

COVER PAGE

Published on behalf of the World Heritage Committee by:

UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP
France

Tel: +33 (0) 1 4568 1571
Fax: +33 (0) 1 4568 5570
E-mail: wh-info@unesco.org
<http://whc.unesco.org>

This report will be available in English and French at the following Web address:
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECISIONS		1
SUMMARY RECORD		29
ANNEXES		143
Annex I	List of participants	145
Annexe II	Requests for Observer status	167
Annex III	Timetable	171
Annex IV	Index of Decisions	173
Annex V	Recommendations and Decisions of the Bureau	179

Distribution limited

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Seventh Extraordinary Session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II

6 – 11 December 2004

DECISIONS

Published on behalf of the World Heritage Committee by:

UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP
France

Tel: +33 (0) 1 4568 1571
Fax: +33 (0) 1 4568 5570
E-mail: wh-info@unesco.org
<http://whc.unesco.org>

This report will be available in English and French at the following Web addresses:

<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-7extcom-17e.pdf> (English)
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-7extcom-17f.pdf> (French)

TABLE OF CONTENT

N°	ITEM OF THE AGENDA	DECISIONS	PAGE
1	Opening of the session	N/A	5
2	Requests for Observer Status	7 EXT.COM 2	5
3A	Adoption of the Agenda	7 EXT.COM 3A	5
3B	Adoption of the Timetable	7 EXT.COM 3B	6
3C	Report of the Rapporteur of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004)	7 EXT.COM 3C	6
4	Working tools and working methods		
4A	Progress Report and discussion on the revised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	7 EXT.COM 4A	6
4B	Working methods of the World Heritage Committee	7 EXT.COM 4B.1	8
		7 EXT.COM 4B.2	12
		7 EXT.COM 4B.3	12
5	Progress reports of Periodic Reporting	7 EXT.COM 5	13
5A	Progress Report on the preparation of the Periodic Report for Europe and North America	7 EXT.COM 5A.1	13
		7 EXT.COM 5A.2	13
5B	Follow-up on the Periodic Report for the Arab States	7 EXT.COM 5B	14
5C	Follow-up on the Periodic Report for Africa	7 EXT.COM 5C	14
5D	Follow-up on the Periodic Report for Asia and Pacific	7 EXT.COM 5D	16
5E	Follow-up on the Periodic Report for Latin America and the Caribbean	7 EXT.COM 5E	16
5F	Progress Report on the nomination of Qhapaq Ñan (Main Andean Road)	7 EXT.COM 5F	17
6	International Assistance	7 EXT.COM 6	17
7	Adjustments to the budget 2004-2005	7 EXT.COM 7.1	18
		7 EXT.COM 7.2	19

8	Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006-2007 (Draft 33C/5) and the UNESCO Medium-Term strategy 2008-2013 (Draft 34C/4)	7 EXT.COM 8	19
9	Co-operation and coordination between the UNESCO Conventions concerning Heritage	7 EXT.COM 9	19
10	Performance indicators for World Heritage Programmes	7 EXT.COM 10	20
11	Progress Report on the Global Training Strategy	7 EXT.COM 11	21
12	Progress Report on the Partnerships for World Heritage Conservation (PACT)	7 EXT.COM 12	22
13	Publication Plans	7 EXT.COM 13	23
14	Report on the use of World Heritage Emblem	7 EXT.COM 14	23
15	New voting mechanism for the election of the members of the World Heritage Committee	7 EXT.COM 15	24
16	Review of the provisional Agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, South Africa, 2005)	7 EXT.COM 16	25
17	Adoption of Decisions	7 EXT.COM 17	27
18	Closure of the session	N/A	

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

(No decision required)

2. REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Decision 7 EXT.COM 2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/2**,
2. Taking into consideration Rule 8 (Observers) of its *Rules of Procedure*,
3. Notes the List of Participants listed in Annex I;
4. Authorises the participation in its 7th extraordinary session as observers of the representatives of the international governmental Organizations (IGOs), international non-governmental Organizations (INGOs), non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), permanent observer missions to UNESCO and non profit-making institutions having activities in the fields covered by the *World Heritage Convention* and having requested observer status at such session, who are listed in Section A of Annex II;
5. Confirms the participation in its 7th extraordinary session as observers of the persons and institutions invited by the Director-General of UNESCO in accordance with Rule 8.4 of its *Rules of Procedure*, which are listed in Section B of Annex II.

3A. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Decision 7 EXT.COM 3A

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3A.Rev** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3A.Rev**,
2. Adopts the agenda included in the first above-mentioned document.

3B. ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE

Decision 7 EXT.COM 3B

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3B.Rev**,
2. Decides to discuss item 11 of the agenda between items 4 and 5, as recommended by the Bureau;
3. Adopts the timetable included in above-mentioned document, as amended.

3C. REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (SUZHOU, 2004)

Decision 7 EXT.COM 3C

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3C** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3C** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3C.Add**
2. Takes note with satisfaction of the Report of the Rapporteur of its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004).

4. WORKING TOOLS AND WORKING METHODS

4A PROGRESS REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE REVISED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Decision 7 EXT.COM 4A

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4 A**,
2. Also noting the oral presentation by the Chairperson of its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003),

I.. TENTATIVE LISTS

3. Reminds the States Parties to the *Convention* about the need to continue submitting their Tentative Lists in accordance with Article 11.1 of the *Convention* and the corresponding provisions of the *Operational Guidelines* ;

4. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the States Parties concerned, to continue updating its records on the basis of the Tentative Lists received – in particular, by removing from its records properties already inscribed in the World Heritage List and nominations which were rejected;
5. Also requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to set up an electronic database reflecting any change in the Tentative Lists, and to report on this matter at its 31st session (2007);

II. TRANSBOUNDARY AND TRANSNATIONAL NOMINATIONS

6. Decides to consider as :
 - a) transboundary nomination, only a property jointly nominated as such, in conformity with Article 11.3 of the *Convention*, by all concerned States Parties having adjacent borders;
 - b) transnational nomination, a serial nomination of properties located in the territory of different States Parties, which need not be contiguous and which are nominated with the consent of all States Parties concerned;

III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSES

7. Decides that comparative analyses by States Parties as part of the nomination dossier shall be undertaken in relation to similar properties, whether or not on the World Heritage List, both at the national and international levels;

IV. PHOTOGRAPH AND AUDIOVISUAL PRODUCTS

8. Decides to add an option in the Technical Annexes of the revised *Operational Guidelines* whereby States Parties are encouraged to grant to UNESCO, in written form and free of charge, the non-exclusive cession of rights of slides/photograph/videos, provided that any profit goes to the World Heritage Fund and that it does not impinge upon intellectual property rights.

V. ENTRY INTO FORCE

9. Decides that the revised *Operational Guidelines* will enter into force on 2 February 2005, on the understanding that the provisions on the format of nominations will apply to nominations to be examined starting from 2007.

4B WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B.Add**,
2. Recalling Decisions **28 COM 13.1** and **28 COM 14B.57**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Confirms that the two complete nominations per State Party referred to in paragraph 17 a) of Decision **28 COM 13.1** are inclusive of nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions of the Committee, extensions (except minor modifications of limits of the properties), transboundary nominations and serial nominations;
4. Recalls its decision at its 6th Extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2003) requesting that, in undertaking their evaluation, the Advisory Bodies consult closely with States Parties submitting nominations to the World Heritage List, and requests the Advisory Bodies to forward by 31 January of each year, starting in 2006, any final question or requests for information that they may have after the examination of their evaluation;
5. Reminds the State Parties to the *Convention* of the deadline of 31 March of the year of examination of the nomination, to submit supplementary information to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and decides to evaluate the viability of this date at its 30th session (2006);
6. Invites the concerned States Parties to send, at least two working days before the opening of its session, a letter to the Chairperson of that session, with copies to the Advisory Bodies, detailing the factual errors they might have identified in the evaluation of a nomination made by the Advisory Bodies. This letter will be distributed in the working languages to the Members of the Committee and may be read by the Chairperson, following the presentation of the evaluation referred to by the Advisory Bodies;
7. Requests the Bureau to ensure, starting from its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the strict application of the procedure detailed in Annex A to this decision regarding the elaboration of documents to be examined at each of its meetings;
8. Invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to submit at its 29th session proposals on ways and means of optimizing the interrelation between the results of the Periodic Reporting cycles and the conclusions derived from the State of Conservation reports –in particular in order to ensure consistency and a better conservation of the sites;

9. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to continue presenting the State of Conservation reports in one document, proposing clearly in such document the reports on the state of conservation that the Committee is invited to debate (“for adoption requiring discussion”) and those that the Committee is invited just to adopt without debate (“for adoption requiring no discussion”);
10. Also requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to propose at its 29th session:
 - criteria to present State of Conservation reports before the Committee
 - criteria orienting the inclusion of a site in the category “for adoption requiring discussion” and the category “for adoption requiring no discussion”;
11. Invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre to use the existing mechanism effectively to ensure that the Committee only considers State of Conservation reports when a decision is required or at significant stages in the implementation of a decision previously taken by the Committee;
12. Encourages States Parties, in addition to current practices, to directly fill their State of Conservation reports electronically;
13. Decides, on an experimental basis and starting at its 29th session, to:
 - continue the current practice of holding one annual ordinary session of the Committee, with the possibility of convening an extraordinary session if the number of non-examined items in the agenda of the session so justifies;
 - establish, in accordance with Rule 21 of the *Rules of Procedure*, an open-ended subsidiary body on administrative and financial issues, which will work simultaneously with the plenary sessions; and
14. Also decides to examine the previous practice in the framework of the 1972 *Convention* and of other conventions regarding the constitution and operation of working groups – inter alia, in parallel with the plenary sessions at the times prescribed by them - and requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to make recommendations on this matter at its 29th session;
15. Further decides to evaluate at its 31st session (2007) the impact of the measures detailed in the preceding paragraph on the time management of its work. This, in particular, with a view to consider additional improvements to its the working methods –including the setting-up of additional working groups;
16. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to organize an orientation session for new Committee Members and new Heads of Delegation.

ANNEX A to the Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.1

PROCEDURE REGARDING THE ELABORATION AND EXAMINATION OF DOCUMENTS AT THE MEETINGS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

1. At least six weeks in advance of each World Heritage Committee meeting, the World Heritage Centre shall have finished the revision of the draft decisions proposed for that meeting –in particular, in order to check for consistency among such decisions and with previous decisions. The text of the draft decision shall appear in the first page of the corresponding working document. The working documents (for decision) shall be clearly distinguished –both in content and presentation- from the information documents.
2. Before circulating the documents to its Members, informal contacts shall take place between the Rapporteur and the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Chairperson, in order to have a first exchange of views on two elements of the future Draft Report, for each item included in the provisional agenda: the formal aspects of the corresponding draft decision and the main issues that may be addressed during the debates.
3. In consultation with the Chairperson, discussion of each item of the agenda of the Committee meeting should be structured as follows:
 - Presentation by the World Heritage Centre of all the working and information documents for the item, including references to the examination of the item at previous meetings of the Committee and/or the General Assembly;
 - Identification by the Chairperson -with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre and, if necessary, of the Rapporteur - of the main issues to be addressed in the debate on the item (to this regard, the results of the exchange of views referred to in the preceding paragraph may offer some guidance); and
 - General discussion of the item, preferably following the issues identified in the preceding paragraph.
4. The Chairperson should enforce rigorously Rule 22.2 of the *Rules of Procedure* and consider the use of appropriate means to this end;
5. In this way, the Committee will be adequately prepared to examine the draft decision for the item. During this process, the *Rules of Procedure* of the Committee and the additional indications by the Chairperson shall be followed fully and strictly, in particular as regards the submission of amendments (Members should submit amendments to decisions, preferably using the standard form included in Annex B)

and the adoption of the draft decision (firstly paragraph by paragraph, and then in its entirety).

6. The Rapporteur is responsible of ensuring that, once a decision has been adopted by the Committee, under no circumstances its text is adjusted, completed or altered in any way.

Annex B to the Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.1

World Heritage

7 EXT.COM

7 EXT.COM/DD/	/1
----------------------	-----------

Paris, (Date)

Original : English

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Seventh Extraordinary Session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II

6 – 11 December 2004

Item of the Agenda:

Amendment to the Draft Decision:

(Add number and paragraph n° of the original Draft Decision)

Submitted by:

(States Parties, Advisory Bodies, WHC)

Supported by:

Date :

TEXT

Decision 7 EXT. COM 4B.2

The World Heritage Committee:

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B**,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 13.1**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004)
3. Decides that the Special Meeting of Experts referred to in paragraph 13 of Decision **28 COM 13.1** shall take place in Kazan, as offered by the Russian Federation and thanks the Russian authorities for their offer;
4. Decides that the Special Meeting mentioned above will take place from 6 to 9 April 2005;
5. Requests the World Heritage Centre to prepare a background paper collecting as much as possible relevant information pertaining to the elements referred to in, points a), b), c), and d) of paragraph 13 of the Decision **28 COM 13.1**. This document should be considered the reference document for the work of the Special Meeting of Experts and it should also be distributed to all Members of the Committee for information under a circular letter;
6. Requests the Advisory Bodies to present to the Special Meeting of Experts a document on the analysis of the Tentative List, and thematic studies as stated in paragraph 12 of the above-mentioned decision in order to get a clear position concerning the question of the unrepresented and less represented categories of natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List;
7. Requests the World Heritage Centre to prepare, on the basis of the conclusions and proposals of the Special Meeting of Experts, a document for the consideration by the Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005).

Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B.Add**,
2. Decides that the Working group on the methods of work of the Committee established at its 7th extraordinary session shall complete its mandate at its 29th session (Durban, 2005).

5. PERIODIC REPORTING

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5

1. Having examined Documents *WHC-04/7EXT.COM/5A*, *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5B*, *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5C*, *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5D* and *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5E*,
2. Aware of the need to:
 - a) study and reflect on the first cycle of Periodic Reporting;
 - b) develop strategic direction on the forms and the format of the Periodic Reports, training priorities and international cooperation priorities; and
 - c) to streamline the Committee's consideration of matters raised through Periodic Reporting relating to inscribed properties;
3. Decides to suspend for one year the commencement of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

5A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Decision 7 EXT COM 5A.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5A*,
2. Recalling its Decision **25 COM VII.25-27** at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001) to examine at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the Periodic Report for North America,
3. Notes the report on the progress of such Periodic Report.

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5A.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5A*,
2. Recalling its Decision **25 COM VII.25-27** at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001) to examine Section I of the Periodic Report for Europe at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), and Section II at its 30th session (2006),
3. Notes the report on the progress of the Periodic Report for Europe.

5B FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR THE ARAB STATES

Decision: 7 EXT.COM 5B

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5B**,
2. Recalling its Decisions **24 COM VII.1-4** and **27 COM 20B.I**, adopted at its 24th session (Cairns, 2000) and its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003), respectively,
3. Takes note of the progress made in the implementation of the Regional Programme for the Arab States and in responding to the priority needs identified in the Periodic Report for the Arab States;
4. Thanks the Dutch Government for supporting the publication of such Periodic Report;
5. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to continue developing the Assistance Modules, as well as projects, as part of the strategy outlined in the Regional Programme, and to consult the concerned States Parties in the process;
6. Further requests the World Heritage Centre to report at its 30th session (2006) on the outcome of the Regional Meeting foreseen in 2005 – with particular attention to the review of the Assistance Modules and the mobilization of extra-budgetary resources for their implementation.

5C FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5C

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5C** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.11**,
2. Recalling its Decision **26 COM 20**, adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),
3. Notes with satisfaction the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the Periodic Report for Africa;
4. Thanks the Italian Government for its prompt and generous contribution to the implementation of the first session of Modules II & III of the Africa Regional Programme 2004-2007, as well as the governments and institutions detailed in

the Annex for their contribution to the conservation of World Heritage Sites in Africa;

5. Invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to take into account, in the implementation of the training component of the Africa Regional Programme, the diversity of languages as well as the need to ensure an appropriate balance between natural and cultural heritage, with a view to promoting integrated programs;
6. Takes note of the meeting of African experts on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and on the State of Conservation of World Heritage sites in Africa planned for March 2005 in Cape Town, South Africa;
7. Calls upon the State Parties to the *Convention*, UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and other partners to support this initiative;
8. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to report at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) on the results and progress accomplished in the implementation of the recommendations of both the Periodic Report for Africa and the Africa Regional Programme.

ANNEX to the Decision 7 EXT.COM 5C

List of Governments and Institutions that have contributed to the Africa Regional Programme and to the conservation of World Heritage properties in Africa:

- Belgium, Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Federal Science Office;
- France – UNESCO Cooperation Agreement;
- Global Environment Facility (GEF)/ Small Grants Programme;
- Italy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- Japan, Funds-in-Trust-Agreement with UNESCO;
- Finland, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Netherlands, Funds-in Trust-Agreement with UNESCO;
- Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD);
- Nordic World Heritage Foundation;
- Portugal, Funds-in-Trust Agreement with UNESCO;
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
- Swedish National Heritage;
- United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility (UNDP/GEF).
- United Nations Foundation (UNF)

5D FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5D

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5D**,
2. Recalling Decision **27 COM 6A**, adopted at its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003),
3. Takes note of the progress made in the implementation of the Regional Programmes for the Asia-Pacific Region, which responds to the priority needs identified in the Periodic Report for such region;
4. Thanks the Japanese Government for supporting the publication of the “State of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region”;
5. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to report at its 30th session (2006) on the outcomes of the sub-regional meetings and other activities foreseen in 2004 and 2005 for the implementation of the programmes “Action Asia 2003-2009” and “World Heritage-Pacific 2009”.

5E FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5E

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5E** and **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.5E**,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 16** adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Takes note of the results of the meetings held in 2004 as a follow-up of the First Periodic Report for Latin America and the Caribbean, being those in Kingston (Jamaica), Cartagena (Colombia) and San José (Costa Rica);
4. Endorses the Action Plan for World Heritage in Latin America included in Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.5E**;
5. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties of the region, to convene a workshop, preferably at the beginning of 2005, to further develop the Caribbean and the Latin American Action Plans into operational work plans, timetables and detailed budgets, and identify partners for their implementation;
6. Strongly encourages the States Parties and all other World Heritage partners and stakeholders in the region to co-operate actively and to take the necessary actions to follow-up, in a concerted and concrete manner, in the implementation of the Action Plans for World Heritage in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean;

7. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to report at its 30th session (2006) on the implementation of the Caribbean and Latin American Action Plans.

5F PROGRESS REPORT ON THE NOMINATION OF QHAPAQ ÑAN (THE MAIN ANDEAN ROAD)

Decision 7 EXT.COM 5F

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/5F**,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 13.2**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou; 2004),
3. Takes note with appreciation of the progress report on the nomination process of Qhapaq Ñan – Main Andean Road on the World Heritage List;
4. Thanks the Chilean Government for supporting the organization of the Fourth Expert Meeting held in Santiago de Chile from 7 to 10 November 2004;
5. Also thanks the Governments of France, the Netherlands and Spain for continuing to cooperate and to contribute extra-budgetary funds for this nomination process, and encourages other States Parties to the *Convention* to contribute additional financial and human resources for the project;
6. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to report at its 30th session (2006) on the follow up of this nomination process.

6. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Decision 7 EXT.COM 6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined the technical cooperation assistance request made by India regarding an improved geographic information system (GIS) for Darjeeling Himalayan Railway (DHR), as presented in Documents **WHC - 04/7EXT.COM/6** and **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/6 Add**,
2. Noting that, in accordance with Decision **28 COM 10A**, four requests for technical cooperation will be submitted to the Chairperson/Committee in 2005, for a total amount of US\$ 104,915,
3. Considering that only an amount of US\$ 160,000 is available for cultural properties under technical cooperation assistance in the 2005 budget of the World Heritage Fund,

4. Taking into account the recommendation of the Bureau and the comments presented by ICOMOS in Document *WHC -04/7EXT.COM/6Add.*, as well as the amount of international assistance provided to the DHR in recent years (US\$ 58,000),
5. Decides not to approve this request for technical cooperation.

7. **ADJUSTMENTS TO THE BUDGET 2004-2005**

Decision 7 EXT.COM 7.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents *WHC -04/7 EXT.COM/7* and *WHC -04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 11**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Authorizes the Director of the World Heritage Centre to re-allocate US\$ 30,000 from the savings made in the 2004 budget of the World Heritage Fund, in order to undertake a retrospective inventory with a view to harmonizing and updating the documentation for the properties inscribed in the World Heritage List,
4. Recognizing that Periodic Reporting is a critical tool for conservation and that the adequate management of the World Heritage List depends on an appropriate assessment of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites, also authorizes the Director of the World Heritage Centre to re-allocate US\$ 20,000 from the savings made in the 2004 budget of the World Heritage Fund, in order to identify main indicators on the state of conservation of sites;
5. Takes note of the Statement of Income and Expenditure and Changes in Reserves and Fund Balances included in the Annex to Document *WHC -04/7EXT.COM/7*.

