mediterranean Europe in Florence, 17-18 September 2013 and Azerbaijan for the upcoming meeting for Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe in Baku, 29-31 October 2013. The Secretariat pointed out that the Mid-Cycle Review Meeting will take place immediately after the 19th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, at UNESCO Headquarters on 22 November 2013. The final meeting on the Second Periodic Reporting Cycle in Europe will take place in Luxemburg in 2014. In the framework of the initiative for the elaboration of a Capacity-Building strategy for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-regions, Training and Capacity-Building questionnaire had been sent out to the States Parties in the sub-regions in January 2012, a Steering Group with representatives from States Parties of the sub-regions, had been created in November 2012 and a Blueprint document had been produced

in May 2013 as basis for discussion of the future Strategy. It was underlined that the Periodic Reporting should be States Parties – driven.

IUCN underlined that the Periodic Reporting exercise was an important tool for the conservation of World Heritage and the implementation of the Convention. It helps to identify gaps and needs in the regions. IUCN reiterated its support for capacity building and the identification of priorities and its commitment to a strong collaboration with Member States and the Centre in order to ensure a balanced and credible World Heritage List.

ICOMOS pointed out that the Europe and North America had similar problems in the area of capacity-building and threats as other regions. The final report of the Periodic Reporting exercise portrayed the regional view of the implementation of the Convention. ICOMOS underlined that the financial constraints could limit the possibilities of the Periodic Reporting exercise and offered its assistance.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 10B** was adopted.

10C. FOLLOW-UP OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR THE OTHER REGIONS

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/10C

Decision: **37 COM 10C**

The **Secretariat** reminded that the region of **Asia and the Pacific** had presented its final report on the results of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise in 2012 and adopted the action plan. The Periodic Reporting exercise was ongoing. At the 37 session of the World Heritage Committee, 55 retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value had been adopted under item 8E. In parallel, Retrospective Inventory on cartographic information of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in the region continues to be reviewed. Bhutan, Myanmar, Maldives, Mongolia, Pakistan, Palau and the Philippines and countries in Central Asia, received assistance from the Centre to update their national Tentative List or preparing nominations. The Secretariat mentioned the visit of the Director General at Myanmar in August 2012 and the preparation of the nomination of Pyu Ancient Cities in Myanmar was prepared and submitted to WHC in January 2013. Funding support has been mobilized from the Korean Funds-In-Trust available to assist the Philippines and Maldives authorities in the implementation upstream Pilot Projects on the Batanes Protected Landscapes and Seascapes in the Philippines and Project on Male Hukuru Miskiy, Maldives for preparing possible World Heritage nomination. The Centre coordinated States Parties for a serial and transnational World Heritage nomination of the Silk Roads that will be examined by the Committee at its 38th session in 2014. The Centre and ICOMOS, through funding support from Japan, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy and Norway had been providing assistance and advice to States Parties in the preparation of the Silk Roads World Heritage nominations for some years in the framework of follow-up to the Periodic Reporting process. The Secretariat stated the importance of community involvement and the need for improved relations between World Heritage property managers and various groups in communities as one of the top priorities for Periodic Reporting follow-up. The September 2011 revised Pacific World Heritage Action Plan 2010-2015 was under implementation. Finally, the Secretariat presented the main activities such as

Regional Workshop on World Heritage Management Planning in the Pacific in November 2013 in Suva, Fiji, and the development of a Pacific Heritage Hub Initiative. Also, a regional capacity-building strategy is being developed by WHI TRAP, a Category 2 Centre. Two publications were produced thanks to the support from Japan and Australia, the Secretariat also called upon countries on the region to mobilize voluntary contribution or Funds-In-Trust to support follow-up actions in the Asia and the Pacific Region.

The **Secretariat** reported on the regional Action Plan for 2012- 2017 developed within the framework of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the **Africa Region** that was endorsed by the Committee at its 36th session in Saint- Petersburg. A comprehensive yearly programme document for the Africa Nature Programme had now been developed and could be found on the World Heritage Centre web site. It was currently being reviewed by all the partners in this programme. In the framework of the Africa Nature Programme, two risk preparedness training workshops were carried out for francophone natural heritage site managers at the Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary in Senegal in November 2012 and for Anglophone natural heritage site managers in Drakensburg South Africa in May 2013. This work was conducted taking into account the orientations given in the World Heritage capacity building strategy as well as the training needs identified in the Periodic reporting. These training workshops were financed thanks to the Governments of Flanders (Belgium) and Spain together with IUCN and the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF). A workshop on the Climate Change Programme also took place in Nairobi, Kenya in February 2013 with funding from UNDP/ Small Grants Programme. As requested in Decision 36 COM 10D, State Parties had started submitting their National Plans. In particular the World Heritage Centre has received National Plans from Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Botswana. As part of the "Implementation Programme of Second Periodic Report in Africa", financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the AWHF, the World Heritage Centre, and the Nordic World Heritage Foundation, there were two risk preparedness training workshops carried-out for cultural World Heritage site managers and local community representatives from francophone and anglophone World Heritage sites at the Royal Palaces of Abomey in Benin in March 2013 and the Great Zimbabwe National Monument in May 2013. A high-level conference on the theme of "Living with World Heritage in Africa" was held in South Africa in September 2012 for the 40th anniversary of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. Over 300 delegates, including 16 African Ministers of Culture, Tourism, Environment and Home Affairs as well as representatives from the African Union, the AWHF and experts in cultural and natural heritage participated in the conference. This conference provided a platform to discuss experiences with World Heritage, role of communities, challenges and opportunities in achieving sustainable development while protecting and conserving natural and cultural World Heritage properties in Africa. The conclusions and recommendations from this conference provided the basis for the Second African Position Paper on World Heritage, which the region's State Parties intend to propose for adoption by the African Union and the World Heritage Committee. Extensive work was conducted to safeguard the Mali heritage with the contribution of many States Parties of the region, the AWHF and the Advisory Bodies. Lastly, a publication entitled "African World Heritage: A Remarkable Diversity", was launched in November 2012 during the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in Japan, thanks to generous financial support from the Government of Switzerland. This publication was an attempt to promote the 86 World Heritage properties in Africa inscribed on the World Heritage List, and provides detailed presentations.

Le **Secrétariat** souligne que les **Etats arabes** ont été les premiers à compléter le deuxième cycle de soumission des rapports périodiques selon le nouveau format. A la 34e session du Comité, en 2010, le Comité accueilli favorablement ce rapport, et fait de même en 2011 lors de la présentation du programme régional, élaboré par les Etats parties de la région (**décision 35 COM 10C.3**). Depuis, le travail du Secrétariat a notamment consisté à renforcer le réseau des points focaux établi à l'occasion des rapports périodiques, en particulier d'y adjoindre des points focaux nationaux pour le patrimoine naturel. Une première réunion exclusivement consacrée au programme régional pour le patrimoine naturel, s'est tenue à Amman en Jordanie, en décembre 2011. Le Secrétariat souligne l'exceptionnelle coopération entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et le Centre régional arabe pour le patrimoine mondial de Bahreïn, qui a entamé ses activités en avril 2012. Sans ce Centre, aucune activité n'aurait pu être menée tous ces derniers mois pour la mise en œuvre du programme régional. Parmi ces activités, le Secrétariat cite l'atelier de formation d'experts de la région, destinés à devenir des personnes ressources dans le domaine de la Convention pour les pays de la région. Ces experts sont désormais impliqués dans la préparation de dossiers de proposition d'inscription. Une réunion régionale des points focaux du patrimoine mondial, culturel et naturel, s'est tenue à Manama en décembre 2012, permettant notamment d'affiner les priorités du programme régional et d'identifier des propositions de projets qui seront financés par le Centre régional. Il est prévu que cette réunion des points focaux se tienne annuellement à Manama, favorisant ainsi les échanges et la coopération régionale. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial, toujours avec le soutien du Centre régional, a lancé une initiative visant à protéger le patrimoine moderne du monde arabe. Deux réunions d'experts se sont déjà tenues, la dernière en mai 2013 à Rabat, une troisième aura lieu d'ici la fin de l'année. Le Centre régional de Bahreïn soutient également le programme des villes du patrimoine mondial et l'application de la Recommandation sur le paysage urbain historique. Avec l'accord du Ministère de la Culture marocain, une réunion régionale sur la Recommandation se tiendra à l'automne 2013 au Maroc.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 10C** was adopted.

ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN noted the progress made in all three regions and called attention to the fact that the periodic reporting was a networking tool to improve the implementation of the convention. They reiterated the regional capacity strategy of the Advisory Bodies in all regions and underlined TRAP Africa, the importance of universities in Africa and the regional centres of UNESCO in the Arab region.

The Chairperson closed Item 10 of the Agenda.

ITEM 11 REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/11

Decision: **37 COM 11**

The **Secretariat** recalled the Open-Ended Working Group that was established by the General Assembly at its 18th session in 2011 and that it met for a second time in February 2013. The group made recommendations which mainly dealt with conflicts of interest and Ms. Vera Lacoeylthe, the Vice-Chairperson of the group, provided an

oral report to the 36th session of the Committee in which she asked the Committee to address any potential conflicts of interest of its members as well as to strengthen **Decision 35 COM.12B** that no State Party should present a nomination during its mandate for a transitional period and on a voluntary basis.

The Secretariat further stated that members of the group had noted that this was not taken up in document WHC-13/37.COM/11. The Secretariat explained that concerning the postponement of the examination of nominations presented by members of the Committee, the Open-Ended Working Group did not explicitly suggest a modification of the Rules of Procedure but recommended that the Rules be modified only with respect to the three last points in Recommendation 12 of the report of the External Auditor - the practice of signed amendments, the transparency of the process and the prohibition of nominations that do not fulfill the conditions set out in the Guidelines. Should the Committee decide, at this 37th session, that members of the Committee postpone on a permanent basis, and not for a particular session, the examination of nominations presented by members of the Committee during their mandate, this would not be in accord with Article 11 of the Convention and Rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention. However, members of the Committee could voluntarily refrain from submitting nominations during their mandate. Therefore this matter should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly. The Committee could however also refine **Decision 35 COM 12B**, point 14.

Furthermore the Secretariat informed that Committee that members of the Open-Ended Working Group raised another question regarding the prohibition of nominations that do not fulfill the conditions set out in the Operational Guidelines. However this point was discussed with the Advsiroy Bodies and was fully covered in the *Operational Guidelines* and the Committee had to apply these Guidelines when deciding whether or not to inscribe properties on the World Heritage List in accordance with Article 11.5 of the Convention. Therefore, the question of the fulfillment of the conditions set out in the Operational Guidelines with respect to nominations was to be asked by the Committee in its decisions. . The Secretariat explained that it did not see any possibility for a new paragraph on this point in the Operational Guidelines as this was a question of the application of the guidelines rather than adding a new paragraph.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Secretariat for the report and asked the Legal Adviser if the Committee could not only change but also set the Rules of Procedure.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that the Convention foresees that the Committee adopts its Rules of Procedure.

The Delegation of **Estonia** pointed out that the Committee had adopted voluntary measures in the past such as the reduction of the mandate from 6 to 4 years. In order to ensure neutrality, Members should not take part of the discussion on their own sites discussed for inscription as this would put the credibility of the convention on risk. Estonia pointed the findings of the external auditor on the correlation between the number of sites inscribed and membership in the Committee. Finally Estonia called upon Members to refrain from nomination during their mandate with an exception for Members with no sites inscribed, transnational or deferred nominations. To promote good practice, Estonia had hold back a nomination until the next session of the Committee when they were leaving the Committee.

La Délégation du **Mali** félicite le Secrétariat pour le rapport détaillé et demande davantage de renseignements sur la partie concernant la transition.

La Délégation de la **France** estime que le travail préparatoire est intéressant mais les modifications du règlement doivent être examinées après que l'Assemblée générale se soit prononcée sur la liste des recommandations prioritaires dans le cadre des objectifs du plan stratégiques adoptées lors de la 18e Assemblée générale des Etats parties.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its confusion, indicating that it had understood the Legal Advisor as saying that the World Heritage Committee was responsible for setting its Rules of Procedure, but that the Delegations of Estonia and France had given contradictory indications. It asked the Legal Adviser to provide further clarification.

The **Legal Advisor** mentioned article 10 of the World Heritage Convention, which indicated that the World Heritage Committee was responsible for adopting its Rules of Procedure.

The **Secretariat** added that the Committee and the General Assembly had their respective and distinct Rules of Procedure. In response to the Delegation of Mali on the transitional period, the Secretariat indicated that the Committee had previously recommended that Committee members refrain from bringing forward new nominations – but that this was voluntary, and done on an experimental basis to be reviewed next year. In response to France, the Secretariat noted that an update on all recommendations of the Open-ended working group would be taken to the 19th General Assembly, which would be free to make further recommendations to the Committee. It noted that in last year's Decision 36 COM 9A point 8, the Committee had decided to implement all recommendations within its own mandate.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the comments from France, and asked the Legal Advisor to inform the Committee regarding the question as to which body had the highest authority, the Committee or the General Assembly. It indicated that if it was the General Assembly, which it assumed would be the case, it asked if the Committee could change the Rules of Procedure if this would be against the spirit of resolutions taken by the General Assembly.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** raised the same question as the German Delegate; indicating that there was no need to express doubts about the possibility of a country presenting a nomination during its mandate. It added that it was not the issue. It pointed out the need to build trust amongst the Committee members to defend the common interest that was "World Heritage". The Delegation added that rules, criteria, and procedures were already in place. Therefore all conditions to work in trust were met.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its confusion. It noted that it seemed that colleagues read only those Rules that suited them, while in fact, the Rules were quite clear. It explained that Rule 52 was evident and that it included a provision whereby the Committee set its Rules of Procedure. It asked its fellow Committee members to clarify the grounds on which they thought these were not clear.

The **Legal Advisor** indicated that the General Assembly and the Committee were two different bodies. It explained that the Convention bound Member States to its provisions, and that in its Article 8, it defined the work of the Committee, stating that the Committee was composed of 21 State Parties to the Convention, elected by State Parties the Convention at the General Assembly. It continued by reading Article 16 of the Convention. It concluded by explaining that the Committee was thus responsible for adopting its own Rules of Procedure, adding that the Rules could not be changed if they were contrary to the provisions of the Convention.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision as amended by the Delegation of India, amending 22.6, 22.7 23.1, and 23.2, as follows (parts underlined):

22.6 *[To avoid any potential conflicts of interest, advocacy by Committee members in favour of a particular proposal(s) concerning World Heritage properties on their territory will not be entertained.]*

Committee members shall not speak to World Heritage properties in their own territories, except at the explicit invitation of the Chairperson within the permitted time for their speech or ~~and~~ in response to specific questions posed.

22.7 *[In order to avoid any potential conflicts of interest],* representatives of a State Party, whether or not a member of the Committee, shall be invited by the Chairperson to present their views after the Advisory Bodies have presented their evaluation regarding not speak to advocate the inclusion in the World Heritage List of a property nominated, the state of conservation of a property on their territory or the approval of an assistance request submitted by that State. After this permitted time for the State Party they may if required be allowed, ~~but~~ only to deal with a point of information in answer to a question. This provision also applies to other observers mentioned in Rule 8.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la délégation de l'Inde et indique qu'elle a des ajouts à apporter au projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that it wanted to keep the last sentence of the present paragraph 22.6.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the proposal made by India. The Delegation understood the correction proposed by the Delegation of France even it thought that it was the duty of the Chair to decide.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the amendment proposed by India. It emphasized the fact that if the amendment was adopted, it would make our work easy and effective.

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported the proposal made by India and the corrections suggested by France.

The Delegation **Germany** expressed support for the comments by the Delegations of France and Estonia.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la proposition faite par la délégation de l'Inde telle qu'elle est présentée avec la conjonction « ou » en réponse aux questions précises posées par la délégation de la France.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la proposition faite par l'Inde qui tend à supprimer l'ajout fait par le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle précise que cet ajout a une portée plutôt philosophique et elle pose la question sur l'intérêt réel que le terme « plaider » apporte au texte. La Délégation du Sénégal récusé la proposition de l'Estonie et demande en outre quels seront les critères qui seront établis pour évaluer un 'plaider'. Elle souhaite obtenir des clarifications quant aux propositions faites par les délégations de l'Inde et de la France et demande qu'on ajoute la conjonction « ou » au texte proposé.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the original amendment by the Delegation of India, and the small change proposed by the Delegations Estonia and France.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'elle s'oppose au fait de retirer la première phrase comme proposée par la Délégation de l'Inde. Elle soutient la proposition faite par les Délégations de l'Estonie et de l'Allemagne afin de garder le terme « plaider » dans le texte.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed support for the Delegation of India's original sentence.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed support the Delegation of India's proposal as it related to replacing the word AND with the word OR.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged the desire to ensure transparency, and that this required that States Parties be allowed to speak to their state of conservation and nomination files. It explained its wish to eliminate the hypocritical situation whereby Committee members ask questions on behalf of the proposing State Party in a pre-scripted manner, and to instead have the States Parties nominating a file to make a statement. In terms of the advocacy issue, it indicated that States Parties will speak on their nomination if allowed to do so – and wondered if that would be considered as advocacy. It noted that in the UN system, member states were allowed to speak. It also explained that whereas the Advisory Bodies had the chance to intervene on several occasions, the States Parties did not have this opportunity. It explained how the Committee had arrived at discussing this particular issue – referring to earlier statements from the Delegation of Japan. It suggested that the Chairperson should give a defined duration of time for a State Party to speak on its own state of conservation report or nomination file. It concluded by explaining that the amendment it proposed would allow for this to happen.

The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed support for the Delegation of India's proposal and for the Delegation of France's addition.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose au Comité de sortir cette querelle de conjonction. Elle indique que le choix des termes « et », « ou » ou « et/ou » relève de l'autorité du Président.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** considère que le terme « plaider » est un jugement anticipé sur les propos des Etats parties et la notion de « conflit d'intérêt » est inadaptée. Elle ajoute que l'éthique est au centre du Comité et que ces termes ne sont pas appropriés quant à la mission du Comité. Elle ajoute qu'il est regrettable d'utiliser des mots très forts. La Délégation précise que le rôle du Comité est de délibérer sur les propositions d'inscription et sur les rapports d'état de conservation, en conséquence le travail du comité se base sur les rapports des Etats parties et les avis sur des Organisations consultatives. Elle indique que le travail du Comité se base sur des procédures et non sur les présentations des Etats parties qui prennent la parole pendant le Comité. La Délégation considère que les Etats parties ont le droit de faire un plaider et indique que si le Comité est « une boîte d'enregistrement » il faudrait revoir la Convention dans son ensemble.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** expressed support for the original proposal from the Delegation of India.