Decision 7 EXT.COM 7.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC -04/7 EXT.COM/7**,
 2. Takes note of the project concerning an exhibition on cultural and natural World Heritage in Africa which the World Heritage Centre plans to organize during the next summit of the African Union, planned on 4 and 5 July 2005;
 3. Invites the States Parties to the *Convention* and partners to provide their financial and/or material support to this awareness-raising activity on the *Convention*.
8. **PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THE UNESCO DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2006 - 2007 (DRAFT 33C/5) AND THE UNESCO MEDIUM-TERM STRATEGY 2008 - 2013 (DRAFT 34C/4)**

Decision 7 EXT.COM 8

The World Heritage Committee

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/8** and **WHC - 04/7EXT.COM/INF.8**,
 2. Takes note of the information included in such documents.
9. **CO-OPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE**

Decision 7 EXT.COM 9

The World Heritage Committee:

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/9** and **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/INF.9**,
2. Recalling Decision **26 COM 11** (paragraph 4), adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),
3. Also mindful of Decision **28 COM 12** (paragraph 9) calling for “*greater coordination and co-operation between the World Heritage Centre and other sectors of UNESCO, as well as coordination between the 1972 Convention and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations relevant to cultural heritage, notably the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and protected area programmes and conventions adopted within and outside the framework of UNESCO*”,

4. Emphasizing Article 3a) of the 2003 Convention, which provides that such convention shall not be interpreted as “*altering the status or diminishing the level of protection under the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of World Heritage properties with which an item of the intangible cultural heritage is directly associated*”,
5. Taking into account the respective scope of application of heritage related conventions,
6. Recognizing the primacy of the *World Heritage Convention* in relation to tangible heritage and where the tangible heritage has a clear link with intangible cultural heritage which cannot be severed,
7. Acknowledges the importance of ensuring an appropriate coordination between the *Convention* and the global environment related conventions and programmes, and welcomes to this regard the initiative to promote a liaison group among the secretariats of the conventions related to biodiversity conservation;
8. Noting the recent entry into force of the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, and aware of the importance of identifying appropriate links between the 1972 *Convention* and such Protocol;
9. Invites States Parties of the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* to consider adhering to other international, regional and sub-regional instruments related to the protection of natural and cultural heritage;
10. Recalls that the coordination between 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and other conventions should apply at all levels, in particular when assisting States Parties in implementing such conventions;
11. Further invites the Director-General to continue to stimulate intellectual debate and reflection concerning the interconnectedness between the tangible and intangible heritage.

10. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMMES

Decision 7 EXT.COM 10

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined the Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/10**,
2. Invites the States Parties and Advisory Bodies to present written comments on the above mentioned document and requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to submit a consolidated document at its 29th session (Durban, 2005).

11. PROGRESS REPORTS ON THE GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY

Decision 7 EXT.COM 11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/11* and *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.11*,
2. Recalling Decisions **28 COM 19.1** and **28 COM 19.2** , adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Takes note of the progress made so far by the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and States Parties to the *Convention* in the implementation of the Global Training Strategy;
4. Encourages the reinforcement and continuation of these implementation efforts as regards all aspects of capacity-building, of which training is only a component, taking into account the results of the Periodic Reporting cycles and ensuring their coordination with the strategic planning initiatives;
5. Requests that ongoing Periodic Reporting cycles and their follow-up be closely linked to the World Heritage Strategic Objectives (the “four C’s”) and to the Global Training Strategy, so that recommendations from such Periodic Reporting cycles can be systematically incorporated into training programmes;
6. Takes note with appreciation of the progress made to date in the setting up of the "World Heritage Research and Training Institute in China", and welcomes the assurances that there will be no financial implications to the World Heritage Fund from such initiative;
7. Takes note of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity-Building on Natural Heritage, as proposed in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/11*;
8. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to submit at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) a proposal on budgetary provisions for the implementation of such Global Framework Programme .

12. PROGRESS REPORTS ON THE PARTNERSHIPS FOR WORLD HERITAGE CONSERVATION (PACT)

Decision 7 EXT.COM 12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/12** and **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/12.Corr**,
2. Recalling Decisions **26 COM 17.3** and **28 COM 20**, adopted respectively at its 26th (Budapest, 2002) and 28th (Suzhou, 2004) sessions,
3. Endorses the proposed change of name of the World Heritage Partnership Initiative as **World Heritage PACT** (“Partnerships for Conservation”);
4. Considers that the progress report on activities since its 26th session demonstrates the potential of the World Heritage PACT as a tool for implementing the Budapest Declaration of 2002;
5. Acknowledges the importance of involving local populations, whenever appropriate, in the implementation of the World Heritage PACT,
6. Suggests that the Director of the World Heritage Centre promotes the public recognition of World Heritage PACT partnerships through awareness-raising activities - preferably by initiatives such as awarding Certificates of appreciation or the establishment of a Roll of Honour published on the World Heritage Web site;
7. Recalls the importance, notably for the partners' own publicity purposes, of including, in every written agreement between the World Heritage Centre and a contributor to the World Heritage PACT, a clause outlining the conditions of use of contributions made by partners;
8. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to submit for adoption at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) the applicable regulatory framework for World Heritage PACT;
9. Also requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present an information document at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) on the performance of World Heritage PACT, using the indicators proposed and other relevant indicators elaborated for World Heritage Programmes, and with particular regard to the following aspects:
 - the impact of the initiative on the World Heritage Fund
 - the overheads charged on partnerships and their appropriation
10. Further requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to submit at its 29th session an accurate inventory of the agreements concluded between the World Heritage Centre and States Parties in the framework of the World

Heritage PACT, as well as non-governmental and private sectors partners, including timeframes, objectives and resources involved.

13. PUBLICATION PLANS

Decision 7 EXT.COM 13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/13**,
2. Recalling its Decisions **6 EXT.COM 5.2** and **6 EXT.COM 5.3**, adopted at its 6th extraordinary session (UNESCO, 2003),
3. Welcomes the recommendation of the World Heritage Centre to merge the proposal to publish a compilation of World Heritage Basic Texts and a Handbook on the *World Heritage Convention* into one publication to be entitled: *The Basic Texts of the 1972 World Heritage Convention*;
4. Recognizes the importance of seeking extrabudgetary funding to ensure the translation of the Basic Texts into other languages;
5. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to:
 - a) Develop, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, as part of the World Heritage Papers Series, a publication on "Principles for the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and interventions situated within their buffer zone";
 - b) Submit at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) an information document with a table of contents and a detailed budget for the financing through extrabudgetary resources of this publication.

14. REPORT ON THE USE OF WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

Decision 7 EXT.COM 14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents **WHC-04/7 EXT COM/14**, and **WHC-04/7 EXT COM/14.Corr**,
2. Recalling Decision **26 COM 15**, adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),
3. Regrets that the World Heritage Emblem was not protected as had been requested;

4. Takes note of the Annual Report on the use of the World Heritage Emblem included in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT COM/14*;
5. Urges the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs of UNESCO, to request the World Intellectual Property Organization to amend its initial communication under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention for the protection of industrial property in order to protect :
 - a) the graphics of the World Heritage Emblem by itself; and
 - b) the graphics with the words 'World Heritage' in any language, surrounding this graphic;
6. Expresses its concern at some inconsistencies in the handling by the World Heritage Centre of requests for use of the World Heritage Emblem and requests that proposals for use of the Emblem which are within the competence of the State Party should be referred immediately to the State Party concerned;
7. Recalls the segment entitled 'Responsibilities of States Parties' of the Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem as follows: *'States Parties to the Convention should take all possible measures to prevent the use of the Emblem in their respective countries by any group or for any purpose not explicitly recognized by the Committee. States Parties are encouraged to make full use of national legislation including Trade Mark Laws'*.

15. NEW VOTING MECHANISM FOR THE ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Decision 7 EXT.COM 15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined the Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/15*,
2. Recalling Resolution **14 GA 4.2** adopted by the 14th General Assembly (UNESCO, 2003) on a new voting mechanism and revision of procedures for elections of the Committee,
3. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Secretary of the UNESCO General Conference, to schedule the General Assembly of the States Parties to the *Convention* prior to the Programme Commissions of the General Conference of UNESCO;
4. Further requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to organize the elections of the members of the Committee in a separate room from the main meeting room, equipped with voting facilities, and with ballots conducted on a pre-scheduled basis agreed by the General Assembly.

16. REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Decision 7 EXT.COM 16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/16.rev**,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 24**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Decides that its 29th session will take place from 10 to 17 July 2005 ;
4. Adopts the following provisional agenda for its 29th session:

**Provisional agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee
(Durban, South Africa, 2005)**

OPENING SESSION

1. Opening Session
 - 1.1 Opening of the session by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
 - 1.2 Introduction by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
 - 1.3 Welcome by the Host Country
2. Requests for Observer status
3. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable

REPORTS

4. Report of the Rapporteur of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee (Paris, 06-11 December 2004)
5. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and on the implementation of the Decisions of the World Heritage Committee
6. World Heritage Committee's report for the General Assembly of States Parties

**EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION
AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND
OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

7. Examination of the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties
 - 7A State of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 7B State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
8. Establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger

- 8A** Tentative Lists of States Parties submitted in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* and as of 15 May 2005
- 8B** Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger

**GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED
AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

- 9.** Assessment of the conclusions and recommendations of the special meeting of experts (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005) established by Decision **28 COM 13.1**

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY

- 10.** Budgetary provisions for the implementation of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Building on Natural Heritage

PERIODIC REPORTS

- 11.** Periodic Reports
- 11A** Presentation of the Periodic Report for North America and Part I of the Periodic for Europe (2005)
- 11B** Progress Report on the preparation of Part II of the Periodic Report for Europe (2006)
- 11C** Progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Periodic Report for Africa
- 11D** Progress Report on the protection of the Palestinian natural and cultural heritage

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

- 12.** Performance indicators for World Heritage Programmes
- 13.** Progress report on World Heritage PACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

- 14.** International Assistance:
- 14A** Examination of International Assistance requests
- 14B** Follow-up to the evaluation of the Emergency Assistance and evaluation of the other components of the International Assistance
- 15.** Report on the execution of the Budget 2004-2005 and follow-up to the recommendations concerning the administrative and financial issues of the Audit of the World Heritage Centre undertaken in 1997 (Decision **28 COM 11**)
- 16.** Presentation of the World Heritage Fund and Budget 2006 - 2007

17. Report on the World Heritage Emblem

WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

18. Working methods of the World Heritage Committee

CLOSING SESSION

19. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur
20. Provisional Agenda of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee (2006)
21. Other business
22. Adoption of Decisions
23. Closure of the session

17. ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Decision 7 EXT.COM 17

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/17*,
2. Adopts the decisions included in this document as amended.

18. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

(No Decision required)

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Seventh extraordinary session

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
6 – 11 December 2004**

SUMMARY RECORD

Published on behalf of the World Heritage Committee by:

UNESCO World Heritage Centre
7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP
France

Tel: +33 (0) 1 4568 1571
Fax: +33 (0) 1 4568 5570
E-mail: wh-info@unesco.org
<http://whc.unesco.org>

This report will be available in English and French at the following Web addresses:

<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-7extcom-17e.pdf> (English)

<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-7extcom-17f.pdf> (French)

TABLE OF CONTENT

FIRST MEETING	33
ITEM 1	OPENING OF THE SESSION 33
ITEM 2	REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS 34
ITEM 3A	ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA 35
ITEM 3B	ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE 35
ITEM 3C	REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (SUZHOU, 2004) 35
ITEM 4A	PROGRESS REPORT ON REVISED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES 37
SECOND MEETING	46
ITEM 4A	PROGRESS REPORT ON REVISED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (CONTINUED) 46
ITEM 4B	WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE 50
THIRD MEETING	60
ITEM 4B	WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE (CONTINUED) 60
ITEM 11	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY 60
ITEM 5A	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA 67
ITEM 5B	FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR THE ARAB STATES 69
ITEM 5C	FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA 69
FOURTH MEETING	73
ITEM 5D	FOLLOW-UP TO THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC 73
ITEM 5E	FOLLOW-UP ON THE PERIODIC REPORT IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN 74
ITEM 5F	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PROPOSAL FOR THE NOMINATION OF QHAPAQ ÑAN – MAIN ANDEAN ROAD. 76
ITEM 6	INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS 77
ITEM 7	ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2004-2005 BUDGET 79
FIFTH MEETING	83
ITEM 8	PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2006-2007 (DRAFT DOCUMENT 33 C/5) AND DOCUMENT 34 C/4 92

ITEM 9	COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE	95
--------	---	----

SIXTH MEETING	98
----------------------	-----------

ITEM 9	COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE (CONTINUED)	98
ITEM 10	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMMES	104
ITEM 12	WORLD HERITAGE PARTNERSHIPS INITIATIVE: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND PROGRESS REPORT	105

SEVENTH MEETING	109
------------------------	------------

ITEM 9	COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE (CONTINUED)	109
ITEM 12	WORLD HERITAGE PARTNERSHIPS INITIATIVE: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND PROGRESS REPORT (CONTINUED)	112
ITEM 13	PUBLICATIONS PLANS (INCLUDING BUDGETED PROPOSALS) FOR A COMPILATION OF <i>WORLD HERITAGE BASIC TEXTS</i> , GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS FOR THE PROTECTION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES THAT WOULD SUPPLEMENT THE <i>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES</i> AND A <i>HANDBOOK ON THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION</i>	114
ITEM 14	REPORT ON THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM	118

EIGHTH MEETING	122
-----------------------	------------

ITEM 14	REPORT ON THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM (CONTINUED)	122
ITEM 15	NEW VOTING MECHANISM FOR THE ELECTION OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS	123

NINTH MEETING	126
----------------------	------------

ITEM 4B	WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE (CONTINUED)	126
ITEM 16	REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29 TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (DURBAN, 2005)	129

TENTH MEETING	132
----------------------	------------

ITEM 17	ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE 7 TH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (PARIS, 6-11 DECEMBER 2004)	132
---------	--	-----

FIRST MEETING

Monday, 6 December 2004, at 10.20 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its first meeting, the Committee, following the opening of the session, examined three of the five pending issues regarding the revised Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention – such as: a) the degree of detail to be introduced in the way in which Tentative Lists are presented; b) the need to clarify the meaning of the expression “transboundary nomination”; and c) the extent to which comparative analyses are to be carried out.

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Seventh Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee was opened on 6 December 2004 at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, France, by Mr Themba Wakashe (South Africa), Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** recalled the importance placed by his Government on the need to preserve heritage and that South Africa was indeed looking forward to hosting the World Heritage Committee in Durban in 2005.

In referring to “Heritage in Danger: protecting the wonders of the Democratic Republic of Congo”, the event organized at UNESCO in September in support of World Heritage sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he underlined the relevance of the *World Heritage Convention* in preventing conflicts and in contributing to the reconciliation process associated with post-conflict situations. He recalled that 19 out of the 35 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage sites in Danger are African, and emphasized the need to spare no effort to save these and other sites under threat. He noted with satisfaction that much work had been accomplished to mobilize support in favour of Bam. Moreover, he suggested that conservation work could be more development-oriented and concluded by inviting the participants to work in the true spirit of international cooperation to make the session and future work a success.

After thanking the Government of China for organizing the Committee’s very successful session in Suzhou, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, noted that South Africa was at the forefront of the promotion of cultural heritage and recalled that Professor Kader Asmal and Mr Themba P. Wakashe, both South African, chaired two important bodies: the Group of Experts working on the International Convention on the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions and the World Heritage Committee respectively.

He also noted and thanked the Chairperson of the Executive Board for attending the opening meeting of the extraordinary session of the Committee.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** drew attention to certain important items on the Agenda which had not been examined in depth in Suzhou, due to lack of time. He referred to item 4.A concerning the revision of the *Operational Guidelines concerning the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, for which the Chairperson of the 27th

session was mandated to approve the final draft version, on behalf of the other Committee members. He also evoked Item 4.B, Reflection on the working methods of the Committee, which he considered to be vital in view of the considerable increase in the number of items on the agenda of each session and the multiplication of state of conservation reports of World Heritage sites which were submitted. He assured that the World Heritage Centre would follow the deliberations concerning this question very closely so as not only to rationalise the work but also to improve the quality of the documents and nomination dossiers being presented. Referring to item 9 of the Agenda regarding cooperation and coordination between the UNESCO Conventions relating to heritage, and notably between that of 1972 and the one of 2003 concerning intangible heritage, the speaker recalled that an international conference organised, among others, with UNESCO, which was held in Nara, Japan, from 19 to 23 October 2004, had as objective a debate at the global level on the possibilities of an integrated approach to the safeguarding of tangible and intangible heritage, theme to be discussed at a later opportunity when it will be part of a special presentation.

Furthermore, the Assistant Director-General noted that the decision taken by UNESCO's Executive Board at its 170th session, by which it recommended that the promotion of cultural diversity be the major priority of the Cultural Sector in 2006-2007, with emphasis on tangible and intangible cultural heritage, was fully in conformity with the wishes of the Committee.

Finally, in rendering tribute to the memory of Michel Batisse, who passed away on 25 September 2004, he informed the members of the Committee of the action taken to ensure the translation into English of the brochure entitled « The Invention of World Heritage » in which he who had been one of the artisans of the *1972 Convention* recounted personal memories and reflections linked to the birth of this instrument.

He then referred to the Steering Committee meeting on Bam, which had taken place on 3 December 2004, commending the continuing efforts of the international community to assist that historical city, and informed the Committee that an inscription ceremony was to be held on 26 December 2004 on the occasion of an expert group meeting in Bam. That date would also mark the first anniversary of the earthquake in Bam.

The Committee observed one minute's silence in tribute to Mr Batisse.

ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/2

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a last-minute request for observer status had been received from Mr Andrea Tramontana, an Italian student.

The decision concerning requests for observer status was adopted.

ITEM 3A ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3A.Rev.2
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3A.Rev

The **Chairperson** introduced item 3 and referred to the recommendation of the Bureau held on 4 December 2004 to switch the order of the discussion between two items of the provisional agenda; accordingly item 11 (Progress report on the Global Training Strategy) would be discussed before item 5A (Progress report on the preparation of the Periodic Report for Europe and North America). The Chairperson then informed the Committee that, at the beginning of each morning's meeting, 10 to 15 minutes would be dedicated to briefing the Committee about the recommendations made by the Bureau at its daily meeting. The Bureau had also recommended that the issue of the expert meeting on the concept of outstanding universal value should be discussed under item 4B (Working methods of the World Heritage Committee).

The Chairperson declared the provisional agenda adopted as amended.

ITEM 3B ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE

Documents: WHC-04/7. EXT.COM/3B.Rev2

The **Chairperson** presented the revised provisional timetable, which reflected the change in the order of discussion of items 11 and 5.

The Chairperson declared the timetable adopted as amended.

ITEM 3C REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (SUZHOU, 2004)

Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3C
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3C

The **Rapporteur of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee**, Ms Louise Graham (South Africa), introduced this item and referred to *Documents WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3C* and *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3*. The first document contained all the decisions taken by the Committee at its 28th session at Suzhou, China, drafted according to the guidelines established for their standardization and format, while the second contained the draft summary records of the Committee's discussions at the same session. With respect to the latter, she acknowledged the significant contribution of the two revisers, made available by the World Heritage Centre in Suzhou, who had aligned the draft summary records with the standards of the Executive Board of UNESCO. The draft summary records had been distributed to members of the Committee to enable them to make any necessary amendment to their own statements. She explained that she had discussed ways of improving further the reporting system with the current Rapporteur, Mr Ariel Gonzalez (Argentina), who had already made some new proposals in that respect. She thanked the **Rapporteur of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee**, Ms Benedicte Selfslagh (Belgium), for her valuable contribution to the improvement of the Committee's work, as well as the World

Heritage Centre, the members of the Committee and the Delegation of South Africa for their support during her tenure as Rapporteur of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson**, recognizing that each Rapporteur wished to contribute towards improving the reporting system and working methods of the Committee, gave the floor to the **Rapporteur of the 7th Extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee** to enable him to present to the Committee some proposals he had prepared in that regard.

The **Rapporteur of the 7th Extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee** made some proposals to improve the way in which documents and decisions for consideration by the Committee were drafted, with a view to facilitating review by the Committee at the session, and to rationalize the reporting system. Among these proposals, he mentioned the need to clearly identify, for each item to be examined by the Committee, the documents and previous decisions related to such item. He added that the proposals would be compiled and further detailed in a document for consideration of the Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005).

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** summarized the discussions held at the meeting of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee on 4 December 2004. The issues considered by the Bureau included the change of the date of the 29th session of the Committee, as the original date overlapped with a major intergovernmental summit in the African region; the consideration of requests for international assistance; the status of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*; and the establishment of a working group on the methods of work of the Committee. On the latter question, the Bureau had recommended that such working group is established as early as possible by the current session of the Committee; is open-ended and has an equitable geographic representation; and is given a clear mandate for its deliberations.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** deplored the mediocrity of the French text of the Decision (WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/3.C), certain sentences of which it found unintelligible or likely to cause misunderstandings due to their divergence from the English text. In view of the status of French as an official language of UNESCO, it requested that an effort be made to remedy this seemingly recurrent problem.

Furthermore, it regretted having received the Summary Records of the 28th session of the Committee (WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.3.C), only two or three days before the opening of the present session, which provided very little time to study their content in detail. It asked what delay was granted to delegations for eventual rectification of their interventions.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to the proposals made by the Rapporteur, wondered if they could not be discussed at the current session, possibly under item 4B “Working methods of the Committee”.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the deadline for the submission of amendments by States Parties to the draft summary records of the Committee at its 28th session was 15 January 2005. He also agreed with the suggestion made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia to discuss the proposals of the Rapporteur under item 4B, at the appropriate time during the current session.

The report was adopted.

ITEM 4A PROGRESS REPORT ON REVISED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4A

The **Chairperson** introduced item 4A and gave the floor to Ms Véra Lacoëuilhe in her capacity as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to whom the Committee had given the mandate to sign the revised *Operational Guidelines* on its behalf.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee** recalled the honour of having been entrusted to sign the final version of the *Operational Guidelines* for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. That honour had also been a heavy burden owing to the enormous task she had to face. It was her duty to give clear explanations about the revision process undertaken in the previous months and the reason why she could not sign the *Operational Guidelines* to permit their entry into force on 1 March 2004, as the Committee had requested.

She had refused to sign the document because it was not in conformity with the decisions taken by the Committee at its 6th Extraordinary session. She recalled that, with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre and the support of the Advisory Bodies and the Rapporteur of the 6th Extraordinary Session, it had taken some time to review the drafting of each paragraph and to insert each decision in the right place. She further recalled that following the decision adopted by the Committee at the 28th session requesting that the text of the *Operational Guidelines* should be in conformity with the *Convention*, she had been required to submit the entire text to the Legal Adviser of UNESCO. She commended the tremendous task accomplished by the Legal Adviser in drawing up the conclusions before the current session, recalling that his final comments had not yet been incorporated and that the French version of the text was yet to be finalized.

To conclude, she mentioned five pending issues that the Committee still needed to clarify: on the first issue, concerning Tentative Lists, she recalled that those Lists had been drawn up in various forms by the States Parties and she outlined the two options set out in the draft Decision reflecting that difference of appreciation.

The Delegation of **Benin**, after being reassured that there was no question of abolishing the Tentative List, favoured Option 2 concerning the use of an asterisk to indicate properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson of the Committee at its 27th session** clarified that it was no question of abolishing Tentative Lists, but rather of deciding whether the sites already inscribed in the World Heritage List should be not indicated at all (Option 1), or indicated with an asterisk (Option 2).

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson of the 27th session for the heroic task she had accomplished in reviewing the revised *Operational Guidelines* and shared the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Benin concerning Tentative Lists. Referring to the two options proposed, it stressed that the option of removing the inscribed properties from the Tentative Lists would delete any historical trace of the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List and further recalled the need to keep the memory in that regard.

After congratulating the Chairperson on his election and the Chairperson of the Committee at its 27th session for her hard work, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the option of adding an asterisk beside the site once it was inscribed would be easier in terms of process than the first option, and recalled that Tentative Lists were drawn up under the responsibility of States Parties. It suggested that the Tentative Lists record updated by the Centre should also indicate when a site had been rejected.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of the United Kingdom to provide a written amendment.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and supported the option to add an asterisk in order to keep a historical trace of the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and recalled that the Tentative List was a separate List from the World Heritage List which recorded the current situation of the properties inscribed. She was in favour of Option 1.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and supported Option 1, for the reasons presented by the Delegation of **Colombia**. After recalling that Tentative Lists were an important tool in the preparation of nominations, it suggested that Option 1 should be reworded by adding the words “on the World Heritage List” after the words “by removing the inscribed property(ies)”.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Portugal. It said that the addition of an asterisk would create some confusion. It expressed support for Option 1, but expressed interest in the arguments presented by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and recalled that the current extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee was the continuation of the excellent 28th session of the Committee. It then thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and it expressed its preference for Option 2, which could give an overall image of the history of inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Chile** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and considered that Option 2 introduced a greater clarity in the Tentative Lists, since it allowed keeping a historical record of the evolution of such Lists.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and said that Option 2 was more suitable, since it showed the progress made by each State Party in the inscription of sites. It supported the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom that rejected nominations be indicated within the Tentative Lists record.

The Delegation of the **China** congratulated the Chairperson on his election as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work. It further declared its preference for Option 1 for the same reasons given by previous speakers. However, it clarified that if a majority of delegations favoured Option 2, it could join the consensus.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recalled that the World Heritage Centre should not be asked to do the work of State Parties, and asked the Legal Adviser for advice with regards to the possibility of introducing any change to Tentative Lists that are elaborated under the entire responsibility of the State Party concerned.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled Article 11 of the *World Heritage Convention* that provided that every State Party to the *Convention* should submit an inventory of property “suitable for inclusion” in the World Heritage List, which meant that once inscribed a property was not suitable for inscription anymore. He further recalled that Tentative Lists were updated on a regular basis and that, therefore, they did not represent the “history” of such lists, since the most recent record produced by the World Heritage Centre did not keep track of all the changes.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom with regard to the need to indicate those sites that had been rejected and recalled that the Tentative Lists were a historical record, which meant that any change in the record, whether it concerned inscribed, deferred or referred properties, should be mentioned.

The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and the Chairperson of the 27th session on her excellent results in accomplishing the arduous task of revising the *Operational Guidelines*. It then suggested that Option 2 be amended by changing the words “Requests the World Heritage Centre” with the words “Requests the States Parties”, since Tentative Lists should be updated directly by States Parties.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and said that it was important that Tentative Lists reflect also the deferred and referred nominations. It therefore supported Option 2 with the amendment to include a reference to deferred and referred nominations.

In support of the comment of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Delegation of **Colombia** recalled that the *Operational Guidelines* referred also to “properties suitable for inclusion” in the World Heritage List. It concluded that the *Convention* referred to two independent and clearly distinct lists: the Tentative Lists drawn up by States Parties and the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the Chairperson of the 27th session on her excellent work and, after expressing support for Option 2, said that Tentative Lists were not just part of the memory but also an important tool with regard to the representivity of the World Heritage List and should be regarded as an overall picture of the gaps in the List. It supported the statements by the Delegations of Argentina and Egypt and agreed that States Parties and not the World Heritage Centre should be responsible for updating the Tentative Lists.

The Delegation of **Italy** congratulated the Chairperson for his election and commended the remarkable efficiency of the Chairperson of the 27th session. It supported the interventions of the Delegations of Israel and the United Kingdom, and indicated its support for Option 2, as amended by the Delegation of Argentina.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her excellent work and considered that, from a strict legal point of view, Option 1 was attractive since it allowed for the removal of a property from the Tentative Lists once it had been inscribed. However, it further considered that Option 2 was clearer, since it reflects the fact that Tentative Lists are an important tool for the implementation of the Global Strategy, which in turn depends substantially on the historical background that such Tentative Lists represent. In conclusion, it supported Option 2, as amended by the Delegation of Argentina.

The **Chairperson**, after recalling the Committee's tradition of adopting decisions by consensus, noted that there was a majority of Committee members in favour of Option 2 with the amendments proposed during the debate.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** asked the Director of the Word Heritage Centre to clarify what was the current practice in updating the Tentative Lists.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that the Centre updated the Tentative Lists regularly based on information from States Parties and that such updating was reflected in a document, distributed at each session of the Committee, which only gave an overview of the last Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties, not a recording of all previous changes made by States Parties to their own Tentative Lists.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed to formulate the first paragraph of the Draft Resolution as follows: "Requests the World Heritage Centre and States Parties to monitor the Committee's consideration of nominated sites and indicate the outcome of that consideration on their published records"

In order for the debate to reach a consensus, the Delegation of **Benin** proposed that amendments be submitted in writing. It noted that the fundamental question, raised by the United Kingdom, of whether or not to maintain on the Tentative List a site for which the inscription had been rejected, remained, because according to the texts, such a site could no longer be examined. It further considered that there was an evident confusion between the work of the Centre and that of the States Parties, whose concerns differed. Once a site was inscribed on the World Heritage List, the State concerned had no need to retain it on the Tentative List. However, the Centre has good reason to keep track of the proposed nominations not only for historical reasons but also for statistical ones, in order to identify the number of sites inscribed over the years and measure what gaps had been filled and to what extent the Global Strategy has been implemented.

The Observer Delegation of **Hungary** pointed out that the current debate was focused on two completely different issues: one concerned the responsibility of States Parties to update their own Tentative Lists while the other concerned the responsibility of the World Heritage Centre to produce updated statistics of the different Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties. It called for a revision of the way the World Heritage Centre published such statistics.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, while reassuring the members of the Committee in that the Centre keeps record of the changes to the Tentative List communicated by the respective State Parties, said that Tentative Lists were part of a dynamic process and that once a nomination was rejected by the Committee, it was automatically removed from the Tentative Lists; furthermore under the current practice rejected nominations were not included in the published record.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** asked the World Heritage Centre to produce a constantly updated document which would guide the Committee in its evaluation. Such a document should therefore indicate the nominations that had been inscribed and those that had been rejected, deferred and referred by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Centre provide such a document every five years.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** said that she considered that to be one of the main tasks of the Centre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that such a document tracking the history of nominations should be drawn up and updated according to a time frame that needed to be specified.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the proposals arising from the debate and read out the draft Decision. He proposed that the first paragraph should read “Requests States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* to update their Tentative Lists by removing from its records properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List” The second paragraph would read “Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to publish the records of the Tentative Lists with reference to all changes with regard to the rejected, deferred and referred nominations”. The third paragraph of the draft Decision would establish a three-year basis as the time frame for the updating of that record. The Rapporteur then asked the Committee to confirm his understanding of the discussions.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** agreed in principle with the overall picture given by the Rapporteur but in regard to the first paragraph said that the completion of Tentative Lists was the responsibility of States Parties. She did not think that a provision could be imposed on States Parties requiring them to remove inscribed properties from their Lists, but felt that was preferable to allow them to choose whether to indicate or remove such properties.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the Chairperson on his election as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and commended the Chairperson of the 27th session for her work on the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. It agreed with the last clarification made by the Chairperson of the 27th session.

The Delegation of **Benin** recalled that in the terms of Article 7 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Committee invites the State to "submit to it a tentative list of properties which it intends to nominate for inscription" and that this list constitutes « the inventory (provided for in Article 11 of the *Convention*) of properties ... which it considers suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List ». Consequently, once a property is inscribed, the first part of the proposal is no longer applicable and the legal problem of the sovereignty of the State Party vis-à-vis its Tentative List, which appeared to cause concern to the Chairperson of the 27th session, no longer exists.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that the debate addressed three issues. The first concentrated on the Tentative Lists as a dynamic tool providing guidance of States Parties in drawing up nominations. The second concerned the record that the Centre updated and published every year; consistency was required in updating that record and it entailed either adding an asterisk or removing the inscribed properties. The third element of the discussion concerned the possible need for a document that would keep a historical track of all the changes in the Tentative Lists of States Parties but that was a more complicated issue that required further discussion within a strategic framework. To conclude, it recalled that responsibility for producing Tentative Lists lay with States Parties and that the Centre was simply requested to publish a record of those Lists.

The **Chairperson** suggested that a drafting group be established to consolidate the various amendments proposed by States Parties.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the suggestion made by the Chairperson and supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Portugal, adding that it was important to ensure consistency and homogeneity in the form of the Tentative Lists of States Parties and that the choice between Option 1 and Option 2 was at that point irrelevant, as indicated by the Delegations of Portugal and Saint Lucia.

The Observer Delegation of **Greece** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and thanked the Chairperson of the 27th session for her work in revising the *Operational Guidelines*. It supported Option 2 amended, as proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and endorsed by many other delegations, to add a reference to rejected, deferred and referred nominations. It also supported the proposal to ask the World Heritage Centre to produce an electronic database accessible on the Internet.

Completing his earlier proposal, the **Chairperson** asked the Chairperson of the 27th session and the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Colombia to work together with the Rapporteur to consolidate the various proposals made during the debate.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal of the **Chairperson**. It added that the Centre published every year a document recording the last Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties and that whenever a nomination was inscribed on the World Heritage List the Centre sent a letter to the State Party to inform it of the inscription, which meant that the State Party itself could remove an inscribed property from the Tentative Lists.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Chairperson of the 27th session to outline the second issue on which a decision by the Committee was required.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session**, recalling the discrepancies in the definition of transboundary properties given in the existing *Operational Guidelines*, said that the 6th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee had not seemed to have addressed the issue. She said that according to the current definition, the term “transboundary nominations” also covered the issue of serial nominations from States Parties with no geographical connections.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it was unclear whether the issue of transboundary nominations as set out in the draft Decision was consistent with the issue of serial nominations raised on many occasions at the last session of the Committee and that it was difficult to evaluate the text of the draft Decision without reading it in the overall context

of the whole text of the revised *Operational Guidelines*. It requested, in this regard, the opinion of the **Legal Adviser**.

The Delegation of **India** supported this last request, further asking whether the formulation in the revised *Operational Guidelines* implied that one of the States Parties concerned in a transboundary nomination could inscribe a property without the consent of the other.

The **Legal Adviser** said that the current *Operational Guidelines* provided a definition of serial and transboundary nominations. Those definitions were not consistent and should therefore be improved, as “transboundary” implied that the sites were adjacent and “transnational” might be a more appropriate term in other cases.

Completing its previous intervention, the Delegation of **India** proposed to add the words “by all concerned” before the words “States Parties having adjacent borders” so that it would be clear that a State Party could not nominate a transboundary site without the consent of the neighbouring State Party.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** said that the *Convention* already addressed the concerns expressed by the Delegation of India.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out Article 11 of the *World Heritage Convention*, which provided that “the inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State concerned”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked to consider the hypothetical case of a State which inscribed a property on the List and some time later another State, its neighbour, requested the inscription of a property with adjacent borders and after inscription proposed a transboundary nomination for the same property. The question was whether a transboundary inscription would be possible when only one of the States Parties with adjacent borders requested such inscription.

The **Legal Adviser** said that it was difficult to answer hypothetical questions and recommended that the Committee address specific issues as they arose.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that it endorsed the proposal made by the Delegation of India and suggested that the word “jointly” be inserted so that the text would read “jointly requested by the concerned States Parties”.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, endorsing the point raised by the Delegation of Egypt, asked whether nominations of transboundary properties should be submitted simultaneously by the States Parties concerned.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stressed the need to clarify the definitions of serial national nominations, serial transnational nominations and transboundary nominations.

The Delegation of **Chile** stated that a regulatory tool could not change the language of the *Convention* and that the *Operational Guidelines* could only add a clarification on the issue. It then agreed on the need for a clarification of the three issues raised by the Delegation of Portugal and of the issue of simultaneity in the inscription of transboundary properties.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was very surprised to learn that the full text of the revised *Operational Guidelines* would not be distributed during the session and said that the debate was showing how difficult it was to discuss such specific issues extrapolated from their context. It therefore suggested to defer the matter to the 29th session.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel**, likening the actual number of sites inscribed to the tip of the iceberg, expressed support for transboundary and transnational nominations and referred to the Frontiers of the Roman Empire, the International Exhibition Movement, the Bird Migratory Routes and the Great Lakes in Africa as cases that had not been addressed simultaneously. In its view, all key aspects of the thematic forms of World Heritage should be accommodated within the definitions.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** said that the definitions of serial and transboundary nominations had not been changed. The confusion in the wording and use in the past of the word “transboundary” to address the issue of “serial” nominations in different countries explained the need for clarification and the need for clear pointers from the Committee concerning the issue of transboundary nominations as proposed in the draft Decision. She stressed that the question was simply to provide clarification as to the exact wording of transboundary nominations in the case of States Parties with adjacent borders and that such clarification would have no impact on its definition and no legal implications, as confirmed by the Legal Adviser.

The Delegation of **India** said that Article 11 of the *World Heritage Convention*, quoted by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, did not refer specifically to transboundary nominations. Furthermore such a serious matter could only be resolved by rewording the draft Decision, as suggested earlier, by adding the words “by all concerned” before the words “States Parties having adjacent borders” or by adding a reference to Article 11 of the Convention.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the discussion and read out the paragraph of the revised draft Decision amended during the debate to read as follows: “Decides to consider as ‘transboundary property’ only a property nominated as such, in conformity with Article 11 of the *World Heritage Convention*, by States Parties having adjacent borders.”

The part of the draft Decision addressing the second issue was adopted provisionally¹ as amended.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session**, introducing the third issue addressed in the draft Decision concerning the comparative analysis, said that even after reading the summary records of the 6th Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee, it was not clear what the Committee had decided in relation to the differing interpretations of that specific issue. She stressed the importance of ensuring clarification in the revised *Operational Guidelines* since a large number of nominations had been rejected, deferred or referred by the Committee on the only ground of lack of comparative analyses.

The Delegation of **Colombia** fully supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Benin** also thought that the comparison must be made at the international level, but the question of whether the property with which the comparison is

¹. Provisionally adopted: means that this decision is subject to the final approval of the World Heritage Committee at the final meeting of the session.

made should simply have an "international value" or an "outstanding universal value » remained to be defined.

ICOMOS said that in its opinion the comparative analysis part of the nomination file should definitely be undertaken in reference to all similar properties whether or not inscribed on the World Heritage List and that it should also be undertaken at the international level as suggested in the draft Decision.

IUCN agreed with the point made by **ICOMOS** and fully supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked what would be the role of the Advisory Bodies if States Parties were supposed to provide comparative analysis at the international level. States Parties should only be responsible for the conduct of comparative analysis of similar properties in their own country; some States Parties could not afford the analyses requested at the international level and it was up to the Advisory Bodies to carry them out in the context of their evaluation. It then suggested that the words "at the international level" be deleted from the draft Decision. Furthermore, he considered that the rationale underlying the need for comparative analysis applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the harmonization of tentative lists.

Sharing the views expressed by **ICOMOS** and **IUCN**, **ICCROM** suggested that the draft Decision be amended by adding the words "at national as well as at international level" after the words "whether or not on the World Heritage List".

ICOMOS added that the focus on comparative analysis at national level would not allow for an evaluation of nominations of sites that were only of outstanding universal value.

Agreeing with **ICOMOS**, **IUCN** emphasized that the evaluation of outstanding universal value could only be done on the basis of international analyses, and reiterated its support for the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the wording of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that it did not understand how the Advisory Bodies could say that it was impossible for them to undertake the comparative analysis during their evaluation since the fact of being judge implied an overall knowledge.

The **Chairperson** noted that the discussion was leading to a positive conclusion and gave the floor to the Rapporteur to summarize the debate.

The **Rapporteur** read the draft Decision as amended following the suggestion made by **ICCROM**.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed to give a more categorical tone to the sentence by replacing the conditional by the indicative.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Monday, 6 December 2004, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its second meeting, the Committee concluded the examination of the item concerning revised Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention by addressing the two remaining issues: d) whether intellectual property rights are applicable to the use of photographs and audiovisual materials included in a nomination file; and e) the date for the entry into force of the revised Operational Guidelines. It also held a substantial debate on the possible ways and means to improve its own working methods, along the following main issues: a) the appropriateness and feasibility of suggesting that Members of the Committee voluntarily abstain from nominating properties during their mandate; b) the number and nature of sessions to be held by the Committee each year; and c) the appropriate procedures and delays to process the reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and the nominations of properties since their inception. It decided to establish a working group to further discuss this matter.

ITEM 4A PROGRESS REPORT ON REVISED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (CONTINUED)

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4A

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur to submit the proposals drawn up by the drafting group for adoption by the Committee concerning the first issue addressed in the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposal as it had been agreed by the drafting group.

The **Chairperson** noted that a consensus had been reached and declared closed the discussion on this point.

Part I of the draft Decision was provisionally adopted as amended.

In introducing the fourth pending issue, the **Chairperson of the 27th session** pointed out that nothing was said in the annexes concerning the rights relating to photographs and audiovisual material contained in the nomination file. She said that UNESCO could not grant those photographs to third parties to promote the sites in the media. She then clarified that the notion of non-exclusive assignment of rights relating to slides, photographs and videograms meant that the photographer or filmmaker would retain all of his/her rights relating to those pictures or movies and that any profits accruing would go to the World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its concerns about this very complicated issue and said that it could not support the proposal to grant copyright.

After recalling that the current nomination files already contained a reference to the non-exclusive right of UNESCO to use the material annexed to such files, the Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that one of the advantages of inscribing sites to the World Heritage List was that UNESCO could make publicity in favour of the site, thus benefiting the State –mainly its tourism industry. It considered that the only issue that the Committee should be discussing in this regard was whether the profits from such publicity should go to the World Heritage Fund –which, in its opinion, was a natural outcome.

The **Chairperson** announced that Mr Claude Van Engeland, Chief of the UNESCO Audiovisual Section, was in the meeting room.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** drew the attention of the Committee to the recent changes in intellectual property legislation at the international level and suggested that the draft Decision be amended by adding the words “subject to intellectual property legislation”.