La Délégation de la **France** fait un plaider contre le plaider, elle soutient la proposition fait par l'Inde. Elle indique que par rapport à la proposition de conjonction de coordination « et/ou », la délégation de la France est en faveur du « est » et non du « ou ». Le « ou », s'il est adopté, remettrait en cause les articles 21.1 et 21.2., et il permettrait des modifications en cascade des autres articles du Règlement intérieur.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that little words could be very important, and in the case of the word “AND” proposed by France it made a big difference. It explained that States Parties had many possibilities to put forth their positions on their nomination – including through factual errors letters. It further noted that it was natural that the Committee may have questions to the State Party and was always able consult them in that regard. However it explained that the State Party could not be a 22nd member of the Committee, to discuss the relative merits of a nomination with the Committee. It referred to a discussion earlier in the session where a State Party had been asked by the Committee if it preferred deferral or referral for its nomination. It explained that arguments needed to be technical and professional to ensure the credibility of the World Heritage List and the Convention.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la proposition de l'Estonie et elle précise qu'il ne s'agit de ne pas vouloir soutenir les Etats parties mais qu'il s'agit plutôt d'une question pratique. Le Délégué précise qu'en étant expert du patrimoine, il ne pourrait pas tirer des recommandations valables à partir des déclarations faites en plénière. Il indique que la Délégation de la Suisse base son expertise sur les rapports d'évaluation et les lettres d'erreur factuelles. Les documents sont mis à disposition sur le web pour fournir toutes les informations au Comité. Elle souligne que les lettres d'erreur factuelles seront en ligne pour la prochaine session du Comité, ainsi le Comité ne sera plus en mesure de faire justice à un Etat partie.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle que le Comité va prendre des décisions et décider de faire des réformes qui ont auront de lourdes conséquences. Elle précise que chaque Etat partie a des ambitions spécifiques vis-à-vis du Comité, avouées ou non. La Délégation souligne que le Comité est l'organe principale de la Convention où chaque pays doit pouvoir s'exprimer mais de façon cadrée. Elle souligne que les organisations consultatives font un travail remarquable, toutefois le Comité ne peut

être sous leur tutelle et elle ajoute qu'être membre du Comité ne signifie pas qu'on ne puisse plus s'exprimer. Le Délégué du Sénégal soutient la proposition faite par l'Inde et elle récusé la notion de plaider puisque chaque membre du Comité ne peut défendre indûment son pays.

The Delegation of **Colombia** regretted the lengthy debate related to terminology. It expressed the wish to come back to the essence of the issue. The Delegation supported the declaration made by the United Arab Emirates and expressed its support to the amendment proposed by India and the proposal made by France to add an "and" in the proposed text.

The Delegation of **South Africa** explained that the Chairperson had a good amount of leeway in the Rules of Procedure. It explained that the State Party needed to be allowed to respond to questions. It added that Advisory Bodies cannot be put on the same level as the State Parties. It concluded that a degree of faith had to be extended to States Parties in that they would have the necessary technical experts in their delegations, able to respond to questions.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que la majorité des membres du Comité est en faveur de l'amendement proposé du paragraphe et procède à la lecture du paragraphe 22.6. Le Rapporteur ajoute qu'il n'y a pas de consensus autour du fait de garder ou biffer le terme « plaider » dans la dernière phrase du paragraphe. Elle indique qu'elle ne peut faire de proposition à cet effet compte tenu de la portée des mots proposés. C'est pourquoi le Rapporteur demande au Comité de prendre une décision et faire une proposition sur ce point.

La Délégué de la **France** souhaite réaffirmer sa proposition pour le « et » et réitère que si l'autre option devait être retenue « et/ou », celle-ci aurait des conséquences sur le point 22.1. La Délégué demande ainsi au conseiller juridique de clarifier ce point.

Le **Rapporteur** demande aux délégations de se mettre d'accord le choix des termes « et/ou ».

The Delegation of **Colombia** raised the issue of maximizing the time and it proposed to count the positions in order to know the general trend within the Committee.

The **Chairperson** encouraged the Committee to reach a real consensus before taking a decision.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its belief that Committee had agreed on the basic fact that States Parties could speak on behalf of their nominations whether or not they were members of the Committee. It suggested that no more time be spent on this issue, and added that the Chairperson could decide how to proceed on a case by case basis. It recommended that the last sentence of paragraph 22.6 be deleted.

La Délégué du **Mali** soutient la proposition faite par la Délégué de la France et souligne le fait que si le choix du « et » et du « ou » cause des changements des autres articles, elle opte pour la proposition qui n'a aucune conséquence.

The Delegation of **Thailand** echoed the Delegation of India's most recent comments.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the proposal made by Estonia, Switzerland, Malaysia and Germany to keep “Advocacy” in the last sentence.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande si cet amendement est dans le paragraphe initial (du texte) ou dans la proposition de l'Estonie, pour clarifier le point de la majorité des deux-tiers.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that removal of the last sentence of paragraph 22.6 would require a two-third majority.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed support for the last comment from the Delegation of **India**.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que le débat porte sur une phrase du texte d'origine et que cette phrase n'est pas une proposition d'un membre du Comité.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** appuie l'Inde pour biffer ce passage.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the deletion of ‘advocacy’ in the last sentence.

La Délégation de la **France** demande des précisions sur la majorité des 2/3 pour un vote sur le règlement intérieur. Selon elle, cette règle ne s'applique pas sur les questions de modification du règlement intérieur d'après le règlement lui-même.

The **Legal Advisor** asked the question to be repeated.

The Delegation of **India** asked for clarification on the issue of the vote.

The **Legal Advisor** rephrased the question from the Delegation from France and asked for confirmation.

La Délégation de la **France** demande si le Comité peut se passer de la majorité des 2/3 si ce point a été adopté dans l'ordre du jour.

The **Legal Advisor** noted that Rule 51 of the Rules of Procedure explained that Rules of Procedure could only be modified by a two-third majority vote.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** underlined that there was a consensus as to whether to have “and” or “or” and it agreed with the proposal of India to strike out this paragraph with regard to the sentence. It reiterated that the Committee should trust its members and it disagreed with the notion of “advocacy”.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite recadrer le débat et elle répète que si la conjonction de coordination “et” amène à d'autre changement, ce point est réglé car le Mali s'aligne à la France. Elle indique qu'il y a un consensus autour de la proposition de l'Inde mais que le nœud du problème reste la notion de « plaidoyer ».

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** asked if the Committee was going to vote on the modification of their Rule in question. It indicated that it thought a vote might be called for, and in that case, that the proposal would need to be clear. It also indicated its support for the deletion of the last sentence.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** ne souhaite pas revenir sur les termes « et » ou « ou ». Elle indique qu'elle a toujours tenu sa conduite vis-à-vis du règlement intérieur et elle souhaite le maintien de la dernière phrase telle qu'elle est. La Délégation du Cambodge soutient la proposition faite par la Délégation de la Suisse.

Le **Président** indique souhaiter trouver un consensus et non procéder à un vote.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite une précision sur ce point de la part du Conseiller juridique notamment sur l'inscription du point à l'ordre du jour. Elle pense que le point est inscrit dans l'ordre du jour donc il peut être débattu par le Comité.

The **Legal Advisor** explained that article 22.6 is under item 11 of the agenda, therefore the agenda would not need to be amended, but a two-third majority would be needed to modify the Rule.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne qu'elle est en faveur de la suppression de la dernière phrase mais que son point de vue n'est pas reflété sur l'écran.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked if there was a consensus to keep “and” as it was currently included in the Rules of Procedure and noted that there was still a disagreement on the last sentence, and suggested that the Committee move on to the next paragraph at this point, and come back to paragraph 22.6 after having addressed paragraph 22.7.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** expressed support the proposal to delete the reference to advocacy.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** s'exprime en faveur du « et » et indique que dans la dernière phrase le terme « le plaidoyer » lui fait penser à terme judiciaire et doit être radié du thésaurus de ce texte.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recalled that the terminology issue was resolved but that it is the last proposal which is causing problem. It supported the proposal to delete this sentence from the text.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its support for deletion of the last sentence, while supporting the maintenance of the word “and”.

The Delegation of **Qatar** was also in favor of the deletion of final sentence.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its support for deletion of the last sentence and agreed to keep the word “and”.

The Delegation of **Iraq** was in favor of the deletion of final sentence.

La Délégation du **Mexique** soutient aussi l'ajout du terme “et” et elle soutient la proposition de supprimer la dernière phrase.

Le **Rapporteur** procède à lecture de la phrase proposée.

The amendment of Paragraph 22.6 was accepted.

Le **Rapporteur** procède à lecture du paragraphe 22.7.

The Delegation of **India** explained that this paragraph had to be considered in tandem with paragraph 22.6. It clarified that the amendment would allow a State Party to speak only after the Advisory Bodies had proceeded with their presentation. It explained that the last amendment in that paragraph would allow the Chairperson to ask the State Party for clarifications.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its belief that a consensus existed on the recognition that a State Party could express its point of view, but only in response to questions asked. It warned however that in the case of the proposed amendment, it appeared as though the State Party would be systematically given the floor to express its own position. It asked if this was the meaning of the amendment.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that the amendment would indeed ask that the State Party be invited to speak after the Advisory Bodies had made their presentation.

The **United Arab Emirates** indicated that countries had the right to take the floor to express their position.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite que le terme « seront invités » soit remplacé par le conditionnel « pourraient être invités ». Elle indique qu'elle souhaite l'ensemble des amendements proposés par l'Inde.

Le **Rapporteur** précise qu'on ne peut pas afficher l'ensemble du texte pour des raisons techniques et qu'il sera distribué en version papier.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed discomfort with the proposed amendment to paragraph 22.7, particularly in contrast to what it thought it had agreed to for paragraph 22.6. It referred to paragraph 22.5, suggesting that there was no need for the State Party to speak to its nomination after the Advisory Body presentation, as no debate would have taken place at that point. It expressed its support for the paragraph as it stood, but would be willing to agree to the deletion of the 1st sentence.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** commented on the issue of advocacy, and noted that a consensus on removing that reference was likely. It supported the initiative which would let the State Party speak after the Advisory Bodies had made their presentation. It expressed its support for the proposition of the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **India** clarified the point raised by the Delegation of Estonia, with regards to paragraph 22.5, which called for the State Party to be given the chance to speak at the end of the debate. It suggested that there was no conflict with the proposed amendment in paragraph 22.6.

The Delegation of **South Africa** underlined that the proposal for the amendment as a useful one. It explained that at times, the Committee wasted a lot of time trying to clarify issues, and suggested that greater opportunity for the State Party to speak would assist deal with this issue. It concluded by expressing support for the amendment.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed support for the word “shall” as opposed to “may”, indicating it should be a right for a State Party to express their opinion.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** fully supported the Japanese Delegation as it was the decision of the Chair to grant or not the floor to the Committee. It stated that the Committee was a democratic body and that it supported the first two parts of the proposed paragraph.

La Délégation de **l’Algérie** opte pour la formulation “seront” proposée par la Délégation du Japon.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la proposition de l’Inde et demande de clarifier les conditions de l’attribution des temps de parole.

The Delegation of **Thailand** also expressed its support for the Delegation of India’s proposed amendment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** recommande de voir le point 22. 6 en même temps que le 22.7. Elle propose d’ajourner la discussion jusqu’au lendemain pour étudier les implications concrètes des débats sur le règlement et pour prendre une décision après consultations entre experts.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it agreed to an adjournment.

The **Legal Advisor** interpreted the proposal by the Delegation of Switzerland as a move for adjournment until the next day, and suggested that one other speaker would be required to support this move.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed that an adjournment should be proposed.

La Délégation de la **France** approuve la proposition faite par la Délégation de la Suisse et de l’Allemagne d’ajourner le débat et elle demande une copie du texte des amendements proposés.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** mentioned that it had no intention to oppose itself to the decision. It stated that it wishes to receive any proposal in writing.

The Delegation of **India** did not oppose the adjournment.

Le Délégation du **Sénégal** demande si l’ajournement du débat ne concerne que le point 22.7.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souhaite avoir du temps pour voir travailler et mener des consultations.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that other delegations may want to propose other amendments that could be discussed on the next day.

The meeting rose at 7 pm.

NINETH DAY – TUESDAY 25 June 2013

SIXTEENTH MEETING

9 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 11 REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE (*continuation*)

The **Chairperson** opened the session, and explained the items remaining to be discussed (items 11 – 19). He then gave the floor to Switzerland.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** ne souhaite pas se lancer dans une réflexion au sujet de l'aménagement du point à l'ordre du jour 11 concernant le règlement intérieur. Elle remarque qu'il y a des compréhensions contrastées sur la latitude dont dispose le Comité en matière de promulgation de règles concernant le règlement intérieur. Elle se demande dans quelle mesure ces règles peuvent contrevenir aux travaux de l'Assemblée générale et tout en reconnaissant que cette question n'est pas encore tranchée, elle se prononce contre cette éventualité et recommande par conséquent d'en déférer à l'Assemblée Générale pour avancer dans les travaux.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** suggested that given the present workload, the timing, and the need for careful reflection on proposed changes, particularly on possible impacts it could have on the operations of the Committee, the coming General Assembly be invited to establish a working group to bring forward recommendations to the 38th session of the Committee on amendments to the Rules of Procedure.

The Delegation of **South Africa** explained that the proposal made by Cambodia was problematic. It explained that if the Committee could not do its own work, then it should not pass it on to the General Assembly. It suggested that a vote be taken if necessary.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed embarrassment over the fact that so much time had been spent discussing the issues, and that despite the Committee having the power to decide its own Rules of Procedure, it was now talking about postponing the debate to the General Assembly, which would have to refer it back to the Committee to decide on the matter, and suggested it was a waste of time and that a decision should be made during this Committee session.

The Delegation of **Estonia** endorsed the proposal made by the Delegations of Switzerland and Cambodia.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** reckoned that the representatives of Japan and South Africa had voiced their opinion. It reminded the Committee members that the debate had begun with the assistance of the Legal Advisor and on the basis of the Rules of Procedure. It declared that the opinions of the States Parties should not be disregarded and therefore voiced support for the stances of Japan and South Africa.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Switzerland and seconded by the Delegation of Estonia. It addressed the comments made by the Delegation of Japan, explaining that the Committee was nearly a day behind schedule, and indicated that the debate on Rules of Procedure would take a good deal of time and would result in the Committee agenda not being completed. It indicated that if Committee members insisted on a decision, going to a vote would be the only option. It reminded the Committee that a consensus was always the preferred approach, and appealed that the proposal of the Swiss Delegation be agreed to, so that more time could be allowed for the discussion of this important issue.

The Delegation of **India** explained that the sense of the Committee, the Chairperson and the Legal Advisor had been very clear in earlier discussions. It insisted that States Parties needed to be given the right to speak to the Committee, as was being requested in the proposed amendment it provided to the Rules of Procedure. It warned the Chairperson that in not doing so would turn the world upside down, recommending that the Committee proceed to a vote if necessary.

The Delegation of **Irak** declared it was against adjournment and that it supported the statements by India, UAE, South Africa and Japan.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stressed that some members had the impression that the Committee was backsliding as this debate had begun the day before. It added that it was suggested the day before that the debate would be adjourned to the next morning asked if the Committee was going to discuss this matter now or if it was going to send it to the General Assembly. It added that this why it felt to have a lack of understanding of what was being suggested. It requested discussing the issue here and now.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** suggested that the prior day's approach had been very clear, and reminded the Committee that the Legal Advisor had confirmed that the Committee had the authority to change its Rules of Procedure. It reminded the Committee that this item was part on the agenda, and needed to be addressed. It expressed support for the proposal of South Africa and India.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** déclare ne veut pas vouloir revenir sur discussion prise la veille mais s'y sentir malgré tout obligée. Elle rappelle les déclarations du conseiller juridique qu'elle considère comme ayant été claires. Elle souligne qu'il est à présent dit qu'il faut reporter ce débat à l'Assemblée Générale ou bien proposer de créer un groupe de travail. Or elle rappelle qu'il a été dit que le groupe de travail sur le Règlement intérieur a été créé par l'Assemblée Générale des parties et qu'on dit maintenant qu'il faut présenter les conclusions du Comité à l'Assemblée Générale. Elle demande quelles sont les prérogatives de l'Assemblée Générale et si celle-ci peut créer un groupe de travail sur les compétences du Comité ?

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that the Rules of Procedure were being discussed in response to the recommendations by the Audit on the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative and as a follow-up to the recommendations of the Open-ended working group. It explained that some of the recommendations related to how the Committee carried out its work; hence the reason the Committee was discussing this issue.

L'**Algérie** recommande de continuer les débats et d'en transmettre les résultats à l'Assemblée Générale.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** déclare soutenir la position du Président qui souhaite gagner du temps. Il estime que le Comité n'a d'autre choix que d'avancer. Il rappelle que la Délégation de la Suisse a suggéré la veille d'arrêter la discussion pour mieux repartir et non pas pour s'enliser. Il recommande de ne pas d'attendre le mois de novembre parce que beaucoup de pays seront sortis du Comité. Il estime que ceux qui ont commencé la discussion doivent la continuer et recommande de chercher un consensus puis de voter si ce consensus n'est pas trouvé.

La Délégation de la **France** estime qu'au vu de ce qui a été indiqué et, afin de respecter les compétences dévolues au Comité, le débat pourrait se poursuivre. Mais elle ajoute que s'il doit y avoir renvoi, elle soutiendrait la possibilité de renvoyer au Comité sachant qu'il pourrait y avoir un groupe de travail ad-hoc dévolu à cette question.

Le Délégation du **Mali** pense que le Comité est sur la bonne voie à savoir qu'un débat avait commencé et qu'une suspension avait été demandée afin d'avancer. Elle estime que le point d'achoppement a été réglé et qu'il faut continuer le débat.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** maintained its position but took note of the intervention of the French Delegation. It asked France to clarify its suggestion, and to say whether it was about continuing the debate and setting up a working group in case a conclusion could not be reached. It stressed that if the suggestion of France was such, it was in favor of pursuing the debate.

La Délégation de la **France** dit envisager la prochaine session de façon à permettre au Comité d'exercer ses compétences tout en respectant les horaires.

Le **Président** souligne que la question des compétences du Comité ne pose pas de problème. Il rappelle que le Comité a la compétence pour décider et estime qu'en raison de l'importance et de la sensibilité du point 11, il se demande s'il faut prendre une décision très rapide ce jour ou bien s'il faut y passer du temps avec la création d'un groupe ad hoc qui continuer à réfléchir à la question pour arriver à une décision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that the matter was a procedural issue and that the Committee had no need to search for a consensus that was virtually unattainable. It suggested that the Committee voted at once.

The Delegation of **India** supported the comments made by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

Le **Président** propose de présenter le texte sur écran pour que les membres du Comité décident paragraphe par paragraphe. Il ajoute que si les décisions ne peuvent pas être prises et qu'on ne peut pas avancer, il conviendra alors de procéder à la création d'un groupe ad hoc pour poursuivre la réflexion. Il souhaite que le Comité puisse décider ensemble et adopter le texte paragraphe par paragraphe mais souligne que si le processus ne peut pas avancer, il arrêtera les discussions et créera un groupe de travail ad hoc pour remettre la discussion à la 38eme Session.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** remarked that two delegations had proposed the vote and that as per the Rules of Procedures, the Committee should move on to voting.