The **Chief of the Audiovisual Section** explained that States Parties submitting nomination dossiers should grant non-exclusive rights to UNESCO for the photos or videos relating to the property in question. In other terms, without renouncing any of its rights, the owner – whether it be the State or a third party – grants to UNESCO the right to distribute photographs, notably for promotional events carried out on the occasion of the inscription of the site (publication of a press release, production of a video and distribution of photos to the media). The existing text gives UNESCO a certain number of rights but not that of providing photographs or videos to a third party. The proposed text attempts to remedy this problem which does not concern all the sites but only those for which it is difficult, due for example to their great distance, to procure this type of material, at least at reasonable cost. It would apply to a limited number of photographs to be decided upon (about 2 or 3), or a limited number of images to be decided (about 30 seconds of filmed images).

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** recalled that the non-exclusive assignment of rights was effected on a voluntary basis by filling the relevant column in the form; it was therefore not an obligation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed that the draft Decision be amended by adding the words “are encouraged to” before the words “grant free of charge to UNESCO”.

The Delegation of **Chile** said that the copyright in audiovisual material belonging to States Parties or to private bodies or individuals could easily and voluntarily be granted free of charge as indicated by the Chairperson of the 27th session. It then said that the granting of copyright with profits going to the World Heritage Fund might be more complicated in the event of commercial use and infringement of the copyright.

The Delegations of **Japan, China** and **Lithuania** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision as amended by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the words “or in the nomination file” be added after the words “in the technical annexes”.

The **Chief of the Audiovisual Section** insisted on the fact that in the text proposed, the State Party or the society that owns the photograph or video should retain all their rights. Furthermore, the audiovisual contracts concluded with UNESCO often have as objective to obtain « non-exclusive assignment of rights » for reproduction. With regard to commercial use, he indicated that even if they are not designated as such, the *Operational Guidelines*, in their present form, already authorised a whole series of activities of a commercial nature, notably the production of postcards. Moreover, UNESCO Publications publishes many reviews, certain of which are sold, and their publication is thus, in strictly legal terms, a commercial activity. Therefore, the proposed amendment had the merit of clarifying the situation by designating the nature of the activity. However, the speaker knows by experience, as he is responsible for the management of the photographic library of UNESCO, that strictly commercial income is exceptional and when there is a question of commercial use, UNESCO directs the request to the owner of the material, as the vocation of the Organization is not that of a commercial house. The only goal of the proposed text is to obtain the means to ensure the promotion of the sites and the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Egypt** insisted on keeping the issues of the new provision on profits accruing to the World Heritage Fund separate from the rest of the form, which already existed in the current nomination file.

The **Chief of the Audiovisual Section** explained that UNESCO retains all owner rights of the photographs and videos it produces; but in the case of certain materials, distribution rights are granted. However, and for all the sectors of the Organization, the financial management, if applicable, was the responsibility of the Fund for Publications and Audiovisual Material. The amounts involved were not large, some few thousand dollars a year, the goal pursued being the promotion of the ideals of the Organization, which is not a lucrative activity. In the present case, the World Heritage Fund is cited because the activity is solely linked to heritage; however, exorbitant income is not anticipated. In any event, the name of the photographer is cited as is that of the owner of the material, if it concerns another person (UNESCO, National Commission, etc.).

The Delegation of **Lebanon** found the text of the Rapporteur satisfactory, and considered that it was up to the World Heritage Centre to discuss technical details with the States concerned. In its view, the request formulated corresponds to current use; for example, an architect cannot hope to make himself known if he refuses to grant photo rights. The Delegation requested that an end be put to this debate that was as unproductive as it was time-consuming.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the text read out by the Rapporteur and suggested the discussion move to the last point requiring a decision by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Chile** said that while the granting of audiovisual material was a rather technical and specific issue, the accrual of profits to the World Heritage Fund was too important a matter not to be discussed. It further said that copyright could only be granted by giving consent in written form.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** stated that the measure contained in the draft Decision was being proposed in the interest of States Parties and that any promotional action to improve the visibility of World Heritage properties should be encouraged.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the reference to “slides, photographs and videograms” excluded CD-ROMs and therefore suggested that a wider reference be made to “audiovisual material”.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the point made by the Delegation of Chile and suggested that the words “expressed in written form” be inserted in the draft Decision.

After the Rapporteur had read out the draft Decision as amended during the debate, the **Chairperson** declared closed the discussion on this point. The issue addressed in the draft Decision regarding photograph and other audiovisual material form was provisionally adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** introduced the fifth and last pending issue, the proposal to bring the *Operational Guidelines* into force on 2 February 2005 in order to avoid any transitional measures. She recalled that the nominations format contained in the revised *Operational Guidelines* would apply to nominations that would be considered in 2007.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the text would be ready on the referred date both in English and French. It also suggested that an explicit reference to the consideration of nominations by the Committee in 2007 be added to the text of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked why the proposed deadline for entry into force was 2 February, which would be a Wednesday, and not 1 February, which would be a Tuesday. It then asked whether all provisions other than those referring to the evaluation of nominations by the Committee would apply immediately.

The **Chairperson of the 27th session** said that the whole text of the revised *Operational Guidelines* would be ready in English and French in time for the deadline. She agreed to add the reference concerning nominations to be evaluated in 2007, as suggested by the United Kingdom.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that except for the provisions on the processing and evaluation of nominations by the Committee, all other provisions contained in the revised *Operational Guidelines* would apply immediately after their entry into force.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer of **Zimbabwe** considered the finalization of the revised *Operational Guidelines* as an historic occasion and shared with other States parties his satisfaction.

Before closing the discussion, the Delegation of **Egypt** proposed to add on page 3 of the working document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4A* as a main change in the revised *Operational Guidelines* the different functions of the Bureau. The **Director of the Centre** while

acknowledging the proposal, pointed out that this part of the document was only for information. The **Chairperson of the 27th session** agreed also on the proposal.

ITEM 4B WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE

*Documents: WHC-04/7.EXT.COM/4B
WHC-04/7.EXT.COM/4B.Add*

In introducing the item, the **Chairperson** noted that the relevant decisions on which the working document had drawn were **28 COM 13.1** (the Cairns/Suzhou Decision) and **28 COM 14B.57**. An open-ended working group, operating under Rule 21 of the Committee's Rules of Procedure, would be established to discuss items that could not be dealt with in plenary and would report back to the plenary on 9 December. Discussion during the current session would provide indicators to the working group of the key items of concern.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the working document, noting that it attempted to facilitate the work of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The key issues for discussion related to: the Cairns/Suzhou decision and the limitations on the numbers of sites to be discussed at any one session; and the submission of nominations files, in particular those dealing with sites in the territory of a member of the Committee – that was a sensitive matter and the Legal Advisor would outline the thinking behind his opinion set out in *WHC-04/7.EXT.COM/4B.Add*. Other issues to be addressed were: (a) the deadlines for submitting (i) supplementary information to nomination dossiers, (ii) for correcting factual errors, and (iii) for submitting state of conservation (SOC) reports; (b) procedures for distinguishing between SOC reports that were “for discussion” and those that were “for noting”; new procedures for amending draft Decisions and proposals relating to the number and content of the Committee's sessions. As decided by the Bureau, the working group should also discuss the proposed expert meeting on outstanding universal value.

Opening the discussion on the document, the **Chairperson** recalled that the discussion was intended to provide indications of key items to the working group.

Regarding paragraph I.A.4, relating to the feasibility, from a legal point of view, of a measure obliging Committee members to abstain from proposing the nomination of a site during their mandate, the Delegation of **Lebanon** considered firstly that it was clear from the Legal Adviser's report that it is impossible to adopt such a measure which would be contrary to the spirit and the letter of the *Convention* as well as the *Operational Guidelines*. It declared in favour of a voluntary action as was the case in the reduction of the length of the mandate of Committee members from six to four years. A recommendation to that effect should be addressed to the General Assembly for approval.

With regard to paragraph I.B.5 of the document, the Delegation of Lebanon indicated that Decision **28 COM 14.B.57**, paragraph 3 (f), that set 31 March as the deadline for submission of supplementary information for a nomination dossier was intended to facilitate the work of the

Advisory Bodies rather than to complicate it. It recalled that States Parties continued to submit information up until and during the session, obliging the Advisory Bodies to continually modify their report.

Turning to the mechanism for the correction of factual errors, subject of paragraph I.B.6, the Delegation of Lebanon judged the idea of giving the floor to the concerned State not only contrary to the rule that States refrain from intervening during the examination of a nomination concerning them, but also dangerous because it is difficult to prevent the said State from using the pretext of an intervention on the form to raise more substantial issues. It suggested rather to invite the State Party to address a letter to the Chairperson of the Committee, which would be read by her/him after the summary of the Advisory Bodies, indicating strictly factual errors.

With regard to paragraph II.7, whilst subscribing to the idea of an electronic presentation of reports, and taking into account the difficulties that certain States could encounter in this respect, the Delegation of Lebanon proposed, that in paragraph 6 of the draft decision, the Committee "encourages", rather than invites the States Parties to use the computerised tool set up by the Centre for this purpose.

Concerning paragraph II.8, the Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that it was important to establish distinctive criteria for reports to be examined and those only to be taken note of, but judged it dangerous to have a two-year gap in the submission of the latter, because the status of a property could evolve rapidly. Also the current practise by which the Committee has a certain flexibility, permitting it to modify the type of report according to the needs, was satisfactory.

However, regarding the periodicity of the sessions of the Committee, Option 2 which favoured alternating from one year to the next the examination of proposals for inscription and state of conservation reports, was in its view not tenable. Firstly, the examination of the state of conservation could not be deferred from one year to the next because of the risk of degradation threatening the site. Furthermore, consideration has to be given to the pressure of States wishing to obtain the inscription of a site and the possibility of having to examine 90 proposals at one time, as their number is limited, with difficulty, to 45 per year. Option 1, which foresees two sessions a year, appears more realistic and tended to happen in reality. To reduce costs, they should be held as often as possible in Paris.

Finally, the Delegation of **Lebanon** wished that the Centre present a progress report on the expert meeting on outstanding universal value, including in particular a comparison of costs involved according to whether the meeting is held in Kazan, as proposed by the Russian Federation, or in Paris.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed several concerns. The criteria for selecting the 45 nominations to be dealt with each year were unclear. It specifically raised the question whether deferred or referred nominations as well as nominations not withheld within the 45 properties to be examined at a given session would automatically have priority at the next session. It agreed with the views expressed by the Delegation of Lebanon on the question of Committee members voluntarily refraining from nominating sites for inscription and believed that it would be important to know a State's Party's intentions at the time it submitted its candidature for the World Heritage Committee. Turning to paragraph B6 it suggested that it

should be possible for a State Party to send corrections of factual errors in writing to the Chairperson in advance of the relevant session so that the Chairperson could submit them to the Committee. The drafting of paragraph II.8a and paragraph item 5(a) of the draft Decision should be amended so that the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies would be asked to “propose” rather than “define” the selection criteria and it would be better for the SOC reports to be presented in one single document to enable the Committee to see the full picture. As to the proposals concerning the number and content of the Committee’s sessions, it expressed a preference for Option 1.

In view of the establishment of the working group, the **Chairperson** asked delegations to refrain from making detailed analyses of issues raised in the document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the agenda item raised issues that were dear to its heart. But it first wished to correct a misunderstanding in the documentation: in fact the United Kingdom had not proposed that Committee members abstain from nominating sites during their terms of office.

The Committee had long expressed concerns about the shortage of resources and there existed a considerable body of work on which the current Committee would do well to draw. Given the increase in the workload of all parties, it was no longer sufficient to tinker at the edges. That could mean questioning some current activities and identifying what the role of the States Parties, the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre was as stipulated in the *Convention*.

The *Convention* allocated duties and responsibilities to the Committee (Articles 8, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22, 23, 26 and 29), UNESCO (Articles 14 and 15) and the States Parties (Articles 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19, 27 and 29). In particular, it placed the obligation for identifying, protecting, conserving, presenting and transmitting to future generations' heritage of outstanding universal value on States Parties. The duties and responsibilities of the Committee were to establish and keep up to date a list of all properties forming part of the heritage of outstanding universal value and to establish and keep up to date a list of properties in the World Heritage List for the conservation of which major operations were necessary and for which assistance had been requested under the Convention. The list might only include such property as was threatened by “serious and specific” dangers. The Committee was also charged with defining criteria for the inclusion of properties on both lists, consulting the States concerned before refusing a request for inclusion on either list, coordinating and encouraging studies and research required for the drawing up of the lists and allocating international assistance.

It was clear from the *Convention* that international protection cooperation should be designed to support States Parties in their efforts to conserve and identify the heritage. It was in that context that the Committee should consider its workload and also whether it had strayed too far from the *Convention*. The area of greatest concern to the United Kingdom was the apparent duplication of work on state of conservation reports and periodic reporting. The purpose of state of conservation reports was not clear and they consumed a significant amount of the resources of the Committee. The United Kingdom considered that the Committee should clarify the following issues before taking forward detailed discussion on working methods: the purpose of state of conservation reports; how they were linked with periodic reporting; and whether the Committee

should spend more time considering issues of global importance such as climate change and the impact of socio-economic changes. Consideration should also be given to potential conflicts of interest and to the overriding need for transparency, for shorter decisions and for a sound process for dealing with corrections to factual errors, which raised a serious problem and could occur even when a case was being presented.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed concerns about the proposed mechanism for dealing with factual errors and requested that the working group address the issue. While it welcomed the advent of the online SOC tool, it stated that not all States Parties would be in a position to use it and therefore suggested that “invites” in paragraph 6 of the draft Decision be amended to “encourages”. It was in favour of a voluntary approach to the ethical issue of whether Committee members should abstain from nominating sites for inscription, although that should perhaps not apply to serial or transboundary nominations in that such abstention could hinder the other States Parties involved in the nomination. As to the proposals concerning the Committee’s future sessions, Lithuania favoured Option 1 (annual sessions).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** wished to focus its statement on paragraph 4 of the working document, given that it had made the proposal that Committee members abstain from nominating sites for inscription during their term of office. The draft summary records of Suzhou had revealed a great deal of misunderstanding about what had been proposed and it was thus particularly unfortunate that the issue had not been debated at the time. That would have enabled Saint Lucia to explain that it was not seeking to introduce new rules for the Committee but suggesting new voluntary measures. That would also have obviated the need for the Legal Adviser to produce what was an excellent but ultimately unnecessary paper. Nor had the Delegation intended to suggest that in nominating sites in the past, Committee members had been acting improperly. There was absolutely no question that the honesty and integrity of Committee members was in doubt. The issue at stake was one of appearance. When members of the Committee were both judge and party there was an inevitable conflict of interest which could but lead to a loss of both credibility and the appearance of independence.

It had been suggested that the proposed measure was not useful because it could never stop lobbying. It was not meant to. Nothing could. However, the proposed measure could give members of the Committee a freer hand which might affect their reaction to lobbying. Citing personal experience of the run-up to the examination of Saint Lucia’s first ever nomination to the List, the Delegation said that the pressure not to upset anyone – and therefore jeopardize the nomination’s chances of success – had been tremendous. Its hands had been tied – by itself. That was a perfect example of a conflict of interest. The Delegation considered that if any of the other Members of the Committee said that they felt differently in a similar situation, it would find it very difficult to believe them.

The proposed measure was not intended to prevent States Parties from inscribing sites – it merely sought to encourage them to do so from outside the Committee. That might help the States Parties who had never succeeded in being elected to the Committee. Very few of the 178 States Parties to the *Convention* had the means to inscribe a site every year, so that should not pose problems, given that they could submit nominations from outside the Committee. It would not prevent new nominations being drawn up while the State Party sat on the Committee.

Some had argued that the proposed measure would deter countries with tremendous expertise. While that might have been true in the past, it no longer was. No one was irreplaceable and expertise was to be found around the world. Indeed, it would be arrogant to suggest that expertise was concentrated in a few countries.

Statistics highlighted the extent of the problem. For example, of the 10 countries with more than 20 sites on the List, seven had also been members of the Committee for the longest number of years. But out of the 70 countries who had been members of the Committee, 40 had inscribed more than 50% of “their” sites during their terms on the Committee. In some cases the rate rose to 80%, in others to 90% and even 100%. Looked at in another way, the 108 countries which had not yet been elected to the Committee had inscribed only 0.22% of the total number of sites on the List. That was the reality of how matters had developed. While no one was to blame, the time was right to do something about it.

The issue had long been a concern. In 1983, the Australian Chairperson of the Committee, Professor Ralph Slatyer had suggested that “... objectivity and freedom from bias [were] so important to the quality and interpreting of the World Heritage List that I would go one step further and ask you to consider the proposition that, whenever a State party is serving on the Committee, none of its nominations should be dealt with. If you felt able to accept such a provision I believe the *World Heritage Convention* would be further strengthened. On a lighter note, I could mention another benefit – there would be less competition for places on the Committee at the biennial elections”.

When that speech had been made, in 1983, 29% of inscriptions were from Committee members. In 2004, the figure had risen to 48%. The Delegation of Saint Lucia considered that it was time to take matters a step further and to adopt a decision asking Committee members to refrain voluntarily from nominating sites during their term. That would not apply to current members because such a decision could only be taken in deciding whether to nominate a candidate for membership of the Committee.

Exceptions should apply to sites in danger so that they might be examined at any time, and it was understandable that countries with no sites on the List should be able to nominate at any time. Serial or transboundary nominations should also not be impeded because one of the States Parties was a member of the Committee.

It was important to remember that the underlying objective of the proposed measure was not to complicate matters but to improve the functioning of the Committee, to make it more transparent and, most of all, more credible.

The Delegation of **India** said that it did not support placing limits on the numbers or types of sites that a country could nominate or the Committee could consider. If more than 45 sites were put forward for inscription in any year, it found it questionable that the Centre would provide an analysis of the nominations. What would be the criteria for making such an analysis? It would be unfair to ask a State Party to abstain from nominating sites at any time: if the site was considered of outstanding universal value, then the State Party had a right to nominate it for inscription. It added that the notion of “voluntary abstention” was relative, since it created an unjustified pressure on a country that could have a rich cultural heritage of outstanding universal

value to protect. Of the options put forward for Committee sessions, it considered that only Option 1 was feasible.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that while world heritage was one of the most visible programmes of UNESCO, there were some issues which merited examination. Those issues included the capacity of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, the need for a long-term strategy, and the desirability of developing a sound and enduring policy for preserving sites, perhaps by fixing a limit on the size of the List. On the question of Committee members refraining from proposing nominations during their term of office, it asked whether the current situation was really so dangerous and whether the proposed solution was the best possible one. Perhaps the Committee needed first to establish a new code of ethics? While the Delegation tended to prefer Option 1 for the Committee's future sessions, it requested more information about the financial implications of each proposal.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** observed that India questioned the Cairns-Suzhou Decision **28 COM 13.1**, although it had actively contributed to its adoption being a member of the Working Group which approved the draft unanimously. The Agenda of the present session concerned the working methods to be adopted to ensure its application.

Finally, it wondered whether the eventual savings made from the suppression of the Bureau session usually held in the spring could not serve to finance the holding of an additional Committee session every two years.

The Delegation of **Benin**, recalling that the Cairns-Suzhou Decision was the fruit of a compromise obtained at the cost of laborious efforts, considered that should it be queried there was a risk of opening a Pandora's box. The question under discussion at the present session concerned the means of its application.

With regard to the idea of refraining to propose new sites for nomination, the Delegation of Benin warned against any hasty decision in this respect, because it raises an ethical issue and multiple aspects should be considered so as to avoid a situation of unequallness as in the case of voluntary reduction of the duration of the mandate.

It feared furthermore, that the proposed mechanism for the correction of factual errors, opposing the word of the State Party to that of the Advisory Bodies, would create tension which might weaken both the Advisory Bodies and the Committee.

Finally, whilst finding Option 1 very tempting concerning the periodicity of the Committee sessions, it wished to have details concerning the financial implications of both of the options before making a final statement.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the Committee seemed to be in the habit of adopting increasing numbers of rules and of enfeebling its subsidiary bodies as could be seen from the effective abolition of the Bureau in recent years, whose role had been to deal with routine matters and facilitate the work of the Committee. Indeed, the weakening of the Bureau and abolition of its annual meeting in March was one of the issues that had contributed to the current situation of the Committee not being able to cope with the workload. Consideration should be given to reviving the annual Bureau meeting.

The Delegation then believed that the proposal in paragraph I A 3 of Document *WHC-04/7.EXT.COM/4B* to decide which sites to consider on the basis of an analysis by the World Heritage Centre was unclear and advocated instead a “first come first served” method for accepting complete nominations. The proposal that all Committee members should abstain from proposing nominations during their term of office was too absolutist. It understood that the proposal was actually to ask them to do so on a voluntary basis, but the document was unclear on that point. Factual errors should be dealt with by the Bureau, but a related issue was the need to fix a time for the Advisory Bodies to transmit their evaluations to the States Parties. It added that the deadline of 31st March for submitting supplementary information was too strict, and that there should be a deadline for the Advisory Bodies to send their evaluations to Member States. Finally, the idea of colour coding documents raised in paragraph 10 of Document *WHC-04/7.EXT.COM/4B* was sensible.

The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Adviser to outline the thinking behind the legal opinion given in *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM 4B.Add*.

The **Legal Adviser** had based his opinion on the texts provided from the session in Suzhou and apologized if he had misunderstood which State Party had made the proposal. He outlined the key points of the opinion which were contained in section III: it was perfectly legal for Committee members to refrain voluntarily from submitting nominations, but it would be illegal to seek to prevent them from so doing. However, the Committee could legally impose on itself restrictions concerning the examination of nominations. Should such a clause be introduced, it would have to be “grandfathered”, that is to say introduced in some years’ time so that all potential Committee members would be fully aware of the implications. However, as it now seemed clear that only voluntary measures were being considered, the debate had become somewhat academic.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** recalled that the Committee had outlined priorities for deciding on nominations at its 24th session. Those should be adhered to. On the question of whether or not Committee members should submit nominations during their term of office, it considered that all were equal. The important point was to ensure that existing guidelines and regulations were observed. Regarding the number of sessions of the Committee, it considered Option 1 to be both more practical and reflective of reality.

Noting that States Parties were increasingly encouraged to make voluntary contributions to facilitate the work of the Committee and the Convention, the Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recalled that it had formally offered to host a meeting to discuss outstanding universal value in the city of Kazan in the spring of 2005 and to cover the costs of up to 30 expert participants. The venue offered the possibility of examining the issue of outstanding universal value in its global context and it was to be hoped that certain logistical issues could be resolved so that the meeting could take place as foreseen in Kazan rather than in Paris.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal of holding two sessions of the Committee each year. That had been borne out in practice in the past two years, which had demonstrated that it could not deal with all the issues before it in a single session. However, the Committee should be aware of the financial implications for developing countries. The Delegation fully subscribed to the idea of Committee members voluntarily abstaining from

submitting nominations, which should be a non-controversial issue. The Committee should also look at capacity-building as an important way of making the List credible and objective and as a means of assisting countries with no or only a few properties on the List.

The Delegation of **Portugal** believed that voluntary abstention from submitting nominations could be divisive in that it could set up a partition between those who abstained and those who did not. It could also have serious implications for countries that did not yet have sites on the List. It was also true that the very fact of being elected to the World Heritage Committee sometimes had the effect of awakening national interest in the *Convention* and kindling the desire to submit nominations. For the proposed measure to be effective, careful thought should be given to various issues. For example, would abstention mean that countries in the third year of a four-year term should not submit nominations for evaluation? And how far ahead of election to the Committee should a State Party apply the brake to nominations under preparation?

The Delegation then expressed a preference for Option 1 in respect of Committee sessions and requested clarification on the financial implications in respect of holding the meeting on the issue of outstanding universal value in Kazan or Paris. It requested the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to prepare a background paper to facilitate the discussions at this meeting.

The Delegation of **China**, in regard to the Committee's future sessions, expressed a preference for Option 1, which should be amended to state that a second meeting should only take place if and when necessary.

IUCN fully supported the move to improve the working methods of the World Heritage Committee and addressed five issues. As the agenda of the World Heritage Committee had become gradually more complex and lengthy, it was imperative to identify clear priorities for the agenda to ensure that the focus was on key issues and core business. IUCN noted that the limitations on the number of nominations to be examined related both to quantity and quality; in limiting the number of nominations, it would be critical to identify clear and explicit criteria and to clarify what would happen to a nomination that was not selected for examination at a particular session. In relation to the correction of factual errors, it would be important for any such errors to be identified as early as possible, ideally through correspondence and consultations before the Committee's session. If States Parties took the floor at the Committee in relation to factual errors in nominations they had submitted, strict compliance with the Committee's Rules of Procedure in relation to advocacy would be ensured. In that regard, IUCN supported the statements by the Delegation of Lebanon. In relation to the submission of supplementary information IUCN stressed that under the current process, it was required to submit its reports in two languages by 31 May. Receipt of supplementary information as late as 31 March did not permit sufficient time to evaluate that information. The deadline should therefore be reviewed. It was important to allocate adequate time for state of conservation reporting, and to focus on the sites facing the highest level of threat. Of the two options for future sessions of the Committee, IUCN noted significant time and cost implications of holding two sessions a year: those implications should be carefully identified and assessed.

ICOMOS said that consideration should be given to whether emergency inscriptions were to be included in the threshold of 45 nominations examined at any one session. Clear criteria were needed in order to prioritize nominations, should a higher number be received, and to

prevent unnecessary pressure. Postponement to the Committee's July session of the decision on which the complete nomination dossier received on February 1 should be evaluated would in itself build a significant delay into the evaluation process. Factual errors should also have a deadline and should be submitted in writing to the World Heritage Centre, to the Chairperson and to the Advisory Bodies so that they could be appropriately incorporated.

The Observer Delegation of **Malta** recalled that the criteria of transparency should be applied to all organizations and institutions involved in the World Heritage process, including Advisory Bodies and consultant companies proposing services in the field of heritage conservation. It noted that the Advisory Bodies, as an integral part of the process set up by the Convention, had a duty of transparency and good governance. In this regard, it remarked that the Resolutions Committee at the last ICOMOS General Assembly (www.international.icomos.org) had reported "continued difficulties regarding the voting process" and had mandated the Executive Committee to draw up appropriate amendments to the rules of procedure. Voting irregularities had also been reported by the New Zealand committee of ICOMOS (www.icomos.org.nz). It was essential to have transparency and separation between the Committee, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and private consultancies to avoid any real or apparent conflict of interest. On further referring to the impropriety in the voting procedures of ICOMOS, it was halted on points of order raised by the Delegation of **Nigeria** and the **Chairperson**. The **Chairperson** ruled that any questions relating to conflicts of interest should be dealt with by the working group, and asked the Delegation of Malta to submit its comments to such working group.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** felt that the proposal to abstain, which includes formula such as "wish to abstain" or "encouraged to abstain", gives an obligatory character to what was intended to be a voluntary action. Italy, which after two years, had renounced completing the term of its mandate, in favour of rotation within the Committee, did not contest the idea of abstention itself, but considered that all constraints in the matter would be contrary to the *Convention*. Consequently, the Delegation requested that the draft decision should clearly indicate that there is no consensus on this question and that in any event the action should be freely taken. Furthermore, while stating that it was sympathetic to the arguments of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, which invoked the present circumstances to justify the proposed limitation, it thought it better to modify the circumstances, and the Global Strategy proposed to the Executive Board by the same country and supported by Italy, would assuredly contribute to this objective if the Centre, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies were given the means to guarantee its implementation. Also, the figures invoked by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, indispensable for an insight into the situation, should encourage a return to the spirit of the *Convention* by which to ensure greater achievement rather than to fix new quantitative limits. Finally, with regard to the periodicity of the Committee sessions, the Delegation was in favour of Option 1.

The Observer Delegation of **France** wished only to speak with regard to the question of abstention of nominations for inscription by Committee members. The Delegation indicated that its country is all the more concerned with the Cairns decision as it was one of the principal authors. Therefore it supported the Suzhou decision in favour of an annual ceiling of 45 proposals for inscription. However, it was concerned that the proposal to abstain, however voluntary it might be, played against the underrepresented or not represented States Parties on the List, while

the decisions under discussion expressly aimed at encouraging an increase in the number of their inscriptions as well as their participation in the work of the Committee. It considered that a moratorium, even on a voluntary basis, appeared to be a discriminatory factor, and in this regard agreed with the concerns expressed by Japan and Portugal.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** believed that the debate had made clear that the issue of limiting the number of nominations to be examined in any year stemmed from the Cairns/Suzhou Decision, in which the criteria had been set out.

The preliminary estimates of the costs of hosting a Committee session in Paris or elsewhere were approximately the same at around US \$ 50,000 (US \$ 16,000 to 17,000 for the organization of the meeting, and US \$ 30,000 to support experts from countries which otherwise could not finance their participation), depending on the exchange rate and considering that any additional costs for meetings outside Paris were met by the host country. Preliminary estimates for hosting the expert meeting on outstanding universal value in Paris, based on it being a two-and-a-half-day meeting, were roughly US \$ 20,000. Such funds were not currently available. If the Committee accepted the offer of the Russian Federation to pay for up to 30 experts, this should include five or six experts from the World Heritage Centre in the capacity of the Secretariat.

The suggestion to revive the annual meeting of the Bureau would not help to reduce costs as in fact the annual meeting had tended to attract the same level of participation and therefore the same volume of resources was required to service the meeting as the Committee's annual session, with the exception of not covering the costs of experts from developing countries.

ICOMOS responded to the charges levelled by the Observer Delegation of Malta by acknowledging particular problems in ICOMOS in Malta, and invited it to the forthcoming elections that were to be held in Xian, China, in 2005.

The **Chairperson** invited delegations to submit nominations for the working group which was to be established on a regionally balanced basis. Nominations should be notified to the meeting of the Bureau which would take place at 9 a.m. on 7 December.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated the Chairperson for his election and clarified that at the working group observer delegations could participate but not vote.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

Tuesday, 7 December 2004, at 10.15 a.m.

**Chairperson: Mr Wakashe
later: Ms Velez Jara**

Note of the Rapporteur: At its third meeting, the Committee considered the Progress Report on the Global Training Strategy. Among the main issues discussed were: a) the status and role within the framework of the Global Training Strategy of the “World Heritage Research and Training Institute” in China and the Programme Africa 2009; b) the links between the Strategy and the periodic reporting exercise; and c) the integration of culture and nature into a single strategy for training under the World Heritage Convention. The Committee subsequently started examination, region by region, of the progress reports related to the periodic reporting exercise, discussing the reports related to Europe and North America, the Arab States and Africa. Among the main issues debated were: a) the need to allow for some “time for reflection” in the periodic reporting exercise; and b) the importance of taking care of linguistic diversity for the purposes of such exercise.

ITEM 4B WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE (continued)

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B.Add*

The **Chairperson of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee** informed the Committee members that the composition of the Working Group on the working methods of the Committee had been finalized and that it was integrated by the Delegations of Egypt, Kuwait for the Arab States, the Delegations of Benin and Nigeria for Africa, the Delegations of New Zealand and India for Asia-Pacific, the Delegations of Lithuania and the Russian Federation for Eastern Europe, the Delegations of Portugal and the United Kingdom for Western Europe, and the Delegations of Colombia and Saint Lucia for Latin America and the Caribbean. He added that the Working Group would be open to observers and that the Rapporteur of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee would act as Rapporteur of the Working Group.

ITEM 11 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/11
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.11*

Recalling the adoption by the Committee of the Global Training Strategy and Priority Action Plan for World Cultural and Natural Heritage at its 25th session in Helsinki in 2001 and the inclusion of capacity-building as one of the four strategic objectives adopted at its 26th

session in Budapest in 2002, the **Chairperson** invited ICCROM and IUCN to report on the progress made in implementing the Global Training Strategy.

ICCROM had proposed that the agenda item be moved forward to give the Committee an opportunity to use the discussion on the progress made in implementing the Global Training Strategy as a framework for reviewing progress achieved under the various regional programmes before considering the periodic reporting exercise. It was the first time that the Committee was reviewing progress made on the implementation of the Global Training Strategy since 2001. The document before the Committee contained a section on the proposal by the Chinese authorities to establish a Training Institute on World Heritage in China, and was submitted as requested by the Committee at its 28th session in Suzhou. After briefly reviewing the sequence of events and decisions that had led to the formulation and adoption of the Global Training Strategy by the Committee, ICCROM summed up the main activities carried out between 2002 and 2004 in that regard, which provided an opportunity to develop and test training materials that would be revised in the light of the new *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. ICCROM emphasized the need to further strengthen ties between the Global Training Strategy and the periodic reporting exercise and to reflect such strengthening in the Regional Programmes by reinforcing their organizational principles. The development of training tools should be continued. The Committee might wish to move from the notion of training towards the more comprehensive concept of “capacity-building”.

IUCN said that before 2003, the situation was based on an ad hoc approach to capacity-building needs and efforts to integrate culture and nature into a single strategy for training under the Convention. As a tangible example of the new approach, 10 publications had recently been issued by IUCN on best practices for the management and conservation of natural heritage properties. A number of other initiatives had been taken by IUCN in the spirit of the Global Training Strategy and were described in detail in document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM 11*. The reflection within IUCN, including its Commission on Education and Communication (CEC), had elaborated further on the principles set out in the Global Training Strategy and had resulted in the development of a five-year Global Framework Programme for Capacity Development on Natural Heritage, contained in Table 1 of the working document. For the future, IUCN planned to continue to develop training kits and modules and to be closely associated with the periodic reporting process. A working group had been set up within the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) on Capacity Development for that purpose.

The Delegation of **China**, at the request of the Chairperson, provided further information on the progress achieved by the Chinese authorities in the establishment of the “World Heritage Research and Training Institute”. A detailed architectural plan for the building of the future Institute had been already completed. Following the visit of Mr Zhang Xinsheng, former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, to the World Heritage Centre in Paris in September 2004, a meeting had been held between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to discuss ways of supporting the process. As a result of that consultation, the Centre had made some suggestions to the Chinese authorities, including the conduct of a feasibility study and the organization of a regional meeting of experts to review the concept and scope of the Training and Research Institute. The Chinese authorities had agreed to that proposal and were ready to participate in identifying experts to carry out the feasibility study and to cover all the costs involved. A task force had been established on the Chinese side to follow up the process and it

comprised representatives from the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, the Ministry of Construction, the State Administration for Cultural Heritage, the Suzhou Municipal Government, and the Tsinghua, Beijing and Tongji Universities. The task force had already met several times and had discussed the possible location, funding sources and scope of the future Institute's work. The Delegation of China emphasized that the initiative would have no financial implications for UNESCO or the World Heritage Fund. On the other hand, the establishment of a training facility on world heritage in China might have a significant role to play in fostering regional cooperation. The Delegation was aware of the procedures required for the Institute to be officially endorsed by UNESCO. As a first step, the Institute would therefore work in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre to achieve significant results and gain the confidence of the Committee and ultimately the support of all Member States of UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended ICCROM and IUCN on their excellent reports. It wondered, however, if any information was available concerning ongoing or planned training activities for the Caribbean region. It referred to a recent press release concerning a joint project between the European Commission and the Australian authorities concerning a study tour for some 40 persons at the World Heritage Centre and requested clarification on that initiative. In regard to the proposal to establish the World Heritage Training and Research Institute in China, the Delegation requested clarification from the Centre as to whether it would be submitted through the usual institutional channels, namely the Executive Board, and under which category –as an institute or a regional centre. Depending on the category proposed, the financial implications for the World Heritage Centre would vary considerably. Even making abstraction of the category, staff from the World Heritage Centre would need to travel to China, and there was information of a focal point that would be established in the World Heritage Centre to deal specifically with the Institute. This seemed to mean “financial implications”. Moreover, if the “Institute” were a regional centre, it should be recalled that the establishment of such had to be considered in a more strategic way. The Delegation wondered whether it would be desirable for the Committee to provide some guidance to States Parties to the *Convention* on the appropriate policies and criteria for deciding where and when a regional centre on World Heritage would be necessary.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked IUCN and ICCROM for their reports. Referring to Table 1, annexed to the working document, it said that the regional level of implementation should be addressed in addition to the national and international levels. The Delegation recalled that in 2002, at Budapest, the Committee had encouraged further cooperation and integration between the Arab and sub-Saharan African regions and, to that effect, the Egyptian authorities had drawn up a proposal for the establishment of a diploma on the conservation and management of natural heritage properties, in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and the University of Cairo. The premises of the teaching facilities, located in the Sinai Peninsula, had already been identified, which should provide sufficient guarantees as to the sustainability of the initiative. The Delegation had discussed with the Centre and IUCN the possibility of organizing a brainstorming meeting to discuss the possible scope of the initiative, and had suggested that it be included among activities to be implemented under the Global Training Strategy and the IUCN five-year Global Framework Programme for Capacity Development on Natural Heritage.

The Delegation of **Japan**, commending the excellent reports of ICCROM and IUCN, expressed full support for the draft Decision. The Global Training Strategy was perhaps the most

important activity within the framework of the World Heritage system. For many years, Japan had been organizing training activities through its own Centre at Nara, in collaboration with ICCROM and the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation welcomed the announced launch of the Training and Research Institute in China, with which it looked forward to cooperating closely.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** joined other speakers in congratulating ICCROM and IUCN on their reports, and commended particularly the efforts made to integrate culture and nature into a single approach. The benefits of adopting a strategic approach to planning and implementing training activities were apparent from the report. The Delegation also shared the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia about the possible financial implications of the Chinese initiative and about the need to include the Caribbean region within the scope of the Global Training Strategy.

The Delegation of **Benin**, after having thanked ICCROM and IUCN for the report and for the efforts undertaken for Africa, reflected on the impact and the monitoring of the two programmes implemented in this region: the Africa 2009 Programme carried out with assistance of the Ecole du patrimoine africain, EPA (African Heritage School) with its Headquarters in Benin, and the Africa Nature Programme (2004-2007). In particular, it wished to know whether the training provided was optimised and in what measure the acquired competences correspond to those required to remedy the imbalance as aimed at by the Global Strategy. It wondered whether the performance indicators could be used to evaluate the results obtained. Furthermore, it urged the Advisory Bodies to assist certain countries of the continent which dispose of sufficient financial resources, but are often lacking in the necessary expertise, to constitute nomination dossiers. The Delegation finally invited the Committee to study the means of providing the Training Institute which is planned to be created in China with the resources it needs in order to become operational.

After thanking both ICCROM and IUCN for their presentations, the Delegation of **Colombia** noted that the capacity-building initiative for the Caribbean sub-region in cooperation with the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM), proposed by the Centre as a follow-up to the periodic reporting, had not yet materialized, and suggested that it be included in the planning framework proposed by the Advisory Bodies, with a view to allocating financial resources for its implementation. Training for natural heritage conservation required more attention, especially in the Latin America region. Regarding the Chinese proposal, the Delegation agreed with previous speakers on the need to indicate clearly under which legal category the World Heritage Training and Research Institute would be established and operate.

In support of the Delegation of Benin, the Delegation of **South Africa** wished that cooperation with ICCROM would be strengthened beyond the termination of the Africa 2009 programme to ensure the sustainability of efforts deployed on the ground. It also emphasized the importance of accurate assessment of needs and of the impact of the training activities carried out. In regard to the draft Decision on the item, the Delegation proposed to insert the words “world heritage strategic objectives (the four Cs), and” in the second line of paragraph 3. As to paragraph 4 concerning the adoption of the IUCN Global Framework Programme for Capacity Development on Natural Heritage, it would be more appropriate to discuss the budget first before approving specific programme proposals.

The Delegation of **China** firstly indicated that the costs relating to the administration and training as well as the funding of experts for the Training Institute for World Heritage Research was entirely financed by the Chinese Government. With regard to the category to which the establishment would be assigned, it considered that it was too early to decide. Finally, cooperation with UNESCO and with other centres in Asia and the Pacific is foreseen. In any event, the creation of this Institute will contribute to the strengthening of capacities as recommended in Suzhou.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the Committee for highlighting the subject of training and underlined its full support for the four proposed outcomes of the Africa 2009 programme mentioned in document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.11*. However, it was not clear to what extent the results of the periodic reporting exercise had been taken into account in the planning of activities under the Africa 2009 programme, which was not exclusively focused on world heritage. The Delegation gave as an example a meeting on immovable heritage that had taken place recently in Africa, whose recommendations should duly be taken into account for Africa 2009. In support of the Delegations of Benin and South Africa, the Delegation of Zimbabwe considered that there seemed to be too many activities within Africa 2009, and that ICCROM seemed to be overstretching its capabilities. A more strategic approach seemed necessary. On the other hand, the Delegation noted the “deafening silence” on the role of ICOMOS in shaping and implementing the Global Training Strategy and wondered whether clarifications could be provided as to whether ICOMOS was or could be involved.

The Delegation of **Belgium** (Observer), noting that the link between the Global Training Strategy, periodic reports and international assistance remains merely formal, without any practical input, suggested that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies submit concrete proposals in this regard to the 29th session, in Durban, South Africa, (Durban, 2005). It noted, furthermore, that the draft decision **7 EXT.COM 11** did not take into account ICCROM’s opinion that recommended not to reduce capacity building to training alone. Finally, considering that in order to be effective, publications must be accessible in English and French when they concern general themes, and in the language of the region when specially destined for that area, it requested what measures the Centre counted upon taking to make up for the insufficiency in this domain.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to respond to the comments made by the States Parties.

IUCN thanked Committee members for their constructive comments and directions. It had noted five points, namely the importance of ensuring a clear strategic approach (Saint Lucia), the need to be opportunistic when it was possible to link existing initiatives, the emphasis on the link between culture and nature in developing capacity-building strategies and tools (United Kingdom), the need to strengthen national institutions and assess the impact of the training programmes (Benin), and the importance of ensuring that the process was adequately funded (Colombia), for which funds would need to be previously allocated .