The Delegation **India** explained that a working group was outside of the task at hand. It explained that if the request to continue deliberating over this item was not continued during this Committee, then it should be brought to the attention of the next session of the Committee, and not to a working group, nor to the General Assembly.

Le **Président** dit que la décision sera prise au nom du Comité, que le groupe de travail ne pourra pas prendre de décision. Il demande sur quoi le Comité pourrait voter si le texte n'est pas encore décidé et se demande comment voter sur un texte qui n'a pas encore été très bien discuté. Il souligne que procéder de la sorte ne serait pas rationnel. Il recommande d'examiner le texte paragraphe par paragraphe et souligne qu'il s'agit du décision très importante et qu'il faut éviter qu'on dise à l'avenir que le Comité a pris une décision erronée. Il recommande donc de procéder paragraphe par paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Germany** suggested that either a vote take place on the amended decision, or the discussion be postponed to the next session of the Committee

The Delegation of **India** reminded the Committee that 16 countries had supported the Indian amendment, and explained that there had been an agreed text the previous day. It clarified that the proposal was not to take it to the next Committee session. It also reminded that 12 members of the Committee would retire – and suggested that if a decision was not taken in this Committee session, then the next Committee session would do so.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** reminded the Committee that it mentioned the day before how important transparency was. It expressed the wish to turn to the Legal Advisor to ask if the discussion of the item should be continued after it was postponed and if the Committee should proceed to a vote if no agreement could be reached. It asked the Legal Advisor if it was legal to proceed to a vote or not.

Le **Président** demande au Rapporteur de présenter le texte paragraphe par paragraphe.

The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that the issue was a critical one, and that moving it to the next Committee would not resolve the problem. It explained that a working group sometimes excluded people from the decision making process, expressly or implicitly. It indicated that a vote had been requested and that it supported the request.

Le **Rapporteur** informe que le Comité était d'accord sur le paragraphe 22.6 et présente le paragraphe 22.7 tel qu'il était au moment où la session a été levée.

Le paragraphe 22.7 est adopté.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique avoir l'impression que le Comité pourrait prendre des décisions qui iraient à l'encontre des résolutions prises par l'Assemblée Générale, même s'il en a le droit. Dans un esprit de conciliation pour le 22.7, elle propose que l'Etat Partie pourrait se prononcer avant et non pas après les Organes consultatifs.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souhaite reformuler le dernier membre du paragraphe 22.7 mais ayant entendu le représentant de la Suisse souhaite lui demander pourquoi il suggère que l'Etat Partie parle avant les Organisations consultatives.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime qu'il s'agit d'une question de logique de procédure. Rappelant que l'Etat Partie constitue d'abord un dossier qui est ensuite examiné par les Organisation consultatives, elle indique souhaiter voir la même logique respectée dans les travaux oraux du Comité.

Le **Président** demande à l'Algérie si elle est satisfaite de la réponse du représentant de la Suisse.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rappelle que le terme de plaidoyer a été longuement discuté hier pour être défini par le fait qu'un pays peut venir encore une fois pour exposer son dossier et y apporter des éclaircissements sur l'évaluation qui a été faite et les questions qui lui sont posées. Elle rappelle que le Comité a passé un certain temps sur cette question la veille et estime que ce n'est pas une question de procédure ne de forme.

Le **Président** indique que le Conseiller Juridique a expliqué plusieurs fois la pleine compétence du Comité pour prendre des décisions.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its belief that the Committee's competencies in the matter of amending the Rules of Procedure were clear to all members, except for some, and once again asked the **Legal Advisor** if the Committee had the power to decide now on the changes to the Rules of Procedure.

The **Legal Advisor** explained that the Committee did indeed have the power to change its Rules of Procedure, as per articles 10 and 13.8 of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Estonia** explained that it understood what the word "advocacy" means, and indicated that he had no illusion that many statements by States Parties often clearly consisted of advocating for the inscription of their sites. It indicated that it supported the "may be" version of the amendment.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** déclare se poser à présent beaucoup de questions en particulier sur ce que le Comité souhaite exactement ; elle se demande si l'on souhaite voir les Etats Parties ligotés et livrés aux évaluateurs. Elle estime qu'il n'y aurait aucun sens à parler avant l'évaluateur. Elle trouve normal que l'évaluateur parle et qu'on donne ensuite à l'Etat Partie les moyens de donner des informations complémentaires pour éclairer le Comité. Elle invite le Comité à être logique et estime que la logique veut qu'une réponse soit apportée à une question.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** seconded the comments made by the Delegation of Senegal, and expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Delegations of India and of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** praised the declaration of Senegal and added that it would not defer when it comes to ideologies or agendas or ways of working when a State Party presents its file. It reminded the Committee of past cases where good ways of dealing with situations were found and discussions were not paralyzed by the Rules of Procedures. It expressed trust in the Committee and declared it was not useful to keep on trying to find arguments hindering its work. It reminded that in a democratic world one should try to make one's case and if there is a disagreement, one should go on to vote. It vowed to continue to discuss to do what could be done if no conclusion could be reached.

Le **Président** souligne que de nombreux commentaires généraux ont été faits et invite les membres à se concentrer sur le texte. Il indique que les Délégations de l'Algérie, du Sénégal et de l'Ethiopie ont pris parole sur la substance du paragraphe et qu'il convient de se concentrer sur cela.

La Délégation du **Mexique** indique qu'elle s'était abstenue d'exprimer son avis sur cette question très importante mais pense, à la lumière du débat et de son expérience, qu'il est beaucoup plus logique de donner la parole aux Etats Parties après avoir entendu l'avis des Organisations consultatives. Elle souhaite nuancer la rédaction du texte en remplaçant « pourront être invitées » par « pourraient être invitées » par le Président à exprimer leur point de vue. Elle estime que cette nuance permettra une plus grande précision plus grande. Elle reprend arguments du Sénégal et Algérie qu'elle déclare appuyer.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** disagreed to give the floor to the State Party before the Advisory Bodies and expressed support to the stances made by Senegal and the others. It added that the Committee members were trying to include what already existed de facto since the Committee actually gives the floor to the State Parties. It asked the Chairperson to take it to the vote and to move on.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souhaite répondre aux réactions à sa précédente intervention et souligne que son intérêt et sa volonté ne sont pas de museler un Etat Partie. Elle rappelle que les rapports sont connus à l'avance et étudiés avant la réunion Comité. Elle déclare que sa suggestion avait été émise pour permettre un travail qui serait une réponse et non un simple résumé oral et que c'est pourquoi elle suggère de donner la parole à l'Etat Partie avant les Organisations consultatives, lui donnant ainsi la possibilité d'apporter des éléments nouveaux en pleine connaissance de ce qui a été écrit et dit auparavant.

Le **Président** propose de procéder au vote.

Le **Sénégal** est d'accord pour voter mais souhaite avoir de plus amples indications sur le sujet exact du vote et ses modalités.

The **Delegation of the Russian Federation** took the floor to explain again that what was currently being discussed, already exists the facto and requested the Chair to consult the Committee Members whether they agree with the proposed formulation.

The **Delegations of Iraq and Qatar** agreed with Senegal that in case no agreement could be reached, the question should be put to a vote.

The **Delegation of Germany** supported Senegal. It mentioned that there are still some open issues but the delegation would go along with the majority. It also addressed the use of the proposed verbs which could be changed to “may” or “could”. Furthermore, the Delegation requested language clarifications concerning the wording of the paragraph in French.

Le **Rapporteur** précise que l'un est au futur, l'autre au conditionnel.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated that it preferred the French suggestion although it would like more time. It supported Mexico and Senegal in view of the consensus.

The **Rapporteur** read the English language version of the paragraph to which no objections were made.

The paragraph was adopted as amended.

The **Delegation of Japan** took the floor to request for clarifications concerning the abandoned use of “shall” which had been supported by many State Parties. In response, the Rapporteur explained that the adopted wording was a compromise solution.

With regard to Paragraph 22, the Delegation of **Germany** requested a clarification why the Committee members should be treated differently than other States Parties, non-members of the Committee and proposed the wording to be harmonized.

Le **Rapporteur** convient qu'il faudrait dire la même chose dans les 2 paragraphes et que le terme « Etats parties » convient mieux, sans préciser s'il s'agit ou non d'un membre du Comité.

Le **Président** suggère qu'afin d'aller plus rapidement, il faudrait se concentrer sur une seule version.

Le **Rapporteur** propose de dire « Une fois ce temps de parole accordé, l'Etat Partie pourra se voir accorder la permission de fournir des informations, exclusivement en réponse aux questions qui lui auront été posées »

La délégation de **l'Algérie** veut proposer autre formulation : il est délicat d'accorder permission à un Etat partie. Il serait préférable de dire : « pourra se voir accorder la parole de nouveau ».

La délégation de la **France** propose d'utiliser le mot « seulement » et non « exclusivement » car c'est la traduction de "only".

La délégation **d'Allemagne** demande à ajouter "limité" en ce qui concerne le temps de parole.

Le **Rapporteur** rajoute cette précision « en respectant le temps limité ».

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** underlined that the discussed issue is quite clear as long as the Chair limits the time for intervention and the text can be maintained as it is.

Le Rapporteur lit l'amendement en français, précisant que cette disposition s'applique également aux autres observateurs.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** indique que sa proposition « l'Etat Partie pourra se voir accorder la parole de nouveau seulement pour répondre aux questions » et non pas « en réponse aux questions », car il est possible que l'Etat partie ne souhaite pas répondre.

Le **Rapporteur** relit le paragraphe.

Le **Président** propose l'adoption, ce qui est fait.

Rule 23

The **Rapporteur** read out the French version of the proposed amendment of Rule 23, as proposed by France and requested adjustment of the English version.

A brief discussion followed concerning a language issue which, according to the Delegation of South Africa, made the English version of the text insufficiently clear. Germany proposed a small reshuffling of the text of the English version which was satisfactory for the Committee members.

La délégation de la **France** indique que son souhait n'était pas de modifier le contenu du texte lui-même mais seulement le clarifier pour éviter des interprétations équivoques.

Le **Président** propose l'adoption s'il n'y a pas d'objection. Cela étant le cas, le paragraphe 23.2 est adopté.

ITEM 12 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/12

Decision: **37 COM 12**

The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairman of the Working Group, Mr Imhoof, for the outstanding quality of the work of the Operational Guidelines working group during the two last sessions of the Committee and asked him to present the results of the work of the group.

RAPPORT ORAL DU PRESIDENT DU GROUPE DE TRAVAIL SUR LES ORIENTATIONS

Le Président du Groupe de travail indique avoir le plaisir de présenter les conclusions et le projet de décision élaborés par le Groupe de travail dont le mandat était la révision de certains points des *Orientations* inventoriés dans le document de travail WHC-13/37.COM/12.

.

Il informe que le groupe s'est réuni six fois à l'heure du déjeuner et a aussi profité d'un après-midi pour se réunir et que les points suivants reflétés dans le projet de décision ont été examinés. .

Paragraphe 150

La discussion du premier jour de travail a porté sur le paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*, qui a trait à la procédure relative au traitement des lettres signalant des « erreurs factuelles », sur la nécessité notamment de définir plus clairement ce qu'est une erreur factuelle et en ce qui concerne le processus de révision des soumissions de propositions faites par les Etats parties. Une proposition a été faite par les Délégations de l'Inde, de la Suisse et du Brésil pour une révision du paragraphe 150, proposition qui a été amendée après discussion pour rationaliser le processus. Il a été décidé d'élaborer un formulaire dont la version retenue est annexée au projet de décision afin de faciliter la soumission des commentaires par les Etats parties, assurer la transparence complète du processus et réduire la charge de travail.

Paragraphes 161 et 162

S'agissant des paragraphes 161 et 162 sur le processus des propositions d'inscription d'urgence, le groupe de travail a eu un débat intense et a constitué un groupe de rédaction avec la France et d'autres participants pour aboutir à une proposition de consensus.

Paragraphe 240

Le Président indique que le Groupe de travail a adopté sans discussion ce paragraphe, étant donné qu'il s'agissait d'une simple question de cohérence.

Paragraphe 61

Le Président indique que ce paragraphe a donné lieu à un débat intense, étant le reflet de la décision 36 COM 15 venant du groupe du budget à la 36e session qui visait à réduire le nombre de propositions d'inscription à traiter chaque année en raison des contraintes budgétaires. Le groupe a eu une discussion sur le nombre de propositions d'inscription mais aussi sur de plus vastes considérations qui relèvent en fait de la Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée, la question de la sur/sous-représentation, l'ordre des priorités des propositions d'inscription, toutes les questions qui devraient être incluses dans le débat sur le futur de la Convention, issu de la décision de Suzhou-Cairns qu'il est prévu de réviser en 2015.

Le Président mentionne que le groupe a décidé sur le nombre d'inscription devant être étudié chaque année qu'il serait sage d'attendre l'évaluation et la révision prévues pour 2015 avant de procéder à ces changements ; le groupe de travail a également enregistré une proposition du Brésil d'y considérer le point concernant le nombre et la nature des inscriptions qui peuvent être soumises chaque année par chaque Etat partie et de revoir la proposition d'origine de la délégation brésilienne consistant à limiter par session la présentation de la candidature d'un site naturel et un site culturel au lieu de la limite à une seule proposition mixte (naturelle/paysage culturel et culturelle). Cette proposition a été renvoyée à un stade ultérieur, de même

que l'examen d'éventuelles propositions mathématiques sur l'équilibre de la représentation par région.

Ainsi le Président précise que le groupe de travail propose de ne pas toucher à l'heure actuelle au libellé du paragraphe 61 des *Orientations*, mais propose que le débat sur ces questions soit repris dans le cadre de la révision de la décision de Suzhou Cairns.

Paragraphe 132

Le Président précise qu'une longue discussion a également eu lieu sur le paragraphe 132 des *Orientations* et sa note explicative figurant en annexe 5, concernant les critères qui permettent d'établir que les dossiers d'inscription sont complets et que les amendements proposés par le Secrétariat apportent d'avantage de clarté, particulièrement en ce qui concerne les cartes topographiques.

Paragraphe 127, 141 et 168

Le Président indique que le groupe a examiné les changements proposés pour les paragraphes 127, 141, et 168. Il a été décidé de ne pas rendre obligatoire la soumission de projets de dossiers d'inscription avant le 30 septembre, mais, en revanche, d'encourager fortement les Etats parties à le faire. C'est l'approche que reflète la version proposée pour la rédaction de ces paragraphes. Par conséquent, le groupe de travail n'a pas suggéré de modification aux paragraphes 141 et 168 concernant la réception des projets de dossiers d'inscription.

Réunions internationales

En ce qui concerne les adaptations envisageables des *Orientations* découlant des réunions thématiques sur différents sujets (intégrité, architecture de terre, peuples autochtones), le Président informe qu'il a été fait référence, dans le projet de décision, au besoin d'une réflexion plus approfondie dans le contexte approprié. A cet égard, le groupe a également souligné que ces réflexions doivent trouver leur place dans les textes les plus appropriés, qu'elles pourraient donc être insérées, non pas nécessairement dans les *Orientations*, mais dans les manuels de ressources ou les pages internet.

Le Président précise aussi que suite aux recommandations de la réunion du Danemark sur les peuples autochtones, plus particulièrement, il y a eu consensus sur le fait d'attendre que le Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO ait examiné la question de la politique sur les peuples indigènes.

Synergies des Conventions de 1954 et 1972

Finalement le groupe a entendu la proposition du Président du Comité de la Convention de 1954, visant à renforcer les synergies entre les deux Conventions. Il s'agirait notamment d'inclure dans le formulaire du dossier d'inscription des biens figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, la possibilité de demander, par la même occasion, le statut de « protection renforcée », sous l'égide du second Protocole de la Convention de 1954 le Groupe a considéré qu'il s'agissait là d'une idée intéressante et a proposé de mandater le Centre du patrimoine mondial de travailler

conjointement avec le Secrétariat de la Convention de 1954 à la présentation d'une proposition concrète à examiner prochainement.

Le Président mentionne finalement que le Groupe a également abordé des questions à traiter lors de prochaines sessions et fait des propositions qui ne sont pas couvertes par le document de travail ni les demandes spécifiques du Comité faites au Groupe de travail.

Ainsi, le Président se réfère à la Décision 36 COM 13.I qui reconnaît précisément « la valeur de la proposition présentée par la Jordanie visant à remplacer le texte du paragraphe 68 des Orientations » mais a cependant considéré que « la modification ne s'impose pas à ce stade » ; le Président indique qu'il a été proposé d'aborder ce thème lors d'une prochaine session.

Le Président mentionne que le Groupe a reçu différentes propositions à examiner par le Comité lors de ses futures sessions. .

Le Président indique qu'il a été décidé que toutes questions relatives au règlement intérieur, à la stratégie à long terme et aux processus ainsi qu'au futur de la Convention, devraient être examinées ultérieurement, peut-être dans le cadre d'une discussion approfondie sur les *Orientations de politique générale*.

Pour finir, le Président souligne qu'il a déjà mentionné que des adaptations des *Orientations*, guide juridique pour les utilisateurs sur le terrain, ne devraient pas être faites dans la précipitation et que le Comité a adopté un cycle de 4 ans pour ce faire. Il pourrait être considéré que le cycle se termine aujourd'hui, mais, de nouvelles propositions sont déjà sur la table. Tenant compte des réflexions générales concernant la Stratégie globale, le Président propose d'envisager de mener la prochaine révision majeure des *Orientations* en 2015, en ligne avec l'évaluation de la Stratégie globale et un certain nombre d'autres processus. [Le texte complet de ce Rapport figure à l'Annexe XI du présent document]

The Draft Decisions **37 COM 12.1** and **12.2** were adopted.

The **Delegations of India** and **France** as well as the Chairperson expressed their appreciation for the high quality and leadership of the Chairperson, Mr. Imhoof, in the work of the Working Group and congratulated him.

La Délégation de la **France** indique qu'elle souhaite se joindre aux propos laudatifs du Président pour le travail accompli sous l'égide de l'ambassadeur Imhof et lui transmettre ses remerciements et félicitations pour ce remarquable travail collectif.

ITEM 13 DRAFT POLICY GUIDELINES

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/12

Decision: **37 COM 13**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Secretariat** to present the working document.

The Secretariat explained that the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session decided to “develop ‘Policy Guidelines’ for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, drawing in part on the results of expert meetings and consultative bodies” (Decision 35 COM 12B, point 12). The Policy Guidelines should assist States Parties to the Convention to better understand and address the management of their cultural and natural heritage and how to face key challenges. They could become a guidance tool for States Parties to improve decision-making in the framework of the World Heritage Convention. They could – in a first step - give an overview about existing policy guidelines and - in a second step - include guidelines to be developed in the future. It was also explained that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have had discussions on the procedure of compiling a Policy Guidelines document as well as on the next steps. The document contains a summary of these discussions as well as a draft text on the compilation of potential Policy Guidelines in the Annex, for consideration and discussion by the Committee.

The scope of Policy Guidelines was much larger than the subjects so far included in the Annex. However, the compilation and further elaboration of Policy Guidelines needs a considerable increase in the resource allocation to provide a useful result. If the Committee decides to move forward with this initiative, extrabudgetary funding will be necessary.

IUCN made a statement on behalf of all Advisory Bodies and expressed appreciation for the work of the World Heritage Centre in compiling a number of policy guidelines. He further mentioned that a potential misunderstanding should be avoided, taking into account that the term “guidelines” is being used both for the operational and the policy guidelines and therefore a different title could be considered and a thorough exercise should be undertaken instead of presenting only a compilation. The document has to be further developed but funding and capacity have to be in place in order for this to happen.

The Delegation of **India** noted the work done by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and highlighted that in its current format the document does not read as Policy guidelines. It noted the lack of financial and human resources and also raised the issue by whom this work should be done. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies were overloaded but maybe ICCROM could be requested to produce a consistent document which could serve as a baseline for further development.

The Delegation of **Estonia** took the floor to highlight that it would be impossible for the work to continue before funding is available. It also underlined that the original version of the proposed decision should be maintained, i.e. the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should be request to continue this work. It also pointed out that the opinion of ICCROM should be sought as to whether it would agree to undertake this work.

ICCROM underlined that the work could not be done by ICCROM alone, without the strong input of the World Heritage Centre and the other Advisory Bodies. He also requested clarification as to the type of work requested – whether it concerns a new version of the Policy Guidelines or a new scoping study. Resource should however be made available.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that a brief scoping document could be produced, the responsibility for which should be given to ICCROM.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 13** was then adopted as amended.

ITEM 14 EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/14
WHC-13/37.COM/INF.14
Decision: **37 COM 14**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Secretariat** from the World Heritage Centre to introduce the working document.

The Secretariat indicated that part I, as requested by the Committee last year (Decision 36 COM 14, paragraph 3), includes the status of implementation of the International assistance requests for the Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar), which was approved by the Committee in 2010 for US\$100,000.

Further, under part II, the Secretariat mentioned that there is a proposal to amend Paragraph 240 of the Operational Guidelines, since the second part of this paragraph is no longer consistent with the new panel system instituted by Decision 36 COM 14. This proposal was discussed in detail by the working group on the Operational Guidelines and the Committee just adopted these changes under item 13.

The Secretariat pointed out as well that in annex, there is also an analysis of Preparatory Assistance requests dedicated to the preparation of nomination files and approved during the period 2001-2010. This analysis was prepared by the Secretariat following the request made by a member of the World Heritage Committee.

In reviewing this analysis it is important to recall that over the years, along with increasingly comprehensive requirements, the preparation of nominations has become a complex and long process. In this context, the funds approved under Preparatory Assistance only amount to a maximum of US\$ 30,000 per request, and therefore can never finance the whole nomination process but only contribute to part of it.

Finally, the Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to Document WHC-13/37.COM/INF.14 which shows the current status of IA budget for 2012-2013.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 14** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to two Observers.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** thanked India for having requested an analysis of the allocated international assistance which was considered very useful.

The Observer Delegation of **Finland** announced that it will be providing additional voluntary contribution towards international assistance, for the conservation of natural and mixed sites.

The **Chairperson** expressed his gratitude to Finland on behalf of all Committee Members.

ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET AND PREPARATION OF THE 2014-2015 BUDGET

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/15.Rev

Decision: **37 COM 15**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Chairman of the Budget Working Group, Mr. Van Schalwyck, to present the results of the work of the group and praised the Chair for his outstanding commitment to the work of the group. The Chairperson further explained that a Draft Decision resulting from the work of the group has been proposed and distributed.

The Chairman of the Budget Working Group expressed its pleasure of introducing the Draft Decision on the budget emanating from the consultations conducted in the budget-working group. He recalled that the Working group held 7 sessions during which it considered the following three main elements of the budget document: the implementation of the budget for the current biennium 2012-2013; the proposed budget for the next biennium of 2014-2015; and the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund.

The Chairman highlighted that in terms of the implementation of the budget for the current biennium, the non-payment of contributions by a major contributing State Party was continuing to have a detrimental effect on the implementation of the Convention. As such, the budget on which the Centre is currently operating is 21.19% less than originally approved, and a number of important activities were not undertaken by the World Heritage Centre.

The Chairman of the Working group indicated that, in addition to the non-payment of assessed contributions, there was also the larger problem of the long-term sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, which existed even before a major contributing State Party stopped paying its contributions. He underlined that the States Parties continue to inscribe more and more World Heritage sites resulting in increased work requested from the Advisory Bodies, as well as from the World Heritage Centre, the latter with fewer staff members. In this regard the World Heritage Centre is further increasingly depended on staff hired for the implementation of extrabudgetary activities to implement statutory work. At the same time, however, assessed contributions are not increasing as no new Member States will be joining the Convention due to it being virtually universal. The Convention also does not provide for an increase in assessed contributions. The options to ensure the

sustainability of the World Heritage Fund are therefore limited and can only be undertaken on a voluntary basis.

The Chairman of the Group indicated that the Group considered a number of options whereby States Parties could be requested to make, on a voluntary basis and within their respective capacities to pay, an additional contribution to the World Heritage Fund. He recalled that the Committee, at its last session, decided that a general appeal be made for supplementary voluntary contributions. This general appeal was subsequently implemented by the World Heritage Centre; sadly this appeal proved ineffective and only one State Party responded with a contribution of \$10 000. Therefore he noted that the Committee needed to consider an alternative method for calling on States Parties to make supplementary voluntary contributions to sustain the World Heritage Fund.

Unfortunately, the Chairman informed that the working group could not find any consensus on the different options proposed. Consequently, noting that the status quo in terms of contributions to the Fund was neither tenable nor sustainable, the Chairman of the Working group indicated that he took the liberty, in his capacity as Chairman, to propose option 1.1 reflected in Annex VI of the budget document for the consideration of the Committee. He underlined that Option 1.1 would merely call on States Parties to consider doubling their assessed contributions or assessed voluntary contributions. The Chairman reiterated in this regard that such a call on States Parties did not place any obligation on them to make additional payments, but merely set an indicative target which States could use if they considered themselves to be in a position to make supplementary voluntary contributions to the Fund.

The Chairman of the Working Group finally appealed to the Committee to adopt this option as a first step to addressing the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. He appealed also to those few Committee Members that interpret this voluntary appeal as in some or other way placing an obligation on them, not to block this decision but rather to allow States Parties to decide for themselves whether they would like to double their contributions or not. Finally he indicated that aside from this one matter, the remainder of the Draft Decision enjoyed consensus and that it was recommended to adopt it as presented.

The Chairman ended his presentation by thanking all the delegates, Committee and non-Committee Members, experts, the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their cooperation and support as well as the collegial manner in which we were able to do our work. He also thanked the host country for the facilities and support personnel which it made available to the Budget Working Group and which greatly facilitated its work. [The text of this Report is attached in its entirety in Annex XII of the present document]

The Delegation of **Japan** took the floor to highlight that the proposed formulation goes against the idea of a voluntary contribution and suggested deletion of the relevant text in paragraphs 30 and 31.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** congratulated the Chair of the Working Group and supported the proposed option put forward by him.

The Delegations of **France, Germany, the Russian Federation and India**, agreed with the Delegation of Japan and highlighted that there should be no confusion as to

the nature of the contribution which should be voluntary and should not be mixed with the compulsory contributions of States Parties.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the Representative of the Director-General.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture thanked the Committee for the adopted Decision. He clarified that this decision concerns only a part of the overall budget necessary for the functioning of the World Heritage Convention and its Secretariat. He recalled the current financial difficulties of UNESCO and highlighted the ongoing restructuring and re-budgeting process. He mentioned, more specifically, the extraordinary meeting of the Executive Board scheduled for 4 July 2013, as well as the work of the Ad hoc group which had a priority-setting mandate. He recalled that the Culture Conventions are largely supported and maybe budget cuts could be limited but currently they are estimated at at least 20%. This would certainly create a problem for the proper functioning of the Secretariat as it will not be able to maintain the same level of services which are provided today. Therefore, a discussion was needed concerning the mode of operation and where cuts can be made. He informed the Committee that in this situation the “business as usual” could not continue.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** took the floor to express her agreement with the concerns raised by the Assistant Director-General for Culture. It expressed its opinion that in the case of the World Heritage Convention, which is the flagship legal instrument of UNESCO; efforts should be made to maintain the allocation of funds and appealed to Committee Members and other States Parties to make relevant steps in this regard.

The Delegation of **India** fully supported the Russian Federation. Every delegation should take a view and a stand on this issue, with regard to the Working Ad hoc group and the Executive Board. It will be up to the Chairperson to decide whether a collective view of the Committee can be communicated to the Executive Board of UNESCO.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** proposed that suitable language can be included in the Budget decision, and not in a separate resolution, to call upon the Executive Board to ensure sufficient funding for the World Heritage Convention.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que cette Convention est l'une des plus reconnues et qu'il est sage de la protéger. Elle considère qu'il serait utile de protéger le budget du Centre et de le mettre hors ajustements, en posant une demande auprès des organes de décision.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal of the Russian Federation.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegations which took part in the discussion and informed the Committee that the Secretariat would present a draft paragraph as agreed, after the lunch break.

The meeting rose at 12.30 pm.

NINETH DAY – TUESDAY 25 June 2013

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

2.30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

The **Chairperson** informed that item 17 of the Agenda regarding the election of the Bureau for the next session will be examined at a later stage.

ITEM 16 OTHER BUSINESS

No document

The Chairperson noted that no matter were raised under Item 16.

ITEM 18 FORTHCOMING SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

18A PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 38TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2014)

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/18A

Decision: **37 COM 18A**

The **Secretariat** presented the Provisional agenda of the next session of the Committee which will be host by Qatar from 15 to 25 June 2014.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Delegation of Qatar for the invitation to host the 2014 Meeting. The Delegation reiterated that Germany would like to host the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee in Berlin in 2015.

The Delegations of **South Africa, Russia, France, Mexico and the UAE** thanked the German Delegation for offering to host the 39th session, and supported the proposal.

La Délégation **française** se réjouit de la proposition allemande et lui apporte son soutien.

La Délégation du **Mexique** se félicite que l'Allemagne propose d'accueillir à Berlin la 39^e session du Comité, étant donné l'ampleur d'un tel événement.

The Delegations of **Mexico, Cambodia and the Russian Federation** supported amending the Draft Decision to include the invitation by Germany for the 39th Session.

The **Secretariat** recalled that the Committee should decide at its 38th session the location of its 39th session, it informed that the invitation by Germany is referred to under the Draft Decision **37 COM 17**.

L'**UICN** propose de mettre deux points à l'agenda du prochain comité. Tout d'abord le point 5C, aborder le suivi de la réunion de la Directrice Générale en coordination avec le suivi de l'évaluation de la stratégie mondiale et du plan d'action stratégique de la convention. Ensuite, revenir aux rapports périodiques afin d'achever et de soutenir le rapport d'action mis en place à cette session pour l'Amérique latine et le Caraïbes.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** noted that the date should not coincide with the Football World Cup.

The Draft Decision **18A** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET AND PREPARATION OF THE 2014-2015 BUDGET *(continuation)*

Coming back to this Agenda item, the **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to present the suggested amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation**, supported by the Delegations of **Switzerland, Malaysia and Colombia** noted that the wording should be more focused. The budget should not be cut. A more decisive tone was suggested.

The **Representative of the Director General** noted that budget issues are not currently being discussed, and recommended that additional complications not be introduced during the already complicated priority-setting exercise.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the comments of the Russian Federation, but took note of the Representative of the Director General's comments. The Delegation suggested that it might be worth noting that the 1972 Convention is a flagship programme of UNESCO, and to call on the Executive Board to take its importance into consideration. It suggested specific language, i.e to urge, requesting that the Executive Board maintain support of the World Heritage Convention as a flagship of UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** suggested that the Executive Board should be asked to maintain its support on the previous level of financial applications.

La délégation du **Sénégal** demande au conseiller juridique si les rapports entre le Comité et le Conseil Exécutif de l'UNESCO permettent l'emploi de termes injonctifs.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that the World Heritage Committee is a body established by a Convention, and is therefore completely independent from the Executive Board. Thus, as a body created by Treaty it is not dependent on UNESCO for its existence.

The **Representative of the Director General** noted that the bodies are autonomous but work closely together and in strong cooperation and interdependence. There is precedents for the Committee to "recommend" issues for consideration by the Executive Board; however, he noted that UNESCO is facing a difficult decision regarding budgets and urged the Committee to not adopt language that is too binding in recognition of the difficult situation.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted the uniqueness of the World Heritage Convention and reiterated its call to not reduce the Centre's budget.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** noted support for what was just said.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that it was not an instruction, but rather a strong request, that was being recommended. The Delegation reiterated its call for stronger wording.

The Draft Decisions **37 COM 15.I and 37 COM 15.II** were adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 15 of the Agenda.

ITEM 18 FORTHCOMING SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (continuation)

18B FEASIBILITY STUDY ON AN ADDITIONAL ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/18B

Decision: **37 COM 18B**

The **Secretariat** presented the Feasibility Study, noting in particular the financial, staffing and timing implications. The Draft Decision recommended not to include an additional session, but to re-assess this matter at its 39th session in 2015.

The Draft Decision **37.COM 18B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 18 of the Agenda.

ITEM 19 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 19TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION (UNESCO HQ, 2013)

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/19

WHC-13/37.COM/INF.19

Decision: **37 COM 19**

The **Secretariat** presented the provisional Agenda of the next session of the General Assembly to the Committee.

The Secretariat presented the provisional Agenda of the next session of the General Assembly to the Committee.

The Representative of the Observer Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that the issue of elections to the World Heritage Committee was of concern for the Delegation of Brazil. He indicated that during the last session of the General Assembly (2011), a number of countries (especially from Group III – GRULAC) expressed their concern on the lack of geographical balance in the membership of the Committee and

expressed their wish that this should be brought to the next session of the GA (2013). He mentioned moreover that during and after the work of the Working Group on the follow-up on the recommendation of the external auditor, the fact that Members of the Committee should not present nominations during their term of Office was raised many times. He indicated that, according to his Delegation, that was going against the spirit of Rule 14.I (paragraph c) of the Rules of Procedures of the General Assembly which states that “ Notwithstanding, at each election, one seat shall be reserved for States Parties with no property on the World Heritage List.”. He indicated therefore that an item on the Revision of the Rule of Procedure should be added to the Draft Agenda of the 19th session of the General Assembly.

He asked a Committee member to support this proposal.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported by **Mexico, the UAE, the Russian Federation and Senegal** agreed with the comments of the Observer Delegation of Brazil, and requested that the item be included on the Agenda for the next session of the General Assembly.

La Délégation du **Soudan** (Observateur) soutient la proposition du Brésil en faveur d’une répartition des Etats du Comité plus équilibrée géographiquement.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** donne lecture d’une déclaration préparée par les Etats observateurs (notamment la Barbade, la Belgique, la Cote d’Ivoire, la Grèce, la Hongrie, le Niger, les Pays-Bas, La Pologne et la Slovaquie). La Déclaration souligne que les Etats observateurs souhaitent un retour aux principes de la convention et une dépolitisation des débats. Ils estiment que l’objectif partagé par tous est celui de la conservation des sites du Patrimoine dont la dégradation ou la disparition appauvrit l’ensemble de l’humanité. Pour ces raisons les Etats dépositaires de cette déclaration souhaitent remettre la question de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle des biens au cœur du débat. [Le texte de la Déclaration est joint dans son intégralité en Annexe XIII du présent document]

The Draft Decision **37 COM 19** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 19** of the Agenda.

ITEM 17 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 38TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2014)

No Document

The **Chairperson** noted the wish of the German Delegation to propose **Her Excellency Sheikha AL MAYASSA BINT HAMAD AI-THANI** from Qatar to chair the session in 2014 due to her excellent professional background on cultural heritage.

The Delegations of **India, France, Russia, Cambodia, Mali, Algeria, Malaysia, Japan, Mexico, Iraq, South Africa, Colombia, UAE, Switzerland, Senegal, Ethiopia, Estonia, Serbia and Thailand** supported the German proposal.

The **Chairperson** declared Her Excellency **Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani** elected as Chair for the 38th Session of the World Heritage Committee

The Delegation of **Qatar** thanked the Committee for their support.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for nominations for the Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed Senegal as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared **Senegal** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed presented its congratulations to Qatar, and proposed Japan as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared **Japan** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

La Délégation **Suisse** salue les décisions prises et propose l'Allemagne pour la Vice-présidence, le pays ayant fait part de sa volonté de recevoir la 39^e session à Berlin en 215.

The **Chairperson** declared **Germany** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

Le Délégation du **Mexique** propose la Colombie pour la Vice-présidence.

The **Chairperson** declared **Colombia** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of the **UAE** proposed Algeria as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared Algeria elected as Vice-Chairperson.

The **United Arab Emirates** proposed Mr Francisco Gutiérrez (Colombia) as Rapporteur.

Mr Francisco Gutiérrez was elected Rapporteur for the 38th Session.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** strongly regretted that Group II will not be represented on the Bureau. It expressed its interest in nominating Serbia for Europe and North America, and recommended 6 Vice-Chairpersons so that Group II is represented. It requested clarifications from the Chairperson and the Legal Adviser as to ensure better regional representation.

The **Secretariat** indicated that Rule 12.1 pertains to the composition of the Bureau and clearly states that there should be 5 Vice-Chairpersons. Further, the Rapporteur and Chair must be elected in their personal capacity.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified also that there must be five Vice-Chairs as well as a Chair and a Rapporteur elected in a personal capacity. There was no rule regarding geographical distribution of elected persons in this case.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed thanks to Committee for their support. The Delegate noted that Colombia was the only remaining Latin-American country on the

Committee and therefore thanked for election as Vice-Chair in addition to his designation as rapporteur in his personal capacity.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that they will not insist on this matter, but that this issue should have been addressed earlier.

The **Chairperson** indicated that he addressed this issue during the Bureau Meeting and that he had suggested consultations to be held between the groups to reach consensus prior to this meeting.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 17** of the Agenda.

TENTH DAY – WEDNESDAY 26 June 2013

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Dr. SOK AN (Cambodia)

ITEM 20 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Document: WHC-13/37.COM/20
WHC-13/37.COM/INF.20
Decision: **37 COM 20**

The **Chairperson** opened the session by congratulating the Rapporteur and the Secretariat to have succeeded in preparing the report on time. He reminded the Committee that the Decisions included in this report have already been adopted by the Committee and that therefore the task before the Committee is an editorial one as the debate on the content of the Decisions will not be re-opened. He then gave the floor to Rapporteur to explain the report.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les procédures de travail et méthodologie ainsi que le rapport des décisions qui est constitué de cinq parties :

Partie I : **37 COM 2 à 37 COM 6**
Partie II : **37 COM 7A à 37 COM 7C**
Partie III : **37 COM 8A à 37 COM 8E**
Partie IV : **37 COM 9 à 37 COM 13**
Partie V : **37 COM 14 à 37 COM 19.**

As there were no comments, **Part I and II** were adopted.