ICCROM thanked the States Parties for their comments and commended the very constructive discussion. With respect to the question raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, two training activities had been carried out in recent years in the Dominican Republic. It noted,

however, that the periodic reporting exercise for the region had only taken place in the previous year and hoped that more initiatives could be planned and implemented in years ahead, in a similar way as it is being done for Africa. The link between culture and nature was crucial, and ICCROM was working with IUCN gradually to further integrate their respective areas of work. In regard to the establishment of a Training and Research Institute in China, ICCROM recalled that the *Convention* encouraged such initiatives on the part of the States Parties. The periodic reporting exercise, on the other hand, could provide the appropriate framework for regional consultation on the need for such institutions. In reply to the question raised by the Delegation of Benin and the Observer Delegation of Zimbabwe, ICCROM noted that Africa 2009 had duly taken into account the need to assess the impact of activities. Questionnaires had been distributed to all those involved and the results were being analysed. Consideration had also been given to linking the periodic reporting exercise to the Africa 2009 programme. A number of issues, such as legal frameworks and national inventories, had been included in the scope of the programme as a result of the periodic reporting exercise. Finally, ICCROM noted that several partners were cooperating in the Africa 2009 programme and there was therefore no cause for concern about ICCROM being overstretched.

ICOMOS, in reply to the comment made by the Observer Delegation of Zimbabwe, referred to the Action Plan submitted to the Committee at its 28th session in Suzhou, which included several proposals for capacity-building. It highlighted the important role played by its various national committees and said that some specific proposals might be submitted to the Committee for consideration at its 29th session (Durban, 2005).

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** supported the views expressed by the Advisory Bodies emphasizing the need to ensure better coordination among existing mechanisms. In support of the Delegation of Saint Lucia, it added that the establishment of new training institutions should be examined carefully in the light of the resources required.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** commended the Advisory Bodies on their reports. It looked forward to examining the full report on the state of conservation of Africa at the 29th session (Durban, 2005).

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** requested clarification on the possible role of the UNESCO Forum of Universities and Heritage in the context of the Global Training Strategy, particularly with regard to the concern expressed by the Delegation of Australia as to the need for better coordination.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, in reply to the question raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, said that the Centre was not aware of any initiative involving the European Commission and Australian governmental agencies and taking place at the Centre. On the issue of the Chinese proposal to establish a Training and Research Institute, the Centre had discussed the matter with the Chinese authorities and had appointed a focal point to follow it up. Such support was part of the World Heritage Centre's normal work with States Parties. The Centre had acted in a similar manner in regard to the Nordic World Heritage Foundation, which had become a very important partner of the Committee; the implication was that time invested in negotiating similar initiatives could be worthwhile. The Chinese proposal was a very good one: the Institute would target mainly site managers, not students, thus avoiding overlap with existing academic networks, and would provide complementarity and a long-term perspective on

capacity-building in heritage conservation. As all costs would be covered by the Chinese authorities, there were only advantages to the proposal.

On the other hand, the process leading to the formal recognition of the Institute under the auspices of UNESCO was long and complex. The institution would have to show its effectiveness and usefulness to the purposes of UNESCO before it could be endorsed by the General Conference. On the issue of the Centre's publications, he stressed that some of them had not yet been translated into the two working languages of the Organization because of financial constraints, since those publications were all funded from extrabudgetary sources. The Centre would continue to seek additional funding so that publications and basic texts of the *Convention* might be translated into as many languages as possible.

In reply to the Observer Delegation of Israel, the **representative of the Director-General of UNESCO** said that the UNESCO Forum of Universities and Heritage, a completely self-financed network, had been founded in 1995 in cooperation with the University of Valencia (Spain) and was based on the concept of solidarity. UNESCO could benefit from this Forum to strengthen capacities in heritage conservation by fostering joined technical assistance programmes at the site level, where certain universities could afford to train students from other universities. UNESCO receives regular reports from this Forum of Universities and Heritage.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the discussion on the item and proposed a revised draft Decision. Two introductory paragraphs would be added to refer to the document examined and the previous relevant decisions of the Committee. No reference had been made in the draft Decision to the proposed Training and Research Institute in China but in view of the importance ascribed to the issue in the debate, he asked the Committee to propose a text for inclusion. He suggested that a reference to the role of States Parties be included in paragraph 1 (new 3). To reflect the point made by the Observer Delegation of Belgium, that training was only a component of capacity-building, he proposed to delete, at the end of paragraph 2 (new 4), the words "in future" and to add "as regards all aspects of capacity-building, of which training is only a component". Finally, to take into account the concern expressed by the Delegation of South Africa, he proposed to reword paragraph 4 (new 6) as follows: "Request the Director of the Centre to prepare a proposal on budgetary provisions for the implementation of the Global Framework Programme for Capacity Development on Natural Heritage, contained in Table 1 enclosed in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/11*, for consideration by the Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005)."

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed to the two introductory paragraphs and accepted the proposed new wording of paragraph 2 (new 4), but requested that the words "taking into account the results of the periodic reporting exercise and ensuring its coordination with the strategic planning objectives" be added. It also agreed to the new proposed wording of paragraph 4 (new 6). On the issue of the Training and Research Institute in China, the Delegation proposed a new paragraph worded as follows: "Takes note with appreciation of the progress made to date in the setting up of the Chinese Training Institute and welcomes the assurances that there would be no financial implication for the World Heritage Fund."

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed that the words "world heritage strategic objectives (the four Cs) be added to the second line of paragraph 3 (new 5).

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed to the proposed amendments.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 5A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5A

After introducing Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5A*, the **Chairperson** reminded the World Heritage Committee that the item had not been submitted to the Committee at the previous session owing to time constraints and explained that updated information had been highlighted in the document.

(Ms Velez Jara took the chair)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that Europe and North America was the region with the highest number of States Parties and the World Heritage Centre had developed an electronic tool to manage the large amount of information that would be submitted by the 50 countries. It then provided updated information on the organization of workshops on the periodic reporting exercise at regional and national levels and of several information meetings at the Headquarters. The World Heritage Centre urged the States Parties in Europe to meet the deadline of 31 December 2004 for the submission of Part I of the periodic report and introduced two draft Decisions. It noted that a written proposed amendment to draft Decision **7 EXT.COM 5A.1** had been submitted requesting that the commencement of the next periodic reporting cycle be suspended for one year to permit reflection on lessons learnt from the exercises in all regions and to deal with issues arising from those exercises.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed that one year be allowed for reflection after the end of the periodic reporting exercise in Europe and North America in order to develop strategic directions for the second cycle, as set out in paragraph 6 of document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5A*.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the proposal to suspend for one year or more the commencement of the next periodic reporting cycle to allow a period of reflection and study of the first reporting cycle and to develop strategic directions on the forms and the format of the report, training priorities, international cooperation priorities and the streamlining of the Committee's consideration of matters pertaining to inscribed sites raised through periodic reporting. The year of reflection would make it possible to update the content of the electronic tool and to respond to the changing situation since the adoption of the format for the Periodic Reporting in 1998. It stressed that the outcome of the periodic reporting exercise should be linked to the Global Training Strategy. Furthermore, the periodic reporting exercise would generate new information, such as the revised definitions of boundaries and statements of significance, which would require examination by the World Heritage Committee which would need to discuss how to deal with its increasing workload.

The Delegations of **Norway** and **Argentina** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that the proposal to suspend for one year or more the commencement of the next periodic reporting cycle would have implications for other regions and pointed out that the decision on the issue could be taken only after the Committee had examined the progress reports on periodic reports from the other regions.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** explained that the proposal to allow one year's reflection stemmed from the experience of the United States of America, which had already completed Sections I and II of the report and the subregional synthesis report. It was concerned that the World Heritage Centre would be obliged to start preparing for the next cycle immediately unless the 7th Extraordinary Session of the Committee made decision on the matter.

The Delegation of **Belgium** (Observer) pointed out that on the one hand the computerised form was presented very late and apparently it did not correspond exactly to the format adopted by the Committee, and on the other, the focal points, at least for Belgium, had been chosen in function with the HEREIN tool, rather than with UNESCO's computer tool.

The **Rapporteur** said that the first paragraph of the draft Decision should refer to the document that the Committee had examined, while the second paragraph would contain the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. He then referred to the statement made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and said that the World Heritage Committee had to determine whether to take a general decision concerning all regions or to reword the draft Decision on this item to apply to Europe and North America only.

Having acknowledged the importance of learning from the experiences of each region, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that general decision should be taken on the proposal to allow a year for reflection but specified that there should be only one year's pause in order to define when to commence the next cycle of periodic reporting in the Arab region.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that "or more" be deleted from the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, stating that such a proposal was in accordance with the recommendation of the Cartagena de Indias meeting in Colombia in October 2004.

The **Rapporteur** said that the amendment by the United Kingdom would be presented separately under item 5 and draft Decision **7 EXT.COM 5A.1** would consist paragraphs 1 and 2 only.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 5B FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR THE ARAB STATES

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5B

The **World Heritage Centre** presented Document *WHC.04/7 EXT.COM/05B* and recalled that the summaries of the conclusions of the Periodic Report for the Arab States as well as the information on the monitoring actions implemented by the Centre have been published in the World Heritage Series thanks to the generous contribution of the Dutch Government. The Centre furthermore recalled that the objectives of the Regional Programme were to provide a proactive response through the establishment of assistance modules and projects to improve the efficiency of international assistance, promote regional and international cooperation, and to establish a Monitoring Committee for the regular evaluation and revision of the Programme.

The **Chairperson** thanked the World Heritage Centre and gave the floor to the members of the Committee. No comments were made.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observers. No comments were made.

The **Rapporteur** suggested that the term “reporting” in paragraph 2 of the English version of document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5B* be replaced by the term “report”.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 5C FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5C

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced item 5C of the agenda and highlighted that the overall objectives of Africa Regional Training Programme Nature (2004-2007) were the development of human resources together with the enhancement of the management of properties and the development of national strategies for World Heritage in Africa. After recalling the training seminars for site managers recently organized in Senegal, it pointed out the major achievements which resulted from the seminars, namely the distribution to all participants of a Periodic Reporting Atlas, the awareness raising of site managers on the specific issue of the economic potential of World Heritage properties, the launch of a new web site and the establishment of a high level network of natural heritage management experts. The Centre further recalled that there was still a need to identify an African Institution to assist in the implementation of the Training Programme and to mobilize extra-budgetary resources to enable a continuous sustainable training in natural heritage conservation and management in Africa.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** welcomed the Centre’s comprehensive report and remarked that sites fell short of expectations in terms of economic potential, particularly those sites in which tourism was not enhanced. The Delegation noted that a training session under the Africa Nature Programme had been held in 2004 for the French-speaking African countries and that training for the English-speaking countries would be considered for 2005 in order to accommodate the use of the two languages, French and English. It expressed concern that the programme had been spread

over two years owing to the use of the two languages and wondered whether joint training could be provided in future using the two languages simultaneously.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the statement by the Delegation of Nigeria and stressed the need for training for the Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa. The Delegation therefore suggested that the interest of Portuguese-speaking countries be considered in future activities. It also said that the language issue was of major importance in capacity-building.

The Delegation of **Benin**, sharing the concerns of the two preceding speakers, thought that the ideal would be to bring together in a same group the speakers of several languages in order to encourage a simultaneous exchange of experiences. Furthermore, whilst commending the actions undertaken to ensure the training of site managers, it regretted that the presentation highlighted the natural heritage rather than the cultural heritage. It welcomed the initiative of South Africa and supported by other countries of the region, to organise, prior to the 29th session of the Committee, an African expert workshop to monitor the situation, and felt that this initiative should be generally welcomed.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on its report and supported the concern expressed by the Delegations of Nigeria and Benin. It then proposed two amendments to draft Decision **7 EXT.COM 5C** and informed the Committee that the decision to designate South Africa as the host country for the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee had been received as a historic development in that it would be the very first time that such meeting of the World Heritage Committee would be held in sub-Saharan Africa. Following this decision, the members of the UNESCO Africa Group requested South Africa to hold a preparatory meeting in March 2005 during which, African experts would develop a position paper for the conservation of African World Heritage sites. The Delegation of South Africa had suggested that the position paper be submitted to the World Heritage Committee at the 29th session. The Delegation further suggested submitting to the Rapporteur its proposal for two amendments in writing, so that it is included in draft Decision **7 EXT.COM 5C**.

IUCN noted that one of the outcomes of the IUCN/World Parks Congress, held in September 2003 in Durban, South Africa, had been the announcement of the African Protected Areas Initiative, in relation to the NEPAD environmental programme. That initiative had been launched in order to strengthen and build capacities for protected areas in Africa. IUCN then stated that support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had recently been announced for the Republic of South Africa and stressed the importance of close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre to ensure that African initiatives for World Heritage and others such as the African Protected Areas Initiative were linked so that States Parties in Africa would benefit. IUCN recognized that the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Durban, South Africa, offered an opportunity to move forward and to formulate a conservation strategy for Africa and assured the Committee of its availability to assist the World Heritage Centre and African States Parties in that regard.

ICCROM, in reply to the question raised by the Delegation of Portugal, stated that it was aware of the issue of languages in the Africa 2009 programme having regard to the Portuguese-speaking African countries and that participants from those countries took part in training courses conducted in French or English. Spanish was another language that was not covered by the

programme and discussions could be held with Portugal on collaborative options in order to address the particular issue of training for Portuguese-speaking countries. ICCROM noted that thematic seminars could bring together both English-speaking and French-speaking countries, but interpretation and translation costs were aspects that also had to be taken into consideration.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its wholehearted support for the meeting to be held in Durban before the session of the World Heritage Committee and supported the two amendments to the draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

At the invitation of the Chairperson, the **Rapporteur** said that two paragraphs could be added as a preamble to the draft Decision as follows:

1. Having examined Documents WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5C and WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.11,
2. Recalling the Decision relating to adoption of Africa Periodic Report (26 COM 20).

He then read out the written proposal submitted by the Delegation of South Africa and seconded by the delegation of Nigeria to add the following two paragraphs: “Takes note of the meeting of African World Heritage experts on the State of Conservation of World Heritage sites in Africa planned for March 2005 in Cape Town, South Africa;” and “The Committee calls upon States Parties, UNESCO, the Director of World Heritage Centre and other partners to support this initiative;” to the draft Decision.

To address concerns regarding the use of languages in the implementation of the Africa Programme and to strike a balance in reporting on natural and cultural heritage, he proposed that the following paragraph: “The Committee invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to take into account, in the Africa Programme the diversity of the languages in the Africa continent as well as to ensure a balance between natural and cultural heritage programme” be added to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the two amendments proposed by the Delegation of South Africa and the Rapporteur’s proposed additions to the draft Decision which reflected the Committee members’ remarks.

The Delegation of **China** supported the South African initiative regarding the meeting to be held before the Committee’s session in Durban.

ICCROM suggested that all financial partners of Africa 2009 Programme, namely the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Swedish National Heritage Board, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Italy and Finland, the UNESCO World Heritage Fund and ICCROM be mentioned in paragraph 2 of the original draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Benin** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of South Africa and subscribed to the proposals of the Rapporteur concerning linguistic diversity and the enumeration of all the partners, despite the great length of the list.

The **Rapporteur** stressed that the remarks made by the Delegations of Portugal and Benin were the bases on which he had proposed to add to the draft Decision a paragraph on the need to diversify working languages in the Africa Programme and to strike a balance between natural and cultural heritage activities in the reporting exercise. He then suggested that a separate annex containing the complete list of financial contributors to the Africa Programme be added to the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted as amended.

FOURTH MEETING

Tuesday, 7 December 2004, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Velez Jara

Note of the Rapporteur: At its fourth meeting, the Committee finished the examination, region by region, of the progress reports related to the periodic reporting exercise, discussing the reports related to Asia and the Pacific, and to Latin America and the Caribbean –including its special project Qhapaq Ñan – Main Andean Road. The Committee also examined one international assistance request requiring its authorisation and the proposals of adjustments to the 2004-2005 budget.

ITEM 5D FOLLOW-UP TO THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5D

The **World Heritage Centre** made a PowerPoint presentation on working document WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5D. The document contained updated information on the most recent events in the region, including a report on the workshop held in October 2004 at Tongariro (New Zealand), which launched the World Heritage Pacific 2009 Programme and resulted in an Action Plan for the implementation of the *Convention* in the Pacific region. Thanks were expressed to the Government of Japan for financing the publication on the State of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region. The Committee was requested to examine and adopt the draft Decision **7 EXT.COM 5D**.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** welcomed the report and particularly the information concerning the Tongariro Workshop, which clearly demonstrated the attention paid by the Committee to the implementation of the *Convention* in the Pacific. In the opinion of the Delegation, special emphasis should be laid on the involvement of indigenous and local communities in heritage conservation programmes as that was the only way to ensure their sustainability and progress in raising meaningful indigenous involvement in the *World Heritage Convention* to the high point of international best practice. In that regard, the indigenous people could be fully integrated into all relevant debates, in accordance with the principles of equality and the rule of law. The Delegation pointed out that there was still a challenge to the *Convention* regarding the way in which outstanding universal value was currently interpreted. It entailed a dynamic process that should take into account the specific character and nature of heritage places in the Pacific region, inasmuch as their historical, aesthetic, ethnological and/or anthropological connections with the local people sometimes differed from those of other regions. That was the reason why the Delegation attached so much importance to the concept of cultural landscapes, which genuinely expressed the meaningful connection that blurred the dualism between natural and cultural heritage. The Delegation stressed that in describing cultural landscapes it was not possible to separate the tangible from the intangible, as those two aspects were interconnected. It

had been a pleasure for New Zealand to host the World Heritage-Pacific 2009 Workshop in Tongariro, in October 2004. The very large number of representatives from the Pacific countries and territories, along with representatives of the Advisory Bodies, funding bodies and conservation NGOs, had contributed significantly to the vibrancy of the discussions. An Action Plan had been drawn up at the workshop, and assistance should be provided for its implementation. While Pacific States Parties would do much of the work themselves, the Committee's support and guidance were much needed. The Delegation looked forward to participating actively in the implementation of the Action Plan.

The Delegation of **China** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the working document, oral report and, in particular, the excellent coordination of work in carrying out the periodic reporting exercise in the Asia and the Pacific region. It also appreciated the support provided by the Government of Japan for the publication on the State of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region and thanked the Government of Italy, the Nordic World Heritage Foundation and New Zealand for their support for States Parties from the Pacific region. It assured the Committee that its Government would take specific follow-up action to implement the recommendations adopted by the Committee in order to address the conservation challenges facing the World Heritage properties in China.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its appreciation to the World Heritage Centre for the excellent document and thanked the Government of New Zealand for holding the workshop for the Pacific countries and the Government of Japan for the financial support provided for the production of the publication, which summarized well the specific nature of, and problems related to, the heritage in the Asia and the Pacific region. It was fully ready to cooperate in future in implementing recommendations arising from the periodic reporting process.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted.

ITEM 5E FOLLOW-UP ON THE PERIODIC REPORT IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5E

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled Decision **28 COM 16** and outlined the objectives and results of the three sub-regional meetings held by the World Heritage Centre as part of the follow-up to the Latin America and Caribbean Periodic Report in Cartagena (Colombia), Kingston (Jamaica) and San José (Costa Rica) respectively. It set out the main points of the Action Plan for World Heritage in Latin America and informed the Committee that a user-friendly summary version of the periodic report had been published in English, French and Spanish and was available to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Government of Colombia for organizing the meeting in Cartagena and expressed appreciation for the work of the UNESCO officer directly responsible for the preparation of the meeting, Mr Herman Van Hooff's (Montevideo Office). Summing up the various issues covered at the Cartagena meeting, it stressed that the meeting had

agreed on the need for better coordination between the 1972 *Convention* and other conventions, including the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The meeting had also discussed issues that were useful for the Global Training Strategy: for instance, successful experiences as the Claes Olrog Institute –an Argentine institution created to train national parks’ managers- were highlighted. The role of different partners was also discussed, and, in particular, the cooperation of indigenous communities was considered critical at all the stages in the process of protection - from identification to management. Furthermore, the meeting had identified concrete actions, evaluation mechanisms, and time frames which were required in order to implement the Latin American Action Plan. Mainly to address these issues, the Delegation proposed to hold a meeting in early 2005. It further considered that the report on progress achieved in implementing the Action Plan and on the results of that meeting should be submitted to the Committee at its 29th session in Durban rather than at its 30th session as suggested in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Chile** congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the follow-up to the periodic report and thanked the Governments of Spain, the Netherlands and France for their continuous financial support.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Argentina to hold a meeting in early 2005 and to report on its results to the Committee at its 29th session and expressed gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and the Government of Spain.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** was satisfied with the results of the Action Plan developed for the Caribbean region and encouraged the World Heritage Centre to continue implementing it.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** welcomed the publication of the Periodic Report and stressed that since Suzhou several important activities had been undertaken by the World Heritage Centre, such as the meetings in Cartagena and San José. It emphasized that similar sub-regional meetings would be instrumental in implementing the Action Plan at the sub-regional level. It underlined the need to put more effort in the formulation of national strategies to follow up the Periodic Report and devise indicators, especially with regard to inventory systems, conservation, management, the capacity of the sites (especially archaeological sites) and cultural tourism.