The **Chairperson** then moved to **Part III** of the report covering decisions **37 COM 8A** to **37 COM 8D**.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that the Decision on the extension of Drakensberg in paragraph 2 second line: it was important to add the word “Park” in the name of the property.

IUCN supported the point made by the Delegation of South Africa and noted that in Decision **37 COM 8B.8** in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, reference should be made to SOUV it should be the inscribed property and not the nominated property. In Decision **37 COM 8B.16** it noted an editorial problem in paragraph 4; third line, as “to be applied” can be deleted. On Decision **37 COM 8B.13** it noted that the in format for name of transboundary property slash should be used in stead of comma.

En réponse à la Délégation du **Mali**, le **Rapporteur** indique que les critères figurant en gras sont ceux qui ont été ajoutés et que la déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle n'a pas encore été rédigée.

The **Chairperson** adopted **Part III** taking into account the comments made.

Regarding **Part IV** (Decisions **37 COM 9** to **37 COM 13**) the Observer Delegation of **Brazil** noted that in Decision **37 COM 10A** regarding the periodic report in the LAC region it should be the World Heritage Centre which is requested to develop the action plan in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and the State Parties.

The **Chairperson** then adopted **Part IV** taking into account the comments made by the Committee members and moved to the last part of report,.

As there were no comments **Part V**, covering decisions **37COM14** to **37COM19**, was adopted.

Finally, the **Chairperson** adopted the Report of Decisions in its entirety.

He declared **Item 20** closed.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The Chairperson gave the floor to the **Director of the World Heritage Centre**

The Director of the World Heritage Centre expressed its sincere gratitude on behalf of the Director General of UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre to the Kingdom of Cambodia for the organization of the 37th session. The Director further thanked the advisory bodies, the Rapporteur and all Committee members for their dedicated collaboration. He expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson for its efficient leadership and its committed efforts to build consensus. The Director pointed to the fact, that the session showed the importance of good collaboration and communication between Committee members, Secretariat and advisory bodies and dialogue with the civil society. The Director indicated that the challenges for the World Heritage Center have continued to amount. While the number of World Heritage Sites would shortly cross the 1000 mark, both financial and human resources had continued to decline and were not adequate to meet the growing needs and expectations. He further pointed out that the issue required serious consideration. To conclude, the Director welcomed the new Chairman and expressed its great anticipation for the collaboration for the 38th Committee session.

Le **Rapporteur** fait une mention spéciale au travail du Secrétariat, aux Organisations consultatives, aux membres du Comité, aux observateurs, aux partenaires et à tous les participants à cette session, sans qui la Convention du patrimoine mondial n'existerait pas. Le Rapporteur souhaite une bonne continuation à M. Gutierrez de la Colombie qui prend sa relève.

The Delegation of **India** on behalf of its Government thanked the State Parties for the condolences it had received over the tragedy taking place in the Himalayas which already had claimed more than 1000 lives.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Chairperson and Government of Cambodia. He also thanked the working volunteers and other people behind the scene.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** thanked Cambodia and expressed its satisfaction as to this meeting, which has been conducted very wisely, in a spirit of cultural exchange, engaging dialogue with each other. The Delegation saluted the wisdom and guidance of the Chairperson. The Delegation thanked the World Heritage Centre, the Rapporteur and the States Parties and reminded it will not be Committee member anymore for the next session but will continue to work with the Centre and the Committee as it shares the values of this Convention.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** félicite le Président du Comité, au nom de la Délégation, pour sa sagesse et sa direction efficace. La Délégation remercie également le Secrétariat, les Organisations consultatives et les interprètes.

La Délégation de la **France** renouvelle ses remerciements sincères aux autorités cambodgiennes, au Secrétariat, aux Organisations consultatives et aux observateurs. La Délégation remercie également le Président du Comité.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, on behalf of the Colombian Ministers for Foreign affairs and Culture and the Ambassador of Colombia for UNESCO, thanked the Chairperson for conducting this Committee. As Colombia is representing the Latin American region, the Delegation expressed its thanks on behalf of the States Parties of the region and recalled that Latin America is devoted to recognize World Heritage. The Delegation thanked the World Heritage Centre for their professional work and thanked the members of the Committee for electing him as the Rapporteur for the next session. Finally the Delegation thanked the Cambodian authorities and people for the warmwelcome.

The Delegation of **Iraq** thanked the Cambodian authorities and the Chairman for his work. The Delegation wished success for the Chairperson and the Cambodian people.

The Delegation of **Estonia** also thanked the Government, the Chairperson and the World Heritage Centre. It noted that this was its last session on the Committee and pointed out that its Delegation had been headed by experts, not diplomats. He explained that the experts had not been subject to any political pressure from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during its term on the Committee and reiterated its trust in the advice provided by the experts from the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. It called on the Committee to take seriously the advice provided to them and pointed out that as a member of the Committee it was important to ensure that all countries ensure their duties under Convention. It closed by saying that during their term, the experts of its Delegation had learned a lot and considered that the cooperation with other delegations had been enriching.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the Chairperson for the efficient and oriental way of conducting the meeting.

The Delegation of **Qatar** commended the work of the Chairperson and thanked the Cambodian government and people for their warm welcome and excellent organization. The Delegation also thanked the World Heritage Centre and the

Rapporteur and invited all to join them in Qatar next year for the 38th session of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** noted that he looked forward to 38th session in Quatar

The Delegation of **Germany** shared the thanks of preceding speakers and noted it will be a challenge to host the session in Berlin in two years time in the same efficient way. It also clarified that the German delegation is expert based and based its decisions on the view of its experts. It also thanked the future chair and host country.

La Délégation du **Mali** remercie sincèrement le peuple cambodgien, le Président du Comité, le Secrétariat, les Organisations consultatives et transmet les remerciements du Ministre au Président du Comité et au Cambodge. La Délégation évoque également les événements au Mali.

The Delegation of **Japan** equally echoed the thanks to the Government of as other Delegations did and congratulated the Secretariat for managing huge workload in spite of its small budget.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** joined the congratulations and as a former Chair expressed its thanks to the Chair for his wise stewardship. It also thanks Secretariat for dealing efficiently with the huge workload, the Interpreters who covered all UNESCO languages and the volunteers.

The Delegation of **India** added its congratulations to the delegations before it and noted that the Chairperson 25 years ago had been the ambassador of Cambodia to India and therefore consider he did not need an invitation to visit India.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie les autorités cambodgiennes pour la qualité de l'accueil, l'organisation et le sens de l'hospitalité. La Délégation remercie aussi le Président du Comité pour sa rigueur et sa capacité à rassembler les positions des membres du Comité. La Délégation remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pour leurs efforts, et leur respect des dispositions de la Convention. La Délégation salue l'art et la culture khmer. La Délégation conclue en évoquant les instabilités multiformes et la conjoncture difficile et rappelle que le Comité n'a pas vocations à défendre des causes mais les valeurs d'un patrimoine sensiblement dynamique.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se joint aux interventions de l'Afrique du Sud et du Mali et remercie les autorités cambodgiennes et le Président du Comité. La Délégation remercie également les Etats parties, particulièrement les membres du Comité, qui ont réussi à mettre la Convention au-dessus des Etats malgré les divergences. La Délégation remercie le Secrétariat, les Organisations consultatives, les interprètes et le Rapporteur, qui a su rendre compte avec fidélité de la substance des travaux. La Délégation souligne que la Convention est un instrument important dans la gouvernance culturelle mondiale et pour effacer les frontières politiques et culturelles et les incompréhensions ; il faut la préserver.

The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its gratitude to the Kingdom of Cambodia, also in name of ASEAN. It noted that both Thailand and Cambodia will leave the Committee this year and expressed its support for the Philippines and Vietnam to

take be elected into the Committee. It thanked the Director, Deputy Director, the whole staff of the Centre and the Rapporteur for their work.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia**, expressing its thanks, noted that it had learned a lot of about Cambodia and that it left home with great and lasting memories.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime ses remerciements et félicitations au Président du Comité et aux professionnels qui l'entourent, en particulier le personnel cambodgien et les interprètes. La Délégation souligne à quel point cette conférence a été riche en rebondissements et en enseignements et précise qu'elle restera fidèle à l'esprit de la Convention malgré que ce soit sa dernière session pour les temps présents.

The Delegation of **Serbia** joined previous speakers in thanking the Government of Cambodia and also expressed thanks to the Government of Qatar for having accepted to host the next meeting.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial, son directeur et tous les collègues pour leur professionnalisme. La Délégation remercie aussi le Rapporteur, les Organisations consultatives, les interprètes et les autorités espagnoles qui ont permis qu'il y ait l'interprétation en espagnol. La Délégation remercie également les membres du Comité, pour les échanges et les critiques et précise qu'il s'agit de la fin de son mandat mais qu'elle reste disposée à collaborer pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention. La Délégation remercie le Qatar pour l'accueil de la prochaine session.

In presenting its conclusion remarks, the **Chairperson** indicated that 10 days have passed and that the Committee session was now going to the close.

He noted that the work of the Committee was intense, constructive, inspiring and enriching, held in a spirit of solidarity, cooperation and tolerance in the name of the honorable mission of the 1972 World Heritage Convention.

He underlined that, having the session held for the first time in Phnom Penh, in the Peace Palace, gave a framework to reach the most appropriate decisions serving the interest of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List.

He recalled that during this session, the Committee inscribed to the World Heritage List **19** properties –of which **3** are from unrepresented countries: Fiji, Lesotho and Qatar. He reiterated its warm congratulations to these States Parties.

The Chairperson indicated that it was a pleasure for him to work with each member of the Committee; with the Rapporteur, Mrs Jasna Zrnovic, all States Parties and the Advisory Bodies in the implementation of such a prestigious instrument as the World Heritage Convention.

He stressed also having appreciated very much the continuous commitment of the Director-General of UNESCO, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director and Deputy-Director of the World Heritage Centre and their devoted staff.

He paid also tribute to all behind the scene: interpreters, technicians, media-centre, interns/volunteers and all services.

He indicated that now he will hand over his authority to his successor **Her Highness Sheika Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani** to whom he gladly passed the wealth of experience he has gained in this post. He also warmly welcomed the newly elected Members of the Committee's Bureau: Algeria, Colombia, Germany, Japan and Senegal, as Vice-Chairs, and Mr Francisco Guterrez as Rapporteur.

He informed that he was delighted the Committee will have the opportunity to visit the iconic site of Angkor. [The text of this intervention can be found in extenso in Annex XIV to the present document]

He declared the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

**Discours d'ouverture du Président du Comité du Patrimoine mondial à
l'occasion de l'ouverture de la 37^{ème} session du Comité du Patrimoine mondial**

Phnom Penh, 16 juin 2013

Samdech Akka Moha Sena Padei Techo HUN Sen, Premier Ministre du
Gouvernement royal du Cambodge

Son Excellence Madame Irina BOKOVA, Directrice générale de l'UNESCO

Son Excellence Madame Katalin BOGYAY, Présidente de la Conférence générale de
l'UNESCO

Son Excellence Madame Alissandra CUMMINS, Présidente du Conseil Exécutif de
l'UNESCO

Excellences, Mesdames et Messieurs les Ministres, les Ambassadeurs et les Chefs
de Délégations,

Honorables Délégués,

Distingués membres et experts des Organisations Consultatives chers collègues du
secrétariat,

C'est pour moi un privilège et un profond plaisir de vous souhaiter une chaleureuse
bienvenue dans mon pays à l'orée des travaux de notre 37^{ème} session.

Cette session s'ouvre sous d'heureux auspices. Son Excellence le Premier Ministre,
Samdech Techo HUN Sen, nous fait l'honneur insigne de son haut patronage pour la
session et de sa présence effective à la cérémonie inaugurale. De plus, il a pris la
décision, rare et significative, d'inviter notre Comité à tenir sa 37^{ème} session au Palais
de la Paix, dans les locaux mêmes de la Présidence du Conseil des Ministres. En
vérité, nous ne pouvions être mieux accueillis et je tiens, en votre nom et au mien, en
ma qualité de Président du Comité, à exprimer à Son Excellence le Premier Ministre
notre vive et profonde gratitude.

Excellences,

Chers collègues,

Mesdames, Messieurs,

I

Je parlerai d'abord du

COMITÉ INTERGOUVERNEMENTAL ET DE SON PRÉSIDENT

Vous le savez bien. L'ensemble des États-Parties à la Convention du patrimoine
mondial atteint, aujourd'hui, le nombre de 190. Comme l'UNESCO compte 195 États-
Membres, cela signifie expressément que la Convention constitue un instrument
juridique quasi universel. Il en résulte que la mission de notre **Comité
intergouvernemental** s'exerce, désormais, à une échelle universelle aussi. Les
pouvoirs dont disposent ce Comité sont étendus, diversifiés et de grande
conséquence pour la culture, pour la nature et pour la société.

Nous devons remarquer que dans ce cadre, il lui incombe, de prendre la décision, en dernier ressort, d'inscrire ou de ne pas inscrire un bien sur la Liste, sur la base de critères qu'il a définis. Il lui revient aussi de procéder à l'examen de l'état de conservation des biens inscrits, ce qui peut, parfois, en cas de menace de danger grave et précis, le conduire à déclarer un bien en péril ou bien, quand s'éloigne la menace, à retirer un bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

De telles charges, tout le monde en convient, sont déjà considérables et elles sont au cœur du système du patrimoine mondial. Si je les rappelle en me référant au texte de la Convention, ce n'est point pour me laisser aller à la redondance, mais assurément pour insister sur la grave responsabilité qu'assument le Comité et chacun de ses membres. A cet égard, c'est un devoir pour nous tous, quand nous avons l'honneur de siéger au sein du Comité, d'être vigilant et de fonder nos jugements strictement sur les données des documents fournis par les États-parties et les évaluations faites par les Organisations Consultatives.

Aujourd'hui, comme toujours, les décisions que nous prenons ne doivent jamais risquer de compromettre la crédibilité de notre Comité intergouvernemental.

En relation avec la mission du Comité se dégage le rôle du **Président**.

Qu'il me soit permis de faire remarquer, à ce propos, que j'ai tenu personnellement à me conformer, au mieux, aux dispositions du règlement intérieur, tout en prêtant une attention particulière à la possibilité de faciliter, autant que possible, l'examen et aussi la résolution des questions épineuses.

C'est pourquoi je me suis rendu à deux reprises au siège de l'UNESCO, à Paris, la première fois les 6, 7 et 8 janvier 2013, la seconde les 6 et 7 mai. Ce fut pour tenir des réunions élargies d'information, de dialogue et de concertation, d'abord avec vous, chers collègues, membres du Comité, spécialement les vice-présidents, ensuite avec vous, les représentants des Organisations Consultatives, et, tout naturellement, avec les responsables du Centre du patrimoine mondial, conduits par M. Kishore RAO et Dr. Mechtild RÖSSLER que je tiens à remercier.

II

J'en viens maintenant à la réflexion sur

LE PATRIMOINE DE L'HUMANITÉ ET LE DEVENIR DE LA CONVENTION

En vérité, même si la question du financement international semble assombrir les horizons, nous devons, tout de même, ne pas perdre de vue des faits positifs et objectifs.

La Convention concernant la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel doit rester, à nos yeux, un objet de fierté. C'est vraiment un instrument juridique international à caractère unique. Tout le monde en a convenu, en particulier tout récemment à KYOTO au Japon (6-8 novembre 2012) quand l'on a fêté le 40^{ème} anniversaire de cette Convention, adoptée par la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO le 16 novembre 1972.

Pour ma part, dans mon allocution liminaire à Kyoto, j'ai mis en exergue l'importance de la diversité des cultures au sein de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et j'ai attiré l'attention sur des faits dont nous devons rester fiers :

Aujourd'hui le patrimoine mondial est respecté et universellement célébré. Mais, il faut reconnaître que la Convention doit, à l'avenir, faire face à des défis non négligeables. Des difficultés sont apparues ces dernières années dans le processus d'inscription des biens sur la Liste et certaines évaluations sur l'état de conservation de tel ou tel bien ont pu être mises en question. Comme je le recommanderai, il s'impose d'éviter des tensions au sein du Comité et de réfléchir sur les voies et moyens d'y parvenir au plus vite et au mieux.

III

RECOMMANDATIONS

Pour finir, j'attire l'attention sur quelque chose auquel j'accorde beaucoup d'importance : les recommandations.

Depuis plus d'une décennie, je suis, pas à pas et dans les détails, la mise en œuvre du programme de sauvegarde et de valorisation de ce site majeur du patrimoine khmer qu'est ANGKOR. Je l'ai fait avec l'Autorité nationale APSARA, gestionnaire du site du patrimoine mondial et à travers ma participation aux sessions techniques et plénières du Comité international de Coordination pour Angkor. Ainsi j'ai pu me familiariser avec un bon nombre de problèmes que traite le Comité du patrimoine mondial.

À la lumière de cette expérience, j'aimerais contribuer à la réflexion sur l'avenir de la Convention.

Ma première recommandation concerne le **Fonds du patrimoine mondial**. Je dois à la vérité de dire que la situation de ce Fonds commence à être alarmante. L'écart n'a cessé de se creuser entre les ressources financières disponibles et les besoins nécessaires à la bonne marche des opérations de mise en œuvre de la Convention : c'est-à-dire, les propositions d'inscription et les rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens. À cela s'ajoute l'analyse des requêtes d'assistance internationale, si essentielles pour les pays démunis ou disposant de moyens insuffisants.

Je fais donc appel pressant à vous tous, distingués représentants des États-Parties. Cette Convention est la vôtre, son avenir vous concerne au premier chef. Assurément, vous avez la possibilité d'améliorer la situation du Fonds du patrimoine mondial. Vous pouvez soit procéder à des contributions volontaires ; soit contribuer directement aux activités du Centre relatives au programme annuel de mise en œuvre de la Convention. Je me permets d'insister.

Mon autre recommandation, aussi pressante, concerne le respect que nous devons tous à la Convention. Son succès tient aussi dans l'observance des **Orientations** et **des procédures**, dans chaque étape.

Nous parlons tous avec fierté du PATRIMOINE DE L'HUMANITÉ, PATRIMOINE PARTAGÉ. Il faut donc que sa Liste reste continuellement **crédible**. Cela nous incombe tout à fait.

Je tiens pour finir, en adressant mes vifs compliments aux Organisations Consultatives pour l'importante tâche qu'elles assument, je tiens à leur rappeler que tous leurs experts doivent veiller à ne pas mettre en doute la crédibilité de l'ICOMOS et de l'IUCN. Je leur rappelle aussi que le **dialogue** avec les États-Parties à la Convention ne peut qu'améliorer les conditions de mise en œuvre de la Convention.

Longue vie à notre Comité ! Je vous remercie de votre aimable attention.

ANNEX II

Remarks delivered by Mrs. Emily K. Rafferty at the Opening Ceremony of the 37th Session of the World Heritage Committee June 16, 2013, Phnom Penh, Cambodia:

My name is Emily Rafferty and I am President of The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Your Excellencies, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Secretary of State, Madame President and Director General of UNESCO, and honored guests and delegates: On behalf of Thomas Campbell, our Director and Chief Executive Officer, and the entire Board of Trustees of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, my colleague Maxwell Hearn and I appreciate the invitation to join you today. It is an honor to represent The Metropolitan and be here with you on this most important occasion. It is also a great honor to be visiting Cambodia for the first time. It is an overwhelming experience and I will treasure it always. Thank you for your gracious hospitality.

To our colleagues at UNESCO and in particular my friend Director General Irina Bokova, it is a privilege to see you again. UNESCO's efforts over the past four decades to protect the world's shared heritage have been essential to fostering relationships among collecting institutions. UNESCO's vigilance in protecting and promoting knowledge of the properties on the World Heritage List, and the assistance granted across the globe through the World Heritage Fund, are increasingly important to the care of the treasures of human culture.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art was founded in 1870. Its mission is *to collect, preserve, study, exhibit, and stimulate appreciation for and advance knowledge of works of art that collectively represent the broadest spectrum of human achievement at the highest level of quality, all in the service of the public and in accordance with the highest professional standards.*

The Museum seeks to educate the public about the cultures and achievements of civilizations around the globe and across time. In its 21 buildings and 2 million square feet, The Metropolitan displays works of art from almost every country on the globe, spanning over 5 millennia that collectively educate the public about the astonishing breadth, creativity, and experience of human history. We welcome more than 6 million visitors from around the world each year. We maintain scholarly exchanges, organize joint exhibitions, exchange loans, undertake conservation projects and excavations sponsor Fellows' programs, and support countless other exchanges and collaborations. The Met is particularly proud of its international outreach and education programs—conducted not only in New York but globally and online, through a website that now attracts more than 50 million visitors a year. Our quest for knowledge and outreach is never ending.

The Museum is committed to the rigorous study of works of art in its collections in an ongoing effort to continually learn as much as possible about their meaning, iconography, materials, form and function, as well as their ownership history. As a result of the Museum's commitment to these values, we are proud to be able to join you today to celebrate the transfer of these monumental stone kneeling attendant figures to Cambodia. Although they were given to the Metropolitan over 20 years

ago, when important new research into the Koh Ker site became available to us, we concluded that the figures should be transferred to the Kingdom of Cambodia. In transferring the statues, the Museum is acting to strengthen the good relationship it has long maintained with scholarly institutions and colleagues in the Kingdom of Cambodia--and indeed throughout the world. It is our constant hope to foster and celebrate continued cooperation and dialogue between us.

We are proud to share with you a commitment to the preservation and study of the world's artistic heritage, and we look forward to continuing our work together towards this shared goal.

**37th session
of the World Heritage Committee**

16 June 2013
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Opening Address

by

**H.E. Ms Katalin Bogayay
President of the General Conference**

Your Excellency, Prime Minister of Cambodia

Your Excellency Mr SOK AN, Deputy Prime Minister, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee,

Madam Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO

Madam Alessandra Cummins, the Chairperson of the Executive Board

Your Excellencies, Dear Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me first express my immense pleasure to be here in Cambodia. I am deeply grateful to the Cambodian authorities, and especially the Chairperson and his team, for introducing me to this wonderful country and for generously hosting the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee.

Cambodia, with its truly astonishing richness of history, art and culture, sets a perfect backdrop to the meeting of the World Heritage Committee. For me, Cambodia symbolizes not only the glory of the marvellous past, but also the inspiration for a peaceful future for humankind. Cambodia today is a vivid demonstration of the power of peace and the power of diversity.

I have always been fascinated by the beautiful flag of Cambodia, featuring a depiction of Angkor Wat in the center, displaying proudly for the world the real gem of world civilization that the Cambodian people have created for all of us, the entire humanity. The love and appreciation of culture and traditions by the Cambodian people is indeed inspiring, and I am delighted to see an equally strong commitment by the Authorities of this country to safeguard and celebrate cultural heritage, and also to play active global role in the preservation of common cultural heritage of humankind.

Let us recall that UNESCO was established to serve the peoples of the world by “advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common

welfare of mankind". This clear mandate is also enshrined in the World Heritage Convention.

I believe UNESCO is also a noble Organisation where we all have to feel responsible to the cultural heritage of humanity, no matter of any political turmoil or conflict we are facing with.

The Convention itself sets out the duties of States Parties in identifying potential sites and their role in protecting and preserving them. By signing the Convention, each country pledges to conserve not only the World Heritage sites situated on its territory, but also to protect its national heritage. The States Parties are encouraged to integrate the protection of the cultural and natural heritage into regional planning programmes, set up staff and services at their sites, undertake scientific and technical conservation research and adopt measures which give this heritage a function in the day-to-day life of the community.

I feel this is an important duty for all of us: we need to give life to this Convention in our everyday work, even in difficult circumstances; I know this from my own country, Hungary, where we are totally committed to safeguard our World Heritage sites in difficult economic circumstances or in the times of flood too; nevertheless we succeeded in creating a special heritage law: the Hungarian Law on World Heritage (2011/LXXVII), which entered into force on 1 January 2012.

I am also proud to say that, in 2002, the Budapest Declaration set out the main policy orientation for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention: credibility, conservation, capacity-building and communication; community participation has been added later.

I encourage all of you, all Member States of UNESCO and all 190 States Parties of the Convention to reflect what else can be done to efficiently protect our precious World Heritage sites and give them a true function in the life of the communities on the ground.

Let me remind you, dear colleagues, that UNESCO is based on the power of international consensus. One of the key functions of the Organization is to set global standards in areas that fall within its unique mandate, of which the World Heritage Convention is a perfect example. UNESCO's World Heritage Committee is an amazing laboratory of global cooperation on safeguarding our shared cultural treasure – these are issues that concern all human beings and issues that do not recognize national boundaries. And the standards that UNESCO establishes in the preservation of our tangible and intangible cultural heritage are agreed upon by all Member States, and by extension, by all the peoples of the world. This, dear colleagues, is an incredible achievement – to be able to come together under the roof of UNESCO, to set aside our differences, to listen to each other, to see the beauty of our diversity as human beings, and to work in unison for preserving this diversity for our children.

Your Excellencies,

UNESCO, in the minds of millions of people around the world, represents a vision, an idea, often embodied in such symbols as the World Heritage Brand.

As President of the General Conference I will follow your deliberations with great interest. I wish you an effective meeting and productive discussions. And please do not forget about our unique ability! Please look for consensus!

Thank you for your attention!

**37th Session of the
World Heritage Committee**

Opening Remarks

**H.E. Ms Alissandra Cummins
Chairperson of the Executive Board**

Phnom Penh, Cambodia
16 June 2013

Excellency, Mr Hun Sen, Prime Minister of Cambodia,
Excellency, Mr Sok An, Deputy Prime Minister of Cambodia and Chairperson of the
World Heritage Committee,
Madame President of the General Conference,
Madame Director-General of UNESCO,
Excellencies, Ministers, Ambassadors,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you for the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Government of Cambodia, and especially the Chairperson and his team for hosting this session of the Committee in Phnom Penh.

Distinguished Colleagues,

Last year, we celebrated the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention by underlining the crucial contribution that World Heritage plays in promoting sustainable development. The presentation of the outcomes from various conferences and events which took place around the world on the occasion of this celebration contributed to a better understanding of sustainable development within the framework of the Convention. This is especially evident during the *Kyoto closing event*, in which I had the privilege to personally participate, and which brought together different stakeholders from site management and national authorities, from private companies to NGOs, as well as from indigenous and local communities.

This year, UNESCO is continuing its advocacy for culture and cultural heritage through the International Congress on “Culture: Key to Sustainable Development” held last month in Hangzhou, China. I also had the opportunity to participate in this Congress, and I wish to acknowledge the generous hospitality of the Chinese authorities in providing a forum to reflect on the place that should be given to culture within the international sustainable development agenda. This was the first International Congress specifically focusing on the linkages between culture and sustainable development organized by UNESCO since the Stockholm Conference in 1998. As such, the Congress provided a forum to discuss the role of culture in sustainable development in view of the post-2015 development framework, with participation of the global community and key international stakeholders. The Hangzhou Agenda truly placed Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies and I hope that this is also strengthening World Heritage.

Furthermore, as part of efforts to enhance our upstream processes in the regions through the sharing of experiences and hands-on exercises at specific sites in the field, I am happy to report that in March this year, I opened and attended the workshop on "Management of Caribbean cultural resources in a natural environment: Sites of Memory and participation of local communities". The workshop took place in Bridgetown, Barbados, and was organized by the UNESCO Offices in Havana and Kingston and UNESCO's World Heritage Centre in coordination with the Barbados National Commission for UNESCO and the University of the West Indies with the financial support of the Netherlands Funds in Trust. In the same month, I also had the opportunity to attend a Caribbean training workshop for the preparation of nomination dossiers in Antigua and Barbuda, supported by the Japanese Funds in Trust. I would like to thank the Government of Antigua and Barbuda for ensuring high-level ministerial representation throughout this event, as well as the governments of Netherlands and Japan for their much appreciated backing of capacity-building efforts in the Caribbean region.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The tendency to frame development in economic terms, and now sustainable development as a combination between economic and environmental sustainability, is in my opinion the biggest limiting factor preventing cultural heritage from deploying its full potential as a contributor to wellbeing and sustainable development. In the current construct, human development is not viewed holistically, and therefore, as an expedient measure, anything that does not immediately fit into this framework is relegated to a minor role. We are working on bringing culture into the sustainable development debate, and often we have had to present our arguments to other international stakeholders from the perspective of how culture would benefit economic purposes, when in actual fact, culture should be the core factor which economic and environmental sustainability is built around. Culture and cultural heritage provide glimpses into the identity and value constructs of a community, and it is there that behavioral change that would lead to sustainable models of development could be realized. Culture is the key upon which we can drive holistic human development that is people-centered, including spiritual development of individuals. The tendency to dismiss this central role of culture as "soft" in an economic model, or at best grudgingly accepting it as a peripheral necessity, is the main hindrance to integrating it into sustainable development.

In the last year and a half, UNESCO has worked tirelessly to include culture and cultural heritage on the post-2015 international sustainable development agenda. This has met with some degree of success, and more could still be accomplished. We need to continue pushing the issue at the international level, as well as inspire new frontiers of intellectual thought on the central role of culture and cultural heritage, including World Heritage sites, in bringing about positive social and economic change. This can only be achieved if we also advocate, especially within the UN system, for an approach to culture which includes relevant disciplines in the social and natural sciences, economics and education.

Dear Colleagues,

As Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO, I would like to echo the concerns of Board Members at the seemingly increasing blatant disregard or

purposeful targeting of World Heritage sites in armed conflicts, as was witnessed in Mali and Syria. These disgraceful acts have resulted in the loss of livelihoods and identities to the communities in and around these sites – communities that have long upheld the living intangible cultural heritage associated with these sites. In some cases, these acts were inspired by extremism based on intolerance where no other cultural views are permitted to thrive, reminiscence of tools of terror used by despots and dictators throughout human history. These acts represent a clear attempt to erase the cultural dignity of certain communities, and should be considered as a form of crime against humanity. All of us, both governments and private individuals alike, as custodians on behalf of future generations, must lend our voices and our efforts to the defense of humanity's common heritage. This is the duty and responsibility of each and every one of us, and should we fail, history will judge us with extreme prejudice. In this regard, I would like to applaud the Director-General's and the World Heritage Center's efforts in helping to restore the site at Timbuktu, and similarly UNESCO's cooperation with the Ahmed Baba Institute on protecting Timbuktu's historical manuscripts. These interventions could serve as a model for UNESCO's eventual assistance to Syria, once the armed conflict has been resolved.

I would also like to draw your attention to the historic consensus achieved during the 191st session of the Executive Board on the understanding between all parties concerned for the implementation of the World Heritage Committee decision 34 COM 7A.20, or Brasilia consensus decision, on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. Unfortunately, the implementation of this consensus has stalled due to disagreements on the exact modalities for executing the decision. Nevertheless, I would like to thank the Director-General for her continued work in this regard, and urge all parties concerned to reconsider their approach to this issue. We must remember that our strenuous efforts to reach a solution on this issue is intended, not only to protect the heritage of one party or another, but to protect cultural heritage that belongs to all of humanity – in this, failure is not an option.

Finally, I would like to also refer to the results of the 191st session, during which – in a context of severe budgetary situation – the importance of the culture programme in all its aspects, including World Heritage, was acknowledged. Regarding the financial situation, the Board decided to set up an open-ended working group comprising three Member States per electoral group tasked to work with the Director-General to identify programmatic priorities for application and selection in the event of a continued and significant cash flow shortfall. This group will report to a Special Session of the Executive Board on 4 July 2013.

In this regard, I would like to share with you my concerns about the financial sustainability of the World Heritage Convention and the cost of its statutory implementation. The current financial constraints have had a severe impact on the Culture Sector and its normative actions, and I am grateful to the Cambodian authorities for their hospitality and immense support for this statutory meeting. Naturally, I am very interested in your discussions on this matter during the budget group, taking into account both the situation of the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund. I encourage you to find innovative solutions to sustain the future of World Heritage.

I wish you a successful meeting and fruitful deliberations. Thank you.

**Discours de la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO
Irina Bokova,
à l'occasion de l'ouverture de la 37^{ème} session du Comité du patrimoine
mondial
Phnom Penh, le 16 juin 2013**

Excellence, Samdech Techo Hun Sen, Premier Ministre du Cambodge,
Excellence Monsieur Sok An, Vice Premier-Ministre et Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial,
Excellence Mme Bogay, Présidente de la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO,
Mesdames et Messieurs les Ministres, les Ambassadeurs et délégués permanents,
Mesdames et Messieurs,

Samdech, nous sommes heureux d'être au Cambodge.

Nous savons que par cette généreuse invitation, le Cambodge a souhaité rendre hommage à l'ensemble de la communauté internationale de lui avoir porté assistance depuis la signature des accords de paix de 1991 et d'avoir permis de sauver l'inestimable trésor d'Angkor suite à l'appel de feu le Roi-Père Norodom Sihanouk.

Ce programme international de sauvegarde est un exemple éclatant de solidarité internationale, et je veux saluer à nouveau la mémoire de sa majesté Norodom Sihanouk, qui a porté ce projet et dont la détermination à le mener à bien continue de nous inspirer.

Angkor reste le lieu d'une aventure humaine et scientifique extraordinaire, pilotée par le Comité international de coordination pour Angkor qui célèbre ses 20 ans en 2013.

Permettez-moi de féliciter ses créateurs, le Cambodge, la France et le Japon, qui en assurent la coprésidence, et tous les états membres associés à ce mécanisme exemplaire, qui incarne la solidarité morale et intellectuelle visée par l'UNESCO.

Je voudrais saluer en particulier sa Majesté le Roi Norodom Sihamoni, qui a permis la réussite de ce projet, par son attachement à la culture, comme Ambassadeur auprès de l'UNESCO et comme autorité suprême de ce pays.

La richesse du patrimoine du Cambodge donne la pleine mesure du rôle de la culture pour l'identité des peuples, la connaissance de leur histoire et la maîtrise de leur destin.

L'attachement des cambodgiens pour ces temples millénaires a joué un rôle décisif dans la réconciliation et la reconstruction du pays.

Au cours des deux dernières décennies, les efforts consentis pour la protection des sites ont également permis le développement de la région, la formation des professionnels, la création d'emplois...

C'est le message du Congrès d'Hangzhou qui vient de se tenir en Chine, c'est aussi le message que j'ai relayé il ya à peine quelques jours à l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies à New York: faire de la culture le pilier d'un nouveau modèle de développement durable, et c'est un message que le Cambodge met en pratique depuis longtemps.

Il fallait, Mesdames et Messieurs, un pays comme le Cambodge, et un site comme Angkor, où vous aurez le privilège de conclure vos travaux, pour situer le cadre des travaux de cette trente-septième session et la nature les enjeux du patrimoine mondial aujourd'hui – mesurer la complexité de nos défis et ce dont nous sommes capables :

- Certains des sites présentés à votre appréciation ouvrent des voies nouvelles de coopération culturelle, à l'échelle de continents, des projets novateurs pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention, qui la font entrer dans le 21^{ème} siècle...
- D'autres, durement touchés par les conflits ou les pillages, nous appellent à unir nos forces pour protéger le patrimoine commun de l'humanité.
- La Convention elle-même et sa crédibilité sont parfois menacées, et bien davantage qu'une réforme, c'est une refondation intellectuelle et morale que nous devons engager.

Tous ces défis, le Cambodge nous montre que nous pouvons les relever, et je suis reconnaissante aux autorités cambodgiennes de leur hospitalité.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends,

Angkor stands, indeed, as testimony to the power of solidarity and political will.

We need the same leadership today, to protect cultural heritage under attack in regions across the globe -- in Mali, in Syria, in Central African Republic and elsewhere.

These are places of "*outstanding universal value*" we must protect together.

This is why UNESCO took immediate action in Mali, and why I personally travelled to Timbuktu with French President François Hollande, to demonstrate our commitment to rebuild and restore that which has been destroyed.

The mission we sent very recently to assess damages has returned, and we have drafted a Plan of Action in close collaboration with the national authorities.

Let me praise once again the powerful message sent by the World Heritage Committee last year in Saint Petersburg under the leadership of Ambassador Mitrofanova, which was instrumental in raising global awareness, and let me appeal today to your continuing support.

During this session, you will examine the state of conservation of four Malian sites, and also six Syrian sites, where the situation has reached new depths of human tragedy.

In Africa, in the Sangha Trinational (Cameroun, Central African Republic, Congo), elephants and rhino face unprecedented threats from poaching linked to the illicit trade in ivory.

We just cannot stand by and watch.

We cannot stand still.

The protection of heritage calls on us to adapt continually, to strengthen capacities, to involve local communities, to show political will, in order to resolve difficulties that often extend beyond States and across borders.

Our capacity to act depends on our credibility.

It depends on our integrity.

UNESCO's strength does not lie in its financial nor material resources – it lies in our collective commitment to uphold the highest standards.

In recent years, a number of developments within the inscription process have weakened the principles of impartiality at the heart of the Convention.

This is not acceptable.

It is my responsibility to ring the bell.

I have done so, and I will continue...

Last October, I convened a working session on the future of the Convention. The report of that meeting is on the agenda of this Committee, and I hope we can move forward together – we must renew the Convention for new times, while remaining true to the values we share.