The **Rapporteur** proposed to amend the draft Decision by placing paragraph 4 before paragraph 3, which would reflect the statements made by the Delegations of Argentina and Colombia better, and by adding a paragraph worded as follows: “The World Heritage Centre should convene a workshop at the beginning of 2005 with the aim to further develop some aspects of the action plan such as: allocation of a detailed budget, identification of partners and definition of a time frame for each action.” In the last paragraph of the draft Decision, the World Heritage Centre would be requested to report on the implementation of the Action Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean and on the results of the meeting proposed by Argentina.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out that there were no funds available to organize the meeting as proposed by Argentina.

The **Rapporteur** accordingly proposed to amend paragraph 3 of the draft Decision to read: “the World Heritage Centre should, preferably at the beginning of 2005, convene a workshop with the aim to further develop some aspects of the action plan such as: allocation of a detailed

budget, identification of partners and definition of a time frame for each action”, which would allow the World Heritage Centre time to seek funds for the holding of the proposed meeting.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 5F PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PROPOSAL FOR THE NOMINATION OF QHAPAQ ÑAN – MAIN ANDEAN ROAD.

*Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/5
Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM/5E*

The **World Heritage Centre** gave a lengthy presentation of the Qhapaq Ñan project by illustrating its background and specificities. The project had begun two years earlier with preparations for the nomination of the ancient Inca road, which was more than 6,000 km long and involved six countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Peru and Colombia. It included more than 200 protected areas and many archaeological sites and remains. The project was articulated as a linear serial transboundary nomination, which crossed a diversity of cultural landscapes. Advanced technologies, such as satellite images and GIS, had been used in implementing the project. It had been designed as an integrated interdisciplinary project in which indigenous communities were fully involved. To facilitate the exchange of information among the experts involved in the Qhapaq Ñan project, an information tool had been developed by the World Heritage Centre. Sixteen transboundary sites had already been placed on the Tentative List and several meetings would be held in 2005, in Ecuador in March and in Argentina in August 2005, to further develop and strengthen working procedures among the States Parties concerned.

The Delegation of **Argentina**, seconded by the Delegations of **Chile** and **Colombia**, thanked the World Heritage Centre, in particular its Director and Ms Nuria Sanz –the officer responsible at the technical level for the project-, for the accurate presentation, which had stressed the challenges, complexity and results of the project. It underlined the importance of the project as a stimulus for the development on adequate national institutions and as a bridge between the *World Heritage Convention* and other conventions and programmes, including the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the RAMSAR Convention and the MAB programme. It highlighted the social and economic aspects of the project, which required the awareness-raising of decision-makers and donors, as well as the importance of cooperation with indigenous communities. Finally, it expressed that much remained to be done, and that cooperation had to be continued and reinforced in order not to frustrate the project.

The Delegations of **India**, **New Zealand** and Nigeria and the Observers Delegations of **Ecuador** and **Spain** expressed sincere appreciation for the excellent presentation and development of the project, which was an inspiration for other regions.

The Observer Delegation of **Ecuador** announced that it would host the next meeting for the implementation of the Qhapaq Ñan project emphasising the fact that a new page of archaeological discoveries is being written. The Observer Delegation of Spain reiterated its

financial and technical commitment towards the project recalling that the “Archivos de las Indias” can be consulted by any expert in Sevilla.

ICOMOS informed the Committee about its International Scientific Committee on Cultural Routes and the possible submission of the project to its General Assembly in China in 2005.

The **Rapporteur** suggested that a paragraph be inserted between paragraphs 2 and 3 thanking all the donors involved in the project, namely Spain, France and the Netherlands, for their continued cooperation and their contribution of extrabudgetary funds and encouraging other governments to contribute additional financial and human resources for the project.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that the decisions were a tool for facilitating the Committee’s work and therefore should not be used in future not to include thanking notes.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 6 INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/6.Add.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **World Heritage Centre** presented the request for international technical cooperation assistance submitted by the Government of India for the development of an improved Geographic Information System (GIS) for the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway (DHR) World Heritage property.

The **Rapporteur** read to the Committee the following recommendation made by the Bureau on 4 December 2004:

“The World Heritage Bureau,

1. Having examined the technical cooperation assistance request made by India regarding an improved geographic information system (GIS) for Darjeeling Himalayan Railway (DHR), as presented in documents *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/BUR.2* and *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/6.Add*,
2. Noting that in accordance with decision **28 COM 10 A**, four requests for technical cooperation assistance will be submitted to the Chairperson and/or the Committee in 2005 for a total amount of US \$104,915,
3. Considering that only an amount of US \$160,000 is available for cultural properties under technical cooperation assistance in the 2005 budget,
4. Taking into account ICOMOS comments, as presented in document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/6.Add*, as well as the amount of international assistance provided to the DHR in recent years (US \$58,000),

5. Recommends to the Committee not to approve this technical cooperation assistance request.”

Despite the fact that no funding was available from the World Heritage Fund for India’s request for international assistance, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support for that activity and stressed that the Centre should consider seeking **funding under natural heritage, since there were unexpended funds, or from extrabudgetary sources.**

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Delegation of the United Kingdom for its support and stressed the outstanding value of the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway, the oldest railway system of its sort in the world. It understood ICOMOS’s comments, but considered them negatively worded. It emphasized the importance of an integrated approach to the conservation and management of such important property. Furthermore, the allusion to the funds already granted to the property through international assistance was inopportune. Paragraph 5 of the draft Decision in document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/6.Add* should be deleted, since India was already seeking additional funds.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that a global picture of international assistance was necessary to make a judgment. It requested the World Heritage Centre to provide a comprehensive report as part of the ongoing evaluation of the various components of international assistance under the World Heritage Fund to the Committee at its 29th session in Durban, South Africa.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that as a matter of principle a State Party should not speak about a request it had submitted.

The **Chairperson** considered that the argument of the Delegation of Saint Lucia was acceptable and had been duly noted.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested that future documents on international assistance contain a list of all requests approved during the biennium by the Director of the Centre and the Chairperson, and the sum total granted as international assistance by country for the past two biennia. Furthermore, in view of the limited funds available, it asked whether, as a matter of principle, a country that had property on the “In Danger List” could be given preparatory assistance and whether it was advantageous to grant funds to inscribe a new site or to keep those funds for the “In Danger” site.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Saint Lucia for its proposals and stressed that international assistance would be thoroughly reviewed in Durban in 2005.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision to which amendments of style had been introduced.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 7 **ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2004-2005 BUDGET**

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced item 7 “Adjustments to the budget 2004-2005”, stressing that paragraph 3 of the document had been withdrawn.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked the World Heritage Centre whether the amount of US \$30,000 proposed for reallocation in the document represented savings or cuts. It then requested that the *INF.7* Document be excluded from the discussion as it had not yet been received by delegations.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that the amount was a saving, being an unexpended portion of the 2004 budget.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the World Heritage Fund should be used for the priorities set out in the Convention, namely conservation and international assistance. If funds from the World Heritage Fund were to be used for non-priority areas, then a specific amendment should be made to the draft Decision for such a deviation from the Convention.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** assumed that in the draft Decision, paragraph 1, should read: “Takes note of the proposals relating to the World Heritage Budget quoted in Document *WHC-04/7EXT COM/7* paragraphs 1 to 3.”

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Delegation of Kuwait and said that as paragraph 3 had been withdrawn, and that only paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft Decision were to be considered by the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the request for clarification made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, stressing that it was difficult to consider the agenda item as a whole, as the *INF.7* Document had not yet been received.

IUCN recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session had requested that the Advisory Bodies provide a document on the funding of the Advisory Bodies and on the evaluation of the Tentative Lists. As some delegations had not received the document, it would be better to examine the item the following day, when the Advisory Bodies would make an explanatory statement on the *INF.7* Document.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, in response to the question raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, confirmed that the proposed retrospective inventory and preparations for the 2006-2007 periodic reporting exercise were part of a long-term conservation strategy, because a proper inventory was essential for monitoring the sites and made it possible to analyse their state of conservation and the implementation of the Convention.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested additional clarification on the proposed preparations for the 2006-2007 periodic report, having regard to the interaction between that

proposal and the earlier decision to allow one year for reflection after the finalization of the first cycle of periodic reports in 2007.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that as decided by the Committee, upon completion of the first periodic reporting cycle in the various regions, there would be one year for reflection before starting the next cycle, to take stock of the evolution in the methodology, technology and its objectives. That reflection would take place in 2007. The proposal in the document before the Committee concerned the use of a small amount in 2006 in order to prepare for reflection in 2007, which would entail a meeting of the Advisory Bodies, some States Parties and the World Heritage Centre to draw up a preliminary methodology for the review of the periodic reporting exercise.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thought this proposal premature, as it pre-empted the decision of the Committee regarding the one-year pause in the periodic reporting exercise.

The Delegation of **Belgium** (Observer), recalling that the use of the Funds is clearly defined in the Convention, requested that the Fund be strictly reserved for conservation, in accordance with the oft-expressed wishes of several Committee members, and that a distinction be established between these expenses and administrative expenses.

The Delegation of **India** asked the World Heritage Centre to provide further clarification on the amount saved on the budget line for the Asia Pacific Regional Programme in respect of the periodic report and specifically whether those savings were being used for bureaucratic instead of programme activities and whether those amounts could be transferred to other parts of the budget.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that savings could be used in the following year but not in the following biennium. The proposed activities, amounting to a small fraction of the total budget of US \$7.2 million, could benefit from a kick start through the available funds, as from 2005. The costs in question were professional expenses linked to conservation and were not administrative expenditure.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its concern, since *the INF.7 Document* made no reference to the Suzhou/Cairns decision **28 COM 14B.57.4**. Furthermore it contained reflections on the budget for 2006-2007 and not adjustments in the 2004-2005 budget.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that the adoption of the draft Decision be postponed until both documents had been discussed, as the content of Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7* could influence the wording of the final decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the two documents were very different. Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7* referred to the current budget of the 2004-2005 biennium and proposed minor adjustments, while Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7* was an information document on the “Analysis by the Advisory Bodies of the funds required for their services” and included budget considerations for the 2006-2007 biennium. A project proposal for “Better Heritage Management through Better Data: Retrospective Inventory of Inscribed Properties and Development of an Advanced Mapping Server”, for which a preliminary budget proposal had been made in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7*, paragraph 1, was also included in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that when two documents were so different, they should bear different reference numbers. It agreed to paragraph 1 of the draft Decision, but not to paragraph 2, since it could not take note of a statement of income and expenditure as representative of programme implementation. It suggested that a more appropriate wording for paragraph 2 of the draft Decision would be “The Committee received as information the state of execution of the budget for 2004-2005 and the contribution to the World Heritage Fund on 30 June 2004”, since the state of execution of the budget for 2004-2005 would be presented, discussed and noted by the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session. Furthermore, a paragraph should be added relating to the Cairns-Suzhou decision on the budget.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that its question did not concern the draft decision but paragraph 6 of Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7* which deals with the organisation, in July 2005, of an exhibition on African Heritage. It wished to know the situation regarding steps taken to seek necessary financing, as it was understood that this would not be covered by the World Heritage Fund. It also wished to know about the connection between this exhibition, foreseen in Khartoum, during the African Union Summit and the one which, according to the Director of the Centre, should be organised in Durban, on the occasion of the 29th session of the Committee. In its opinion, it was important to clearly define the objectives and the targeted public for each of these very different events.

Whilst agreeing that his summary might have given cause for confusion, the **Director of the Centre** confirmed that it concerned two very distinct exhibitions. The aim of the one foreseen for Khartoum, organised in parallel with the first counter-summit for culture, is to promote the Committee’s activities to the leaders of the African Union. With regard to funding, several partners had been solicited and he hoped for a response in the coming weeks.

The Delegation of **Benin** considered that it was a unique occasion to raise awareness at the highest level of African decision makers, because with regard to site conservation, what is missing most in this region of the world is political willpower. Hence, it made a heartfelt appeal to the Centre to do its utmost to ensure that this exhibition will take place.

The Delegation of **India** said that paragraph 6 of the document was very important and should be the subject of a separate paragraph in the draft Decision and, in the light of the World Heritage Centre’s explanations, had no objection to the remainder of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** repeated its objection to paragraph 2 of the draft Decision, stating that the Committee could not take note of the state of execution of the budget for 2004-2005 as it was not presented in the manner requested by the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** concluded from the debate that the original draft Decision was inappropriate and requested that all draft Decisions be submitted to him for review before distribution to the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session. He then suggested that the draft Decision be worded as follows:

“The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined* document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7*,

2. *Authorizes* the Director of the World Heritage Centre to reallocate US \$30,000 from the savings made in the 2004 budget of the World Heritage Fund in order to undertake a retrospective inventory with a view to harmonizing and updating the documentation for the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List;
3. *Takes note* of the Statement of Income and Expenditure and Changes in Reserves and Fund Balances included in the Annex to the document *WHC-04/7EXT.COM/7*.”

No reference would be made in the draft Decision to document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7* because its content and implications would be discussed at the 29th session. Paragraph 2 of the draft Decision clearly indicated which amount would be used from which budget line and for which objective, while paragraph 3 addressed the concern raised by the representative of Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Rapporteur and agreed to the proposed draft Decision, stressing that it agreed only to a reallocation of funds mentioned in paragraph 1 in the document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Saint Lucia and thanked the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Wednesday, 8 December 2004, at 9.55 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its fifth meeting, the Committee closed discussion on the proposals of adjustments to the 2004-2005 budget and took note of the proposals concerning the preparation of the UNESCO draft programme and budget for 2006-2007 and of its Medium Term Strategy for 2008-2014. The Committee then began the examination of the relationship between the World Heritage Convention and other relevant legal international instruments, both within and outside UNESCO. This first part of the discussion concentrated on the need and urgency to develop links between the 1972 Convention and the 2003 Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, as compared with other environment-related and tangible heritage-related conventions and programmes.

ITEM 7 ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2004-2005 BUDGET (continued)

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*

The **Chairperson** reported on two issues that had been discussed at that morning's meeting of the Bureau: the request for international assistance submitted by Sudan and the previous day's decision regarding the budget under agenda item 7. The Chairperson sought clarification as to whether the Bureau and the Committee had a common understanding regarding the decision taken on the previous day.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee about the international assistance requested by Sudan. The Bureau, after noting the additional information provided by the State Party on their request for US\$30,000 for the preparation of a nomination file for the Island of Meroe, had approved the request for an amount of US\$20,000.

At the invitation of the Chairperson, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred then to the previous day's discussion on item 7. He understood that no clear decision had yet emerged at the end of such discussion regarding the readjustment of US\$30,000 to carry out the retrospective inventory of inscribed properties and US\$20,000 for reflection on future cycles.

The **Rapporteur of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee** said that the draft Decision had been discussed and reformulated into two sections as follows:

“The World Heritage Committee,

– I –

1. *Having examined document WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7,*
2. *Recalling Decision 28 COM 13.1 adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Authorizes the Director of the World Heritage Centre to reallocate US \$30,000 from the savings made in the 2004 budget of the World Heritage Fund in order to undertake a retrospective inventory with a view to harmonizing and updating the documentation for the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List;*
4. *Takes note of the Statement of Income and Expenditure and Changes in Reserves and Fund Balances included in the Annex to the referred document WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7.*

– II –

5. *Takes note of the project for the African cultural and natural heritage exhibition that the World Heritage Centre envisages organising during the next African Union Summit, foreseen for 4 and 5 July 2005 in Khartoum (Sudan) ;*
6. *Invites States Parties to the Convention and partners to grant financial support and/or material to this awareness-raising activity for the World Heritage Convention.*

The **Chairperson** sought confirmation of the proposed draft Decision, recalling that the Delegation of Saint Lucia had objected to the proposal to allocate funding in preparation for the periodic reporting exercise, described in paragraph 2 of the document, and asked the Committee whether it was the mutual understanding that the Committee had not yet taken a decision approving paragraph(s) 1 and/or 2 of the document.

The Delegation of **Portugal** wished to receive more information from the World Heritage Centre on Document WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/7 before it could take a clear position on three issues, namely the harmonization work on the different databases, the analysis of their content and the identification of state of conservation indicators for the periodic reporting exercise and the state of conservation documents. It wanted to know how the amount of US\$20,000 would be allocated to the different issues. In regard to the funds required by the Advisory Bodies in Document WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7, the Delegation recalled **Decision 28 COM 14B.57 paragraph 10** (The World Heritage Committee decides to consider at its next session means of ensuring that adequate resources are provided for the functioning of the Advisory Bodies) and suggested that the Committee only take note of the document as it pertained to the 2006-2007 budget, which would be discussed and decided upon at the 29th session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the Committee had decided at the current session to suspend the commencement of the next periodic reporting cycle to enable all involved to reflect on the first cycle – and, in particular, develop indicators for better monitoring. In his view, for such purpose an expert meeting should be organized in 2005,

bringing together the Advisory Bodies and statistical professionals. The US\$ 20,000 would be allocated to finance such meeting.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** understood that the agenda item had been finalized on the previous day. Were the discussion to be reopened, it wanted the Legal Adviser to explain what legal uses could be given to the World Heritage Fund. It agreed that the periodic reporting exercise should be evaluated, but the document did not indicate clearly exactly what was to be done. It was also very concerned that that information requested by the Committee at its 28th session on the evaluation of Tentative Lists had not been provided.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** fully agreed with the recollection of the Rapporteur and with the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It recalled that, on the previous day, the Committee had approved only paragraph 1 of the draft Decision contained in the document; no delegation had said anything in support of paragraph 2. It was unacceptable therefore to seek to reopen the debate. It requested legal advice on the use of the World Heritage Fund and an explanation on the use of unexpended funds from the Asia/Pacific programme, which should be used for long-term activities under this programme.

The **Chairperson** took note of the request for clarification from the Legal Adviser.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** recalled that the discussion on item 7 had not been concluded, that a decision had been taken to approve paragraph 1 of the draft Decision and that paragraph 3 of the document had been withdrawn.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that paragraph 3 of the document had been withdrawn.

The Delegation of **India** had no further objection to the document and supported the funding referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the document.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the statements by the Delegations of Saint Lucia and the United Kingdom. It was of the view that the matter had been decided on the previous day and it agreed to paragraph 1 only.

The Delegation of **Chile** saw no legal problem in the proposed use of funds from the World Heritage Fund, as the Committee was sovereign and could take decisions on the use of funds that had been earmarked either for special tasks or to improve a specific task. It recalled that the Committee had on many occasions wished for more precision in fulfilling its tasks. Appropriate funding should be found for the costs involved.

ICOMOS confirmed, as a full partner in the periodic reporting exercise, that it shared the World Heritage Centre's concerns and considered that some issues should be studied to prepare for the next reporting cycle before it began. It therefore supported paragraph 2 of the document.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, referring to the Committee's request for legal advice on the use of funds, said that it was the Committee's prerogative to decide on the use of the World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to the *World Heritage Convention*, stressed that funds could be used only for international assistance and conservation and insisted that the Legal Adviser be consulted on the proposal to use the Fund for another purpose. Furthermore, it could not contemplate cuts in the budget for the Asia-Pacific regional programme. It noted, to this regards, that US\$ 20,000 represents a significant amount for the implementation of World Heritage-related activities in the Pacific islands.

The **Chairperson** agreed that the opinion of the Legal Adviser was needed and said that the central question was whether the periodic reporting exercise could be considered to be part of conservation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** emphasized its positive position towards the periodic reporting exercise which it did not consider to be the issue at that point.

The Delegation of **Benin** recalled that according to paragraph 4 of Article 15 of the *Convention*, the Committee alone shall define the use of the resources of the Fund. Hence, the question was not whether to request the opinion of the Legal Adviser, but to decide upon the use of contributions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the statement made by the Delegation of Benin and said that no discussion was needed on the *Convention* text or whether periodic reporting was part of conservation. The important point was that there was clarity as to the use of funds and which part was used for conservation. It underlined that if the *Convention* gave the Committee the right to decide on the use of the World Heritage Fund, the right should be exercised.

The Delegation of **India** said that the periodic reporting exercise was an important tool for conservation and that the Committee, being free to decide on the use of funds, would not violate the *Convention* by approving paragraph 2 of the document. The Delegation emphasized that it spoke for the Asia and the Pacific region.

The Delegation of **Portugal** felt that after receiving clarification from the Legal Adviser, the Committee would need to take a decision concerning paragraph 2 of the document. Furthermore, the Committee should have received clearer information regarding the reason for the savings on the budget lines mentioned in paragraph 4 of the document and the reason for the reallocation of funds. The Delegation agreed to the possibility of reallocating funds, as proposed in paragraph 2 of the document.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished that in the future the World Heritage Centre would provide at the outset all necessary information for the examination of a proposal to avoid the reopening of a debate considered as closed.