The stakes are high.

But we can draw confidence, as we look at what we have accomplished in forty years of World Heritage -- and I wish to take this moment to thank Japan once again for their support in making the anniversary such a success last year with our major celebration in Kyoto.

I think we are all encouraged by the historic voluntary restitution of two important Khmer Pandava statues by the Metropolitan Museum of New York to the people of Cambodia. And I want to thank again the Metropolitan Museum for their ethical and moral respect.

This restitution is an expression of strong ethical and moral behaviour that provides an example of good practice to other museums and collectors. I would like to launch from here an appeal to the importance of ethical and moral values that come into play when we speak about preserving cultural heritage, return and restitution of cultural objects to their country of origin. Cultural heritage is first and foremost a source of identity and belonging for the peoples across the world.

It is symbol of peace and cooperation between two countries, and a major step to strengthen the cultural integrity of Cambodia.

UNESCO is honoured to have contributed to this restitution, which is, I believe, a move towards greater respect and mutual understanding; and I wish to recall here the importance of UNESCO's 1970 Convention to fight the illicit trafficking of cultural objects.

This is important also for our understanding of Khmer art -- as we now see that depictions of Mahabharata and Ramayana were represented not only as bas-reliefs, as is usually the case, but also as "in-the-round" statues.

Looting obscured this knowledge, and, thereby, reduced, humanity's collective heritage.

This is what we redress through restitution.

Through such acts of cultural cooperation, thanks to archaeological research, each of us gains a deeper symbolic understanding of this unique place.

With this, part of the soul of Cambodia is crossing continents and seas.

I see this as a vibrant appeal for us to stand firm, to remain focused and united in the defence of our shared values.

Thank you.

ANNEX VI

**Speech
by
Samdech Akka Moha Sena Padei Techo Hun Sen
Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Cambodia**

**On the
Opening Occasion of the 37th Session of the World Heritage Committee
Peace Palace, Phnom Penh, 16 June 2013**

- *Excellency Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO;*
- *Excellency Deputy Prime Minister Sok An, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee;*
- *Excellency **Katalin Bogyay**, the President of the General Conference of UNESCO;*
- *Excellency **Alissandra Cummins**, the President of the Executive Board of UNESCO;*
- *Distinguished Guests, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen!*

On behalf of the Royal Government and People of Cambodia, I would like to extend our warmest welcome to all of you, the Leaders of UNESCO and all the delegates from countries members of the World Heritage Committee, who are attending this 37th Session of the Committee held in Phnom Penh, Kingdom of Cambodia. The Royal Government and People of Cambodia are most honored to host this important meeting for the first time, and we would like to welcome Your Excellencies, the Distinguished Representatives of the World Heritage Committee's, as our neighbors, friends and relatives. We welcome you to the land of Angkor, Kingdom of Cambodia, the Kingdom of Wonders, which is rich in cultural heritage and invaluable, oldest ancient temples in Asia, dating back a thousand years.

On this occasion, I would like to express our deep gratitude and high appreciation to the 36th Session of the World Heritage Committee, especially for your unanimous vote choosing Cambodia to host this 37th Session of the Committee. This indeed represents another great honor for Cambodia and the Cambodian people, after our successful and fruitful ASEAN chairmanship in 2012, which was conducted with full ownership and accountability. The peace and full territorial unification, achieved through the Royal Government's Win-Win Policy since 1998, has allowed Cambodia to integrate itself quickly into international and regional community, and to play its dynamic and proactive role on the basis of an equal footing and rights, both at regional and global levels. Moreover, the upcoming general elections in July 2013 will reconfirm our commitment to adhering to a multiparty and liberal democracy, the respect for human rights and the dignity of the people, on the basis of equality and non-discrimination against races and religions.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;

The World Heritage Committee is becoming, over the years, a real and strong body of global governance for the Cultural and Natural Heritage of Humanity. The World Heritage Committee is therefore a special forum for dialogue to promote cooperation

on culture and civilization shedding lights on human hope. Moreover, this session represents not only an important milestone in the history of the Committee, but it also expresses the triumph of the long aspiration of many for equal dignity of cultures and civilization, the ideals of mutual respect highly affirmed in the Constitution of UNESCO. Whatever may be their size and gross national product, small and middle-sized countries have become real players in various enterprises of universal character, as exemplified by the work of the World Heritage Committee.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;

Therefore, it was the right decision to give the chance to Cambodia to host this 37th session. That was not only a great honor for the Royal Government and People of Cambodia, but it was also a testimony of your tribute to and appreciation of the rich and invaluable cultural heritage in Cambodia. It was particularly a testimony of your participation in the promotion, conservation and development of Angkor, our country's flagship on the World Heritage List and the most illustrious capital of the Khmer Empire.

Taking this rare opportunity, I would like to share some of my views with Your Excellencies including the renowned researchers, such as historians, archaeologists and heritage architects, in order to highlight the importance and contributions of Angkor Temples to the world's culture and civilization, especially to further strengthen the outstanding universal value of Angkor sites. Sited between two great empires: China on one side and the Indian Subcontinent on the other, the Khmer Empire was able to find its place and has preserved its specificity, through its own language, still alive today, and through its great material culture. Angkor promoted innovative planning, by appropriating with engineering a model city with a rigorously structured cadastral division of land, similar to that we see today in New York, for example. Angkor Thom, a city that covers a square of 900 ha, protected by massive ramparts and surrounded by wide moats erected by the great King of kings, Jayavarman VII, was unique in the world in the late twelfth century.

As a matter of fact, Angkor's monumental achievements in hydraulic engineering are just now being revealed by a team of Cambodian young hydrologists. A science and technology of water management enabled the establishment and maintenance for many centuries of a coherent network to capture, store, transport and distribute water across a vast territory, from the Kulen Mountains in the northeast to the Great Lake (the Tonle Sap) in the south.

And, furthermore, it turns out that the ancient Khmers were masters of the land, for agricultural and horticultural development, as shown by recent surveys over an area of some 2000 km² around Angkor, utilizing photo-interpretation of remote sensing images.

Consequently, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen would have an important role to play in changing the image of Angkor. Until now, most people have limited knowledge about and are aware of the grandiose features of Angkor strictly as only architectural. I strongly believe that the World Heritage Committee could help convince the entire world to give the Khmer civilization its rightful place in the history of humanity, especially in the history of science and technology.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;

Civil war and internal conflicts since 1970s plunged Cambodia deeply into the age of "darkness", causing serious damages to our national heritage. Our wonderful and ancient temples were suffered from wars and looting as art thieves took advantage of insecurity to loot the artifacts and sell them abroad. For examples, during the mid-1970s, 7 out of 9 statues of the **Koh Ker Style** in the 10th century were stolen from Cambodia and were passed into private hands.

Thanks to the efforts of the Royal Government of Cambodia working in close collaboration with UNESCO and other friendly countries, Cambodia has recovered and returned back some of the lost statues. Thus, I would like to take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude to the Metropolitan Museum of New York, represented by Ms. Emily Rafferty, who decided to return to Cambodia the two Statues – **Sahadeva** and **Nakula** which are among the nine sculptures mentioned above. This act indeed indicates the high standard of professional code of conduct adhered to by the Metropolitan Museum. Moreover, I would like also to thank the U.S. Government for their efforts in claiming back the statue of **Duryodhana**, which is now subject to a lawsuit in the New York Court.

We acknowledge with gratitude the fact that you hold in high esteem the international campaign, launched at Angkor in 1993 and still in full swing today, after 20 years. Two decades have passed of intense and fruitful, work under the watchful patronage of UNESCO and under the able chairmanship of France and Japan as co-chairs. With this support, Cambodia has developed a legal framework and established an institutional arrangement to manage its own heritage with active participation from the government ministries, local communities, the Royal University of Fine Arts, the private sector and development partners, such as international organizations and international experts including Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen who are present here. Over the past two decades, many local Cambodian experts have been trained and learned good experiences from foreign experts on how to maintain and repair ancient temples. More than twenty countries from four continents have been carrying out outstanding work in close partnership with the APSARA National Authority. To date, nearly 70 projects have been implemented or are in progress, and more than US\$250 million have been mobilized.

The program involves research, conservation and development, but also education and training and cooperation as well as the development of tourism. All that you, within the World Heritage Committee, hold dear, all that constitutes the very fabric of the 1972 Convention, -- this is the essence of the Angkor programs. That is why the International Coordinating Committee for Angkor is considered a model, and it is also undoubtedly a reason why you had no hesitation in choosing the country of Angkor for your present 37th session. But, I think there is probably another reason. Your vote was justified by the policy of cultural development that the Royal Government has been implementing for many years and that has long held my personal attention in my capacity as the Prime Minister of the Royal Government of Cambodia.

The Royal Government of Cambodia has consciously placed a high priority on the promotion of Khmer's cultural values, along with the deployment of realistic vision, strategies and action plans, and regarded culture as the nation's invaluable soul and identity as well as the non-depletable source of sustainable development. In this

sense, we fully agree with the UNESCO on the fundamental role of culture, i.e. culture has its footprint not only in development policies, but also in methods and practices of development. This is the reason why we have embedded the culture, especially, heritage, in our growth strategy to achieve economic and social progress. The outcomes that stemmed from this effort, including the inscription of **Angkor archaeological site** on the list of world heritage on 14 December 1992, "**Royal Ballet of Cambodia**" and "**Khmer Shadow Theatre** (Lakhaon Sbek Thom)" on the list of intangible cultural heritage of humanity on 7 November 2003 and 25 November 2005 respectively, has greatly enhanced the image of the Kingdom of Cambodia on international stage. In addition, another historical moment of our nation was marked when the sacred **Preah Vihear Temple** was inscribed on the list of the world heritage on 7 July 2009. On this basis, Cambodia earned overwhelming trust and support from the international community and received the second highest vote to become a permanent member of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee on 26 October 2009.

I would like to bring to the attention of this noble World Heritage Committee that, for Cambodia, development is not just about extracting resources or manufacturing goods. Culture can also have a utilitarian value, a material benefit and a great economic impact. The approach, used for some years now, driven by the principles and ethics as reflected in the UNESCO 2000 "World Report on Culture", has brought us significant benefits. Through over a decade of experience, these principles have been translated into actual implementation, as shown in the International Congress recently held in Hangzhou, People's Republic of China, on "**Culture: the key to development**".

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen;

It is not for me to recall what heritage means before such assembly, a real parliament of universal heritage. I wish, however, to point out that Cambodia is the only country in the world which has on its national flag a heritage property, more specifically, the Angkor Wat Temple. In this country, rich in historical monuments and archaeological sites, heritage is a priceless asset in economic sense. Heritage is, indeed, social capital that produces a flow of services over the long term. Hence, we have placed paramount importance on cultural tourism and its sustainability. In this regard, the Ministry of Tourism, together with the Apsara National Authority - the body managing Angkor -, has put great effort to increase revenue and the number of Angkor-bound tourists by assuring hospitality of international standard and conservation of cultural values that justified the inscription of Angkor on the World Heritage List. We firmly believe that cultural conservation, in terms of both quantity and quality, does matter to ensure sustainability, a crucial aspect of development.

I would say bluntly that our policy for heritage and cultural tourism is not a passing fancy. We are pleased and proud that the Kingdom of Cambodia this year chairs the World Heritage Committee and hosts its 37th session, but we will not leave it at that. As before this session and even more so in the future, we are determined to continue our efforts to strengthen cultural tourism. We will never do anything that threatens the sanctity of the sites of Angkor and Preah Vihear Temples or endangers their existence or outstanding universal value.

And we propose to extend our list of World Heritage properties by nominating Sambor Prei Kuk, our main pre-Angkorian site, and Koh Ker, the ephemeral capital of the Khmer empire in the tenth century, which invented the art of dynamic statuary in

Asia. Thereby, we will widen the choice for visitors and better assure the safeguarding and conservation of the diversity of our heritage.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;

Speaking of the world heritage value and management that links to sustainable development, I want to make the case about benefits gained from inscription on the list of World Heritage that has drawn regional and global attention to the promotion, safeguarding and development of those sites to help promoting the economy and improving the living standard of people. Therefore, in economic sense, I think we should focus on the development of both tangible and intangible cultural assets by integrating this work into development process, including within regional and global frameworks. This will indeed help promoting sustainable development of the tourism sector, in which cultural heritage plays such an important role in job creation, a factor contributing to poverty reduction and mobilization of revenue for the management and conservation of cultural assets. In this regard, the Royal Government of Cambodia has introduced a policy of “**Conservation for Development, Development for Conservation**” in the tourism sector.

Over the last two decades, cultural and eco-tourism have become pillars of equitable growth and played an instrumental role in poverty reduction in Cambodia. The last two decades of sustained high growth, together with peace and macro-economic stability, have provided a new opportunity for rapid poverty reduction and enhanced living standard. In particular, Cambodia's poverty rate dropped from 100% in 1979 to 19% in 2011. Undoubtedly, heritage and cultural tourism are playing a substantial part in this growth. Twenty years ago, when Angkor was inscribed on the World Heritage list, the number of international visitors was just 120,000. The figure then climbed to 3.5 million in 2012, with the expectation of 4.5 million by 2015.

However, this requires that we increase alertness. Heritage should in no way suffer from these gains. That is why our experts, together with UNESCO and Australia, have prepared a tourism management plan for Angkor and the region to ensure a balance between the imperatives of development and conservation needs in conformity with the new concept of green development.

This is a good lesson for young Cambodians and for the youth of the whole world, as discussed last week in the Youth Forum, organized under the auspices of the National Commission for UNESCO and the United Federation of Youth in Cambodia, which ends tomorrow with the report they will submit to the Committee.

In fact, I think the youth can draw on two experiences for their consideration and more active involvement. Firstly, the Cambodian experience highlights the important role of heritage in the development process. Eco-tourism and beach tourism begin to attract more and more visitors, but the fact remains that for the moment the overwhelming majority of international tourists are attracted by the prestige of the wonders of Angkor. Secondly, code of ethics is another experience to be learned by the youth. It is imperative to pass on the message to future generations to continue preserving the value of heritage, belonging either to their own nation or humanity as a whole. It is absolutely clear that each nation is obliged to conserve its own heritage, but we must also acknowledge that heritage also belongs to humanity as a whole, therefore, everyone must do his/her bit to conserve and value either tangible or

intangible heritage at all places, regardless of the original nation, original race or actual location of those heritage and culture.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;

Before ending my remarks, I would like to say again that if past arguments for the conservation of cultural assets and civilization relied on art, archaeology and history, it is clear that the economic dimensions of heritage are now becoming more important. In this sense, people in this era of globalization must love heritage just as they need to live in safety or desire to breathe clean air. Our young youth, wherever they are, must take over this task and become, in their turn, the vigilant guardians of heritage. In this connection, let us hope that the Youth Forum in Angkor has instilled in them an even deeper love of heritage.

What we will achieve from this 37th session will no doubt contribute to strengthening international solidarity for the protection and enhancement of heritage of humanity. In everyone's eyes, the 1972 Convention is a powerful tool for maintaining peace in the world.

Finally, I wish Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Distinguished Delegates good health and success in your endeavours as well as pleasant and memorable stay in this heritage-rich country of Angkor. I look forward to a great success of this meeting over the coming days.

Now it is indeed an honour for me to declare the opening of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee.

Thank you for your kind attention!

ANNEX VII

THE CHAIRPERSON
OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
37th SESSION
(Phnom Penh)

STATEMENT

During several days, I made many efforts to promote understanding between all parties concerned by the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls as property inscribed in the World Heritage List.

Unfortunately, I did not have the possibility to reach a consensus based on which a draft decision would be prepared and submitted to the Committee. However, in my capacity as Chairperson and with full support of the Members of the Committee, I **would like to request the implementation of a joint WHC/ICCROM/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission** to the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls **as soon as possible**, in conformity with the past relevant decisions of this Committee.

Finally, I warmly thank the Director-General of UNESCO for her efforts and initiatives on this matter. On behalf of the Committee, I would like to bring to her attention that necessary measures need to be undertaken to send the mission and to submit the present statement to the Executive Board of UNESCO for the record.

ANNEX VIII

Statement by the Observer Delegation of Israel on the occasion of the examination of the Draft Decision on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls

Thank you Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson, Excellencies, distinguished delegates,

To begin with, Israel would like to thank the Kingdom of Cambodia for its warm welcoming and hospitality. We would also like to thank the Kingdom of Cambodia for its good intentions to facilitate a dialogue between the concerned parties.

Time and again Israel strives to depoliticize UNESCO. Since the last Executive Board of UNESCO, Israel, together with the indispensable help of its close friends from the United States of America and other member states, has provided the Palestinians with viable options to allow the implementation of the technical mission of four experts to the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls.

Let us recall that on 16 May 2013, only few days before the members of the mission were expected in Israel, the Palestinians unveiled their true intentions to politicize the mission, severely violate the agreement between the concerned parties, and turn their back at the fragile trust given to them by Member States of UNESCO.

Despite the blunt violations of and politicization by the Palestinians, Israel was willing to favour the conservation and preservation of the Old City in particular, and the protection of the important values of the Organization as a whole. The outcome of Israel's continuous goodwill efforts lies in front of you at this very moment.

Passing, once more, a fabricated political decision against Israel, which portrays nothing but the outstanding creative writing skills and unique sense of imagination of both the Palestinians and Jordanians, bears devastating ramifications on the future of UNESCO. It is rather unfortunate that at such a critical point in time for UNESCO the Palestinians and their active partners consciously choose to undermine the core values and identity of this Organization to an extent that would certainly lead to its final destruction.

Déclaration par la Délégation de Palestine (Observateur) à l'occasion de l'examen du Projet de décision concernant la Vieille Ville de Jérusalem et ses Remparts.

La Délégation de la Palestine (Observateur) indique ne pas souhaiter répondre aux propos apocalyptiques du Représentant d'Israël. Elle indique être habituée à ce genre de description extrêmement inquiétantes.

La Délégation précise que la Décision proposée, et qui a été votée, est une Décision qui ne sort en aucun point du champ de compétence de l'UNESCO.

La Délégation exprime sa tristesse de voir des traitements différents appliqués à des sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial qui sont censés être traités sur pied d'égalité.

La Délégation informe le Comité que cela fait trois ans que les parties arabes, et notamment la Jordanie et la Palestine, font des concessions positives, constructives. Elle précise que la demande qui vient d'être faite n'est pas nouvelle et que cela fait trois ans que l'occasion est donnée à Israël d'appliquer les Conventions qu'il a pourtant signées sans pour autant les respecter; La Délégation note que ce qui a été présenté ce jour symbolise la volonté de ne plus attendre, de ne plus accepter des demandes de reports qui ont cours depuis trois ans alors que la situation sur le terrain ne cesse de s'aggraver et d'aller vers le désastre pour les peuples concernés.

La Délégation précise que le fait que cette Décision ait été votée, admise, ne remet en rien en cause la demande absolue de voir une mission dépêchée sur les lieux.. Elle assure avoir le plus d'intérêt que quiconque à ce qu'une mission aille à Jérusalem, une mission technique neutre, composée de tierces parties, de techniciens, d'experts internationaux.

La Délégation remercie le courage de ceux qui ont voté en faveur de la Décision et précise que ceux-là ont donné toute sa noblesse à la mission de l'UNESCO.

La Délégation termine en précisant à quel point elle est touchée et extrêmement émue par l'accueil qui lui a été réservé par le peuple et les autorités cambodgiennes; elle remercie le Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial au nom du peuple Palestinien.

ANNEX X

Draft Decision on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls

**Statement by Head of Delegation Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
Ms Saja Majali, Director on the International Relations and Organizations
Department**

My delegation expresses its appreciation and gratitude to the government and people of Cambodia for hosting this 37th session of the WHC and for their and kind hospitality and generosity.

The Jordanian, Palestinian and indeed the Arab position in previous sessions as well as in this 37th was to exhaust all possible amicable venues prior to submitting a draft decision on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (a site proposed by Jordan 1981) or putting it to a vote.

Jordan regrets however that we find ourselves at the stalemate we are in.

Jordan squarely blames Israel for the failure of the reactive monitoring mission which could not see the light due to last minute new conditions imposed by Israel on the delegation's mandate as stipulated in the Brasilia decision.

We deem that Israel regrettably has politicized the process by placing new preconditions on the mission itself namely by seeking to limit it to pre-specified sites contrary to the legal reference of the Mission as stipulated in WHC decision 34 Com7A20 adopted by acclamation in Brasilia.

Moreover, Israel, not only failed to honor its own letter of guarantees to admit the mission in accordance to the Brasilia decision as embodied in the agreement reached last April through decision EX191/9 which was adopted by consensus but it also rejected the proposals forwarded by H.E. the Chairman of the 37th Session whom we thank for having exerted all efforts to broker an acceptable solution. We also thank Dr. Mounir Bouchenaki acting on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, H.E. Irina Bokova for having tried to mediate between concerned delegations.

Finally, Jordan thanks all Member States that have voted in favor this draft Decision which comes at a time of dramatic and heightened Israeli violations against the heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem, and the great damages being done to its authenticity, integrity and sanctity. Jordan also calls upon Member States who have voted against the decision or abstained to reconsider their position.

ANNEX XI

RAPPORT ORAL DU PRESIDENT DU GROUPE DE TRAVAIL SUR LES ORIENTATIONS

J'ai le plaisir de présenter les conclusions et le projet de décision élaborés par le Groupe de travail que le Comité a établi sur le point 12 de l'ordre du jour le lundi 17 juin.

Le mandat de ce groupe était la révision de certains points des *Orientations* inventoriés dans le document de travail WHC-13/37.COM/12.

Le groupe s'est réuni six fois à l'heure du déjeuner de 12h30 à 13h30 et a aussi profité d'un après-midi libre le jeudi 20 juin 2013 pour se réunir encore 2 heures.

Les points suivants reflétés dans le projet de décision remis à votre approbation ont été examinés.

Paragraphe 150

La discussion du premier jour de travail a porté sur le paragraphe 150 des *Orientations*, qui a trait à la procédure relative au traitement des lettres signalant des « erreurs factuelles ». Il y a eu un débat fructueux sur la nécessité de définir plus clairement ce qu'est une erreur factuelle et en ce qui concerne le processus de révision des soumissions de propositions faites par les Etats parties.

Une proposition a été faite par les Délégations de l'Inde, de la Suisse et du Brésil pour une révision du paragraphe 150, proposition qui a été amendée après discussion pour rationaliser le processus. Il a été décidé d'élaborer un formulaire dont la version retenue est annexée au projet de décision afin de faciliter la soumission des commentaires par les Etats parties, assurer la transparence complète du processus et réduire la charge de travail.

Paragraphes 161 et 162

S'agissant des paragraphes 161 et 162 sur le processus des propositions d'inscription d'urgence, nous avons eu un débat intense et avons constitué un groupe de rédaction avec la France et d'autres participants pour aboutir à la proposition de consensus que vous avez sous les yeux.

Paragraphe 240

A été adopté par le groupe sans discussion étant donné qu'il s'agissait d'une simple question de cohérence.

Paragraphe 61

Ce paragraphe a donné lieu à un débat intense : cette question n'a pas été soulevée par le Secrétariat, mais est le reflet de la décision 36 COM 15 venant du groupe du budget à la 36e session qui visait à réduire le nombre de propositions d'inscription à traiter chaque année en raison des contraintes budgétaires. Le groupe a eu une

discussion non seulement sur le nombre de propositions d'inscription mais aussi sur de plus vastes considérations qui relèvent en fait de la Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée, la question de la sur/sous-représentation, l'ordre des priorités des propositions d'inscription, toutes les questions qui devraient être incluses dans le débat sur le futur de la Convention, issu de la décision de Suzhou-Cairns qu'il est prévu de réviser en 2015.

Le groupe a décidé sur le point (b) (le nombre d'inscription devant être étudié chaque année) qu'il serait sage d'attendre l'évaluation et la révision prévues pour 2015 avant de procéder à ces changements ; le groupe de travail a également enregistré une proposition du Brésil d'y considérer le point (a) (le nombre et la nature des inscriptions qui peuvent être soumises chaque année par chaque Etat partie) et de revoir la proposition d'origine de la délégation brésilienne consistant à limiter par session la présentation de la candidature d'un site naturel et un site culturel au lieu de la limite à une seule proposition mixte (naturelle/paysage culturel et culturelle). Cette proposition a été renvoyée à un stade ultérieur, de même que l'examen d'éventuelles propositions mathématiques sur l'équilibre de la représentation par région.

Pour ces raisons, le groupe de travail propose de ne pas toucher à l'heure actuelle au libellé du paragraphe 61 des *Orientations*. Il propose en revanche que le débat sur ces questions soit repris dans le cadre de la révision de la décision de Suzhou Cairns.

Paragraphe 132

Une longue discussion a également eu lieu sur le paragraphe 132 des *Orientations* et sa note explicative figurant en annexe 5, concernant les critères qui permettent d'établir que les dossiers d'inscription sont complets et que les amendements proposés par le Secrétariat apportent d'avantage de clarté, particulièrement en ce qui concerne les cartes topographiques.

Paragraphe 127, 141 et 168

Nous avons en outre examiné les changements proposés pour les paragraphes 127, 141, et 168. Il a été décidé de ne pas rendre obligatoire la soumission de projets de dossiers d'inscription avant le 30 septembre, mais, en revanche, d'encourager fortement les Etats parties à le faire. C'est l'approche que reflète la version proposée pour la rédaction de ces paragraphes. Par conséquent, le groupe de travail n'a pas suggéré de modification aux paragraphes 141 et 168 concernant la réception des projets de dossiers d'inscription.

Réunions internationales

En ce qui concerne les adaptations envisageables des *Orientations* découlant des réunions thématiques sur différents sujets (intégrité, architecture de terre, peuples autochtones), il a été fait référence, dans le projet de décision, au besoin d'une réflexion plus approfondie dans le contexte approprié. A cet égard, le groupe a également souligné que ces réflexions doivent trouver leur reflet en bonne et due place dans les textes les plus appropriés, qu'elles pourraient donc être insérées, PAS nécessairement dans les *Orientations*, mais dans les manuels de ressources ou les pages internet.

Suite aux recommandations de la réunion du Danemark sur les peuples indigènes, plus particulièrement, il y a eu consensus sur le fait d'attendre que le Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO ait examiné la question de la politique sur les peuples indigènes.

Synergies 1954-1972

Finalement le groupe a entendu la proposition du Président du Comité de la Convention de 1954, M. Goess, visant à renforcer les synergies entre les deux Conventions. Il s'agirait notamment d'inclure dans le formulaire du dossier d'inscription des biens figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, la possibilité de demander, par la même occasion, le statuts de « protection renforcée », sous l'égide du second Protocole de la Convention de 1954 . Nous considérons qu'il s'agit là d'une idée intéressante et proposons de mandater le Centre du patrimoine mondial de travailler conjointement avec le Secrétariat de la Convention de 1954 à la présentation d'une proposition concrète à examiner prochainement.

Autres questions à traiter lors des prochaines sessions :

Je souhaiterais enfin, Monsieur le Président, vous informer qu'un certain nombre de propositions ont été faites en cours de débat qui ne sont pas couvertes par le document de travail ni les demandes spécifiques du Comité faites au Groupe de travail.

Vous vous souviendrez que la Décision 36 COM 13.I reconnaît précisément « la valeur de la proposition présentée par la Jordanie visant à remplacer le texte du paragraphe 68 des Orientations » mais a cependant considéré que « la modification ne s'impose pas à ce stade » ; il a cependant été noté d'aborder ce thème lors d'une prochaine session.

Nous avons également reçu des propositions de l'Inde concernant les paragraphes 112 et 174. Par ailleurs, le Brésil a également soumis des propositions relatives au paragraphe 191 ainsi que des propositions concernant la soumission d'erreurs factuelles aux SOC, qui auraient une incidence sur les paragraphes 174, 175 et 177.

En outre nous avons conclu que toute question relative au règlement intérieur, à la stratégie à long terme et aux processus ainsi qu'au futur de la Convention, devrait être examinée ultérieurement, peut-être dans le cadre d'une discussion approfondie sur les *Orientations* de politique générale.

Pour finir, nous avons mené une réflexion sur la méthodologie : j'ai déjà mentionné que des adaptations des *Orientations*, guide juridique pour les utilisateurs sur le terrain, ne devraient pas être faites dans la précipitation et que le Comité a adopté un cycle de 4 ans pour ce faire. On peut considérer que le cycle se termine aujourd'hui. Mais, comme nous venons de le voir, de nouvelles propositions sont déjà sur la table. Vues nos réflexions générales concernant la Stratégie globale, je propose que nous envisagions de mener la prochaine révision majeure des *Orientations* en 2015, en ligne avec l'évaluation de la Stratégie globale et un certain nombre d'autres processus.

Oral Report of the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group

Thank you Mr Chairperson,

- I have the pleasure of introducing the draft decision on the budget emanating from the consultations conducted in the budget-working group. I believe the document was distributed yesterday and I trust that Committee Members have used the opportunity to scrutinise the proposed decision.

Mr Chairperson,

- Please allow me to make a few observations before the Committee takes up the draft decision for adoption.

Mr Chairperson,

- The Budget Working Group commenced its activities on Tuesday, 18 June 2013, with the mandate to examine document WHC-13/37.COM/15.Rev and to work on the draft decision contained in it.
- The Working group held **7 sessions** during which it considered the following three main elements of the budget document:
 - The implementation of the budget for the current biennium 2012-2013;
 - The proposed budget for the next biennium of 2014-2015; and
 - The sustainability of the World Heritage Fund.
- In terms of the discussions on these three parts, I would like to highlight the following main elements:
 - In terms of the implementation of the budget for the current biennium, the non-payment of contributions by a major contributing State Party is continuing to have a detrimental effect on the implementation of the Convention;
 - As such the budget on which the Centre is currently operating is 21.19% less than originally approved, and a number of important activities are not being undertaken by the World Heritage Centre;
 - These activities include in particular the provision of International Assistance to Least Developed and Low Income States Parties, capacity building activities, assistance with retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value, regional programmes in terms of follow-up to periodic reporting, education and world heritage as well as public awareness and communication;
 - The World Heritage Centre is also under ever-increasing pressure to do more work with fewer staff members, to the point where unpaid overtime and excessive working hours have become the norm;
 - In this regard the World Heritage Centre is further increasingly depended on staff hired for the implementation of extrabudgetary activities to implement statutory work;
 - This is not an acceptable situation and clearly highlights the extent of the budget pressure being experienced by the Centre;

Mr. Chairperson,

- In addition to the non-payment of assessed contributions, there is also the larger problem of the long-term sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, which existed even before a major contributing State Party stop paying its contributions;
- We as States Parties continue to inscribe more and more world heritage sites resulting in more and more work being requested from the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies;
- At the same time, however, assessed contributions are not increasing as no new Member States will be joining the Convention due to it being virtually universal;
- The Convention also does not provide for an increase in assessed contributions;
- The options to ensure the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund are therefore limited and can only be undertaken on a voluntary basis;

Mr Chairperson,

- The Working Group considered a number of options whereby States Parties could be requested to make, on a voluntary basis and within their respective capacities to pay, an additional contribution to the World Heritage Fund;
- I should like to indicate in this regard that during last year's session the Budget Working Group also discussed these options, but after protracted discussions decided to propose to the Committee that a general appeal be made for supplementary voluntary contributions;
- This general appeal was subsequently approved by the Committee and implemented by the World Heritage Centre;
- Sadly this appeal proved ineffective and only one State Party responded with a contribution of \$20 000 for the current biennium;
- There is therefore very little hope that another such appeal will deliver any different result and the Committee needs to consider an alternative method for calling on States Parties to make supplementary voluntary contributions to sustain the World Heritage Fund;

Mr Chairperson,

- The Budget Working Group discussed the different options which could be recommended to States Parties for them to consider when making their contributions, and while there was support for putting forward one of the options reflected in Annex VI of the budget document, the working group could not find consensus in this regard;
- Therefore:
 - In the light of the failure of the general appeal for supplementary voluntary contributions to elicit any meaningful contributions; and
 - In view of the fact that the status quo in terms of contributions to the Fund is not tenable nor sustainable, I have taken the liberty, in my capacity as chairman of the working group, to

propose option 1.1 reflected in Annex VI of the budget document for the consideration of the Committee;

- I would like to request the Secretariat to please put on the screen Annex VI which reflects the different options;

Mr. Chairperson,

- Option 1.1 which I am proposing the Committee considers approving, would merely call on States Parties to consider doubling their assessed contributions or assessed voluntary contributions;
- I would like to reiterate in this regard that such a call on States Parties does not place any obligation on them to make additional payments, it merely sets an indicative target which States can use if they consider themselves to be in a position to make supplementary voluntary contributions to the Fund;
- In the unlikely event that each and every State Party takes up this invitation to double its contribution, it will still not ensure the sustainability of the Fund, but it will at least be a start towards this goal.

Mr Chairperson,

- I am appealing to the Committee to adopt this option as a first step to addressing the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund;
- I am also appealing to those few Committee Members that interpret this voluntary appeal as, in some or other way placing an obligation on them, not to bloc this decision but rather to allow States Parties to decide for themselves whether they would like to double their contributions or not.
- Aside from this one matter, Mr. Chairperson, I am happy to report that the remainder of the draft decision enjoyed consensus and it is recommended that the Committee consider adopting it as presented.

Finally, Mr Chairperson, allow me to thank all the delegates, Committee and non-Committee Members, experts, the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their wonderful cooperation and support as well as the collegial manner in which we were able to conduct our work. I would also like to thank the host country, Cambodia, for the facilities and support personnel which it made available to the Budget Working Group and which greatly facilitated our work.

Thank you.

DÉCLARATION DES OBSERVATEURS

(Soutien : Barbade, Belgique, Côte d'Ivoire, Grèce, Hongrie, Niger, Pays-Bas,
Pologne, Slovaquie)

Monsieur le Président,
Excellences,
Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Comité

Nous sommes réunis depuis plus d'une semaine à l'invitation du Royaume du Cambodge que nous, Observateurs, remercions de son accueil et de son hospitalité.

La 37^{ème} session touche à sa fin et les observateurs souhaitent faire part de leur point de vue concernant quelques questions qui ont été discutées.

Nous commencerons par vous remercier du travail important que vous avez réalisé. Toutefois, nous souhaitons demander un retour aux principes de la Convention et à une dépolitisation des débats.

L'Assemblée générale en élisant les membres du Comité leur donne la lourde responsabilité de veiller à la mise en œuvre de la Convention et des recommandations qu'elle adopte.

Pour nous, l'objectif commun du Comité, du Centre du Patrimoine mondial, des organisations consultatives, des Etats parties est et doit rester la conservation des sites du patrimoine. Les paragraphes 1 et 2 du préambule sont clairs : « Considérant que la dégradation ou la disparition d'un bien du patrimoine culturel et naturel constitue un appauvrissement néfaste du patrimoine de tous les peuples du monde ». Nous souhaitons donc que les sites et leur Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle soient remis au cœur des débats.

The richness of the Convention lies in its objective to create solidarity and a common responsibility for these sites, regardless of their location. From paragraphs 7 and 8 of its preamble onwards, the Convention deals with the collegiality in relation to our heritage. Articles 6 and 7 of the Convention are also essential in this regard. That is why the fathers of the Convention, in their wisdom, mentioned in Article 9 paragraph 3 that "States members of the Committee shall choose as their representatives persons qualified in the field of cultural and natural heritage."

As observers, States Parties to the Convention, we urge the Committee to spread the message of the experts and to enhance the international solidarity on which it is based.

In the spirit of democracy, which we all treasure, and which has been invoked several times during this session, the General Assembly had appointed an open-ended working group to consider the recommendations of the external auditor following his assessment of the global strategy and the PACT initiative. We deeply regret that the Committee decided not to consider its conclusions in full.

Thank you Chair.

**Statement
by H.E. Mr SOK AN
Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
Peace Palace, Phnom Penh**

26 June 2013

Dear Colleagues and friends –
Members of the World Heritage Committee,
Representatives of States Parties,
Representatives of ICCROM, IUCN and ICCOMOS,
Representatives of the local communities and non-governmental organizations,
Members of the World Heritage Centre,

10 days have passed; the Committee session is now going to the close.

Today I would like to note that our work was intense, constructive, inspiring and enriching, in a spirit of solidarity, cooperation and tolerance. All of this, in the name of the honorable mission of the 1972 World Heritage Convention.

Having the session held for the first time in Phnom Penh, in this Peace Palace, gave us a framework to reach the most appropriate decisions serving the interest of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List.

This time the Committee has inscribed to the World Heritage List **19** properties –of which **3** are from unrepresented countries: Fiji, Lesotho and Qatar. Let us express to these States Parties our warm congratulations!

It was a pleasure for me working with you, particularly with our Rapporteur Jasna Zrnovic, Committee Members, Bureau, States Parties and Advisory Bodies in the implementation of such a prestigious instrument as the World Heritage Convention. I also very much appreciated the continuous commitment of the Director-General of UNESCO, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director and Deputy-Director of the World Heritage Centre and their devoted staff, I would also like to pay tribute to all behind the scene: interpreters, technicians, media-centre, interns/volunteers and all services.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I now shall hand over my authority in order to join you in congratulating my successor **Her Royal Highness Sheika Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani** to whom I shall gladly pass the wealth of experience I have gained in this post. I would like that we warmly welcome the newly elected Members of the Committee`s Bureau: Algeria, Colombia, Germany, Japan and Senegal, as Vice-Chairs, and Mr Francisco Guiterrez as Rapporteur.

I am especially pleased that you will now visit our iconic site: Angkor and for those who cannot join us, safe travels!

I now declare the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO closed!