The Delegation of **Colombia** approved paragraph 1 of the document, but felt that unexpended amounts should remain available for their original purpose, namely regional programmes for the periodic reports in the different regions.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up the debate, said that the Delegation of the United Kingdom had requested clarification from the Legal Adviser on the use of the World Heritage Fund and

specifically whether the *World Heritage Convention* allowed the World Heritage Fund to be used for the purpose proposed in paragraph 2 in the document.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** added that it had sought clarification on both paragraphs 2 and 3 of the document, considering that no proposals in contravention of the *Convention* should be submitted to the Committee and proper use of the World Heritage Fund should be promoted.

The **Legal Adviser** read out to Article 15.4 of the *Convention*, which left decisions on the use of the Fund to the Committee. He added that the Committee could, by a majority vote, approve or disapprove of the proposed use of funds.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that paragraph 2 of the document was important for the development of indicators as technical tools for the coming periodic reporting cycle, which could be regarded as part of conservation. The Delegation approved paragraph 2 of the document as proposed, in the light of the Legal Adviser's explanation.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** approved the budget reallocations proposed in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the document. It considered that paragraph 2 of the document dealt basically with conservation.

The Delegation of **Benin** noted that, as might be expected, the Legal Adviser brought no new element. The Committee could adopt a decision but the deletion of paragraph 3 did not settle a fundamental problem which remained and which would sooner or later reappear, that of the independence of the Chairperson of the Committee in the exercise of his functions, which is dependent on the guarantee of his means of action.

The **Chairperson** observed that a majority of the Committee was moving towards adopting the budget reallocations proposed in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the document, to which the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Saint Lucia were opposed. He recalled that it was the tradition of the Committee to avoid a vote and appealed to the two States Parties to consider that tradition of consensus in decision-making.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** accepted in the spirit of consensus the proposal made by the Chairperson, but maintained that paragraphs 2 and 3 were contrary to the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** had reservations about the decision and wished that they be recorded in the Summary Records. It emphasized that the World Heritage Centre should not make proposals contrary to the *Convention* in the Committee's documents.

The **Rapporteur** suggested that a third paragraph be added to the draft Decision as follows:

"The World Heritage Committee,

recognizing that the periodic reporting exercise is a critical tool of conservation and that adequate management of the World Heritage List depends on an appropriate assessment of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites, also authorizes the Director of the World Heritage Centre to allocate US\$20,000 from the savings made in the budget of 2004 of the

World Heritage Fund, in order to identify main indicators on the state of conservation of sites to be nominated to the World Heritage List.”

The **Chairperson** closed the discussion on item 7, having noted no objections to the proposal of the Rapporteur. The Chairperson declared the decision provisionally adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies to introduce Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*.

IUCN, speaking on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM, recalled that the Committee at its 28th session had decided (Decision **28 COM 14B.57**) “to consider at its next session means of ensuring that adequate resources are provided for the functioning of the Advisory Bodies”.

The Advisory Bodies had accordingly made an analysis of the funding required for their services, as set out in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*. It stressed that at all times the Advisory Bodies strove to provide the highest level of technical, and where necessary policy, advice to the Committee. After having explained the table related to IUCN’s work, it stressed it was pleased to continue to contribute to the process and to the conservation of World Heritage, drawing on its international expert networks. It saw, however, a future constraint in continued reliance on voluntary support from top experts while expecting at the same time the highest quality of technical input.

In regard to ICOMOS, it said that given the increased complexity of nominations and the need for consistency and the best possible advice, ICOMOS would in future need to offer more appropriate remuneration for its work and would require more support to set nominations in context, by reflecting previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee. Current funding was not in line with current assessment needs.

It stressed that ICCROM was pleased to contribute to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and to improvement in the conservation and management of World Heritage properties. It would strive to continue to meet the increased demands placed on it in its role as an Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee, specifically in respect of statutory meetings, training initiatives, scientific development of the *Convention*, and work to improve its administration and implementation.

The Advisory Bodies considered that there was a clear shortfall between current funding and real costs and that the budget requests submitted in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7* were realistic and necessary, given the importance of such key work for the implementation of the *Convention*. Guidance would be sought from the Committee as to which items might be dropped from the current workload if additional resources could not be allocated. The Advisory Bodies asked the Committee to note the concerns raised and to ensure that adequate resources, as outlined in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*, were allocated to the Advisory Bodies in the decision on the budget adopted for the 2006-2007 biennium by the Committee at its 29th session.

ICOMOS then addressed the issue of the Tentative Lists and referred to the Committee’s decision adopted at the 28th session requesting (Decision **28 COM 14B.57**) ICOMOS and IUCN to “consider the resource implications of evaluating Tentative Lists and provide feedback at the

7th extraordinary session to States Parties on the proposals in terms of their potential to meet the benchmark of ‘outstanding universal value’ and their ability to contribute to the representativity of the World Heritage List”.

Having considered the issue of evaluating Tentative Lists, ICOMOS and IUCN fully supported the strengthening of Tentative Lists and considered the review process to be critical. That process should be based on the best available research and information, and on full appreciation of the process of identifying outstanding universal value. It should allow for adequate and effective stakeholder participation, as exemplified by the recent review of the Tentative List in Canada.

The Advisory Bodies saw their role as a strategic one, rather than one of conducting detailed evaluation of each State Party’s Tentative List. The review of Tentative Lists could best be undertaken when States Parties conduct periodic reviews to assess and strengthen their lists. ICOMOS and IUCN considered that the strengthening and development of Tentative Lists should be part of capacity-building, linked to raising awareness of the World Heritage process, in particular the identification of outstanding universal value, and the rationale and implications of World Heritage status.

Referring to Documents *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A* and *B*, (“ICOMOS Analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and follow-up action plan” and “IUCN Analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and follow-up action plan”), it said that ICOMOS and IUCN had agreed that they could assist in regional workshops by sending experts, promoting the goal of awareness raising, harmonizing and reviewing Tentative Lists and assisting in drawing up new Tentative Lists. IUCN also welcomed the idea of producing a training kit on the preparation of Tentative Lists.

As a detailed review of States Parties’ Tentative Lists would have considerable resource implications, ICOMOS and IUCN suggested that a programme of regional Tentative List workshops be implemented over the next three years, involving States Parties, ICOMOS, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. The costs of the regional workshops had been estimated at around US\$30,000 per workshop (not including costs of participants). The cost of drafting Tentative List Guidelines had been estimated at around US\$20,000. Both Advisory Bodies were willing to assist in that crucial process.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their introduction to Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7*. He reminded the Committee that the actual budget proposals for the 2006-2007 biennium would be discussed at the 29th session, but asked the States Parties to comment on the document and on the Advisory Bodies’ introduction.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commended the Advisory Bodies for their comprehensive explanations and wished the PowerPoint presentation could be copied and distributed, especially as it added clarity and cohesion to the *INF.7* Document. The Delegation requested IUCN to explain, in connection with the evaluation of the Tentative Lists, and their harmonization, the purpose and outcome of the evaluation and the meaning of the word “harmonization”, as the question had been raised at the recent Arab workshop for natural sites.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Advisory Bodies for the information provided and said that it was unsure whether the request made by the Committee at its 28th session (Decision **28 COM 14B.57**) had been fully met. In regard to the Advisory Bodies' statement to the effect that they had assisted States Parties in improving submitted nominations when they were of poor quality, the Delegation wondered whether that was the role of the Advisory Bodies. Furthermore, in its view it was unrealistic to try to harmonize the Tentative Lists before the planned meeting of experts on outstanding universal value. It was clear that States Parties were required to identify properties of outstanding universal value on their territory.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its gratitude to the Advisory Bodies and, in regard to Table 2 on page 4, item 1C, said that it could be useful for all States Parties to have access to such information when conducting international comparative analyses of nomination files. The IUCN and ICOMOS tables showed that large amounts were devoted to the evaluation of nominations, but the amounts used by IUCN for state of conservation reports were twice as much as those used by ICOMOS. It requested some clarification on the differences in costs shown.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the Advisory Bodies on their presentation. As nominations depended on the quality of the Advisory Bodies' evaluation, their expertise was critical, even more so for nominations which were being submitted under the global strategy. After the adoption of the new *Operational Guidelines*, there might even be a rise in the number of nominations. It noted that the Advisory Bodies were not receiving the requisite level of funds and argued that experts in poorer regions could not afford to make evaluations under those circumstances. The Advisory Bodies were therefore relying on experts who had funds, and owing to financial constraints, were not selecting experts on the basis of expertise. It stressed that evaluators also shared their expertise in the less privileged States Parties when they conducted evaluation missions to proposed properties, which could contribute to capacity-building.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Advisory Bodies for the comprehensive document, and praised the transparency that it provided. The Delegation requested some clarification from IUCN regarding unpaid fees, and wondered whether contractors paid full fees under other conventions or whether full fees were not paid under the *World Heritage Convention* only.

Replying to the question regarding the harmonization of the Tentative Lists, **ICOMOS** said that there already was a certain standard, which should be promoted further, because the quality of the Tentative Lists varied. The planned workshop would address not only the issue of Tentative Lists, but also that of outstanding universal value in relation to specific regions, their existing future sites and the various categories and frameworks, as mentioned in Document *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A*. The workshop should also be used to draw up guidelines for the submission of Tentative Lists.

The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that the Advisory Bodies had complained at the 24th session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000) about the increasing workload involved in examining nomination files, but were proposing at the current session to conduct a programme on Tentative Lists and to hold workshops that entailed further expenditure. The Delegation thought that the current level of cooperation between the State Party and the World Heritage

Centre in respect of the Tentative Lists was sufficient, all the more so since the lists were only tentative in character. The Advisory Bodies had a role to play when a State Party submitted a nomination file.

IUCN thanked the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Egypt for their complimentary remarks and said that it would provide a clear picture of the real and realistic costs at the 29th session. In regard to the Tentative Lists, it explained that it was necessary to harmonize the lists submitted by States Parties on a cooperative basis, especially in the case of serial or transboundary nominations, since ecosystems and species recognized no borders. The subject could be further discussed at the experts meeting on outstanding universal value to be held in April in Kazan, Russian Federation. In reply to the Delegation of Colombia, IUCN said that, besides its cooperation with the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, it also worked with Conservation International with which it shared the World Database on Protected Areas. In reply to the Delegation of the Netherlands, it said that it provided input for the Convention on Biological Diversity on a voluntary basis, but that it was becoming increasingly difficult to recruit high-level experts without providing some form of payment. In responding to the Delegations of the United Kingdom and the Observer Delegation of Zimbabwe, IUCN observed that more time and research were required when the quality of the nomination file submitted was poor, and the Advisory Bodies worked together to improve the quality of the files. To conclude, it emphasized that the document and the presentation had been intended as preparation for high-quality debate at the 29th session.

The **Chairperson** stressed that the document was for information only and that the budget would be discussed at the Committee's session in Durban.

The **Rapporteur of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee** said that although the document was an information document, a draft Decision seemed desirable, and he suggested that it be worded as follows:

"The World Heritage Committee,

Having examined WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7,

Recalling Decision 28 COM 14B.57,

Considering the critical matters addressed in the document,

Takes note of the Advisory Bodies' need for additional funding to function;

Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to include these concerns in a proposal for its 29th session."

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** wondered why the information document had been discussed under item 7, when the future budget was to be considered under item 8.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that item 8 related to the UNESCO programme and budget, not that of the World Heritage Fund. Only item 7 dealt with the World Heritage Fund, and so the issue had been placed under that item for discussion.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** queried whether the Committee had agreed to increase funding for the Advisory Bodies in the 2006-2007 biennium, as the draft Decision proposed by the Rapporteur seemed to imply. The Delegation would be in favour of such an increase, since the Advisory Bodies were an important pillar of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the discussion related to an information document, and decisions were not taken on information documents. In the light of the debate and on the basis of the information document, the World Heritage Centre could draw up a document, for submission and discussion at the 29th session. The Delegation was not in a position to take a decision at the 7th extraordinary session on the future budget.

The **Rapporteur of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee** said that it was up to the Committee to take a decision and that a decision had to be taken in view of the nature of the debate. He was of the opinion that the proposed draft Decision contained no implication that the budget for the Advisory Bodies would be increased. If the Committee did not agree to the draft Decision, there would nonetheless be a record of the discussion in the Summary Records.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia and thought that the matter should be discussed at the 29th session under item 16. It suggested that the Committee should decide only to take note of the document.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee would take note of the Advisory Bodies' concerns regarding their financial proposals and of Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.7* and closed the debate.

ITEM 8 PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2006-2007 (DRAFT DOCUMENT 33 C/5) AND DOCUMENT 34 C/4

Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/8

WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.8

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, after introducing the recently appointed Deputy-Director, began the presentation of this item by explaining that the content of Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/8* had been presented to the Committee at its 28th session in Suzhou and that the current document contained only minor changes. The item did not relate to the World Heritage Fund, but to UNESCO's regular programme and budget (33 C/5). He recalled that World Heritage had been designated as a UNESCO flagship programme in UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy for 2002-2007, which granted it a special position and ensured additional support. Furthermore, in the current Approved Programme and Budget for 2004-2005, the World Heritage sub-programme comprised two Main Lines of Action geared to the strategic objectives adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2002.

He then said that new intersectoral programmes, including a new programme on risk preparedness, were being proposed for the 2006-2007 biennium. The funds earmarked in the

2004-2005 budget for the programme implemented by the World Heritage Centre had been increased by US\$1 million from the United States of America, but there had been a net decrease as a result of a reduction in the World Heritage Fund. With regard to staffing, he said that all Chief of Unit posts had been filled, except for the Latin America and the Caribbean desk. The new Deputy-Director, Mr Kishore Rao, present in the room, had recently been appointed and would take up duties mid-February. However, the situation in the Natural Heritage Section, particularly in regard to temporary posts, gave cause for concern and he stressed the need to consolidate and strengthen the section.

Furthermore, he noted that in the past four years over 100 interns had been trained in the World Heritage Centre, an activity that was instrumental in creating a large pool of specialist professionals in the future. To conclude, he remarked that the World Heritage Centre had been assessed by a Canadian auditor in 1997 and that internal assessments of the budget and international assistance were currently under way. He then proposed that a mechanism be established for the periodic evaluation and audit of the World Heritage Centre, having regard to both budgetary and management aspects.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** recalled that at its 170th session, the Executive Board of UNESCO recommended, for the Culture Sector, that the major priority be, within the framework of the promotion of cultural diversity, cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, which signified that the activities relating to this priority would not be affected by budgetary restrictions operated in the rest of the Sector. Therefore, it was on this basis that the funding proposals for the Regular Programme were based, and which will be ready in January 2005 and transmitted to the Executive Board. Of course, the Board is informed of the composition of the World Heritage Fund but does not intervene in the management of its resources which are considered as extrabudgetary, and the responsibility of the Committee.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated the new Deputy-Director of the World Heritage Centre on his appointment and opened the floor for discussion.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Director for his explanation and for the document which, being an information document, did not require a decision; it accordingly suggested that the draft Decision be deleted and replaced by a reference to the effect that the Committee took note of the document, inasmuch as a decision on the subject (Decision **28 COM 12**) had already been taken in Suzhou. It further remarked that there was little balance in the staffing of the World Heritage Centre's various units and that trainees were being used for the execution of standard work. It calculated, on the basis of the numbers provided in the document, that eight to ten more permanent staff members would be needed to replace trainees. It approved the proposed evaluation of programmes every two to four years and, with regard to intersectoral work, stressed that the Decision taken in Suzhou (Decision **28 COM 12**) pointed clearly to the need for the World Heritage Centre to cooperate more with the other sectors in the Culture Sector.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** seconded the remarks made by the Netherlands. It also expressed concern that paragraph 12 of the document stated that "the primary function of the World Heritage Centre is to assist the World Heritage Committee, notably by organizing its statutory meetings, developing and proposing policy on its behalf..." and stressed, with reference

to Article 14 of the *Convention*, that that policy was set by the Committee and not by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** also seconded the Netherlands and asked whether the Decision taken in Suzhou (Decision **28 COM 12**) would be taken into consideration in Document 33 C/5. It stressed that trainees and associate experts should not be executing any core functions and wondered why the number of consultants was not indicated in the report on the staffing situation. Furthermore, recalling that the Committee had requested in Suzhou that the External Auditor examine the recommendations of the previous audit held in 1997, the Delegation said that to its knowledge the decision had not yet at that late juncture been given to the External Auditor. Issues concerning oversight were the prerogative of the Director-General, but it hoped that as an External Auditor was currently auditing the Culture Sector, it would audit the management of the World Heritage Centre as well.

The Delegation of **Benin** subscribed to the decision to only take note of the document, all the more so as in addition to the observations formulated by the Netherlands, certain items dealt with in the draft decision had not yet been discussed by the Committee, as for example in paragraph 7 concerning the question of coordination between the different conventions relating to heritage. However, ideas were evoked in this document that held its attention. In particular, it wondered how, given its mission, the Committee could envisage contributing to the realisation of the Millennium Objectives for development and notably Objective 1 which aimed at « reducing extreme poverty and hunger », as is proposed at the end of paragraph 9 of the said document. With regard to the concern formulated by the United Kingdom in respect to the first sentence of paragraph 12, it would like to indicate that, in its opinion, the work of the World Heritage Centre was not reduced to the tasks of a secretariat, which it fulfilled satisfactorily, but also comprised the stimulus of action in the domain of heritage based on the *Operational Guidelines* given by the Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, responding to the questions raised, said that the follow-up to the 1997 audit would be on the agenda of the 29th session in 2005 and a full review would be submitted. In regard to the point made by the Delegation of Benin, he underlined that the concept of secretariat entailed more than providing for staff for the organization of statutory meetings in that it also meant providing professionals to implement the *Convention* and the Committee's decisions. He explained that the seven associate experts working in the various units were not executing primary functions, as they were supervised by the Chiefs of Unit. Furthermore, with regard to the Millennium Development Goals, the development of sustainable tourism at World Heritage properties was an important element in poverty alleviation.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** shared the concerns of the Netherlands and Saint Lucia and explained that the functions of the World Heritage Centre would be addressed in Document 33 C/5: the Director-General had taken note of the deliberations in Suzhou and, unlike the other sections of the Culture Sector, no budget or staff cuts were to be made to the World Heritage Centre.

Furthermore, coordination between the Centre and the Division of Cultural Heritage (CLT/CH) had already improved through regular meetings on key issues in which the Centre was

taking the lead. The Task Force on Afghanistan was a good example of clear and concrete coordination between operational aspects, overseen by CLT/CH, and the implementation of the *Convention* by the Centre. Another example of such action related to Bam (Iran), which had not been listed at the time of the earthquake: CLT/CH had been requested to intervene and the Centre had coordinated activities for the inscription of Bam on the World Heritage List. Action had been taken to ensure that there was no overlap or duplication of work and in future the operational activities of the World Heritage Centre would be reinforced by transferring staff from CLT/CH to the Centre.

He concluded by stating that the entire Culture Sector, including the World Heritage Centre, was currently being audited.

The **Rapporteur** stated that following the statement by the Netherlands, which had been supported by all Delegations that had taken the floor, the draft Decision would consist of only two paragraphs and that the operative paragraph would merely take note of the document.

The **Chairperson** declared that it was provisionally decided.

ITEM 9 COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.9*

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** introduced Documents *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9* and *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.9* and remarked that the concept of heritage had broadened in the past decade to acknowledge that cultural heritage encompassed not only monuments and sites, but also living culture and its innumerable forms of expression, including systems of knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, traditional craftsmanship, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, and oral traditions and expressions. It further stressed that, while the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage would only enter into force after the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, it was crucial to formulate a coherent and consistent set of heritage policies, taking into account the complementary scopes of the 1972 and 2003 Conventions. He also referred to the United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage (2002) and the thirtieth anniversary of the 1972 *Convention* which had generated reflection on the need to develop integrated approach for safeguarding tangible and intangible culture heritage; such concern among heritage professionals was also reflected at the ICOMOS 14th General Assembly in 2003, the ICOM General Conference in 2004 and the International Conference on the Safeguarding of Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Towards an Integrated Approach (Nara, Japan, 2004). He emphasized that, while the elements of the tangible and intangible heritage of communities and groups were often interdependent, intangible cultural heritage was as important as tangible heritage, and different activities were required to safeguard the tangible and intangible components of the cultural heritage. It was, however, necessary also to pay attention to the totality of the cultural heritage of peoples and communities to ensure that protection measures were not only adapted to each component of the heritage but also mutually supportive wherever possible.

While welcoming enhanced synergies and cooperation between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions, the Delegation of **New Zealand** sounded a note of caution about possible relationships between them, stating that New Zealand placed great emphasis on indigenous values as part of heritage. It proposed that the draft Decision be amended by inserting two new paragraphs, “Emphasizing Article 3 of the 2003 Intangible Convention which provides that such Convention shall not to be interpreted as altering the status or the level of obligations contracted under the 1972 *Convention*” and the second “Recognizing the primacy of the World Heritage *Convention* in relation to tangible cultural heritage and where the tangible cultural heritage has a clear link with intangible heritage which cannot be severed” after paragraph 3. The Delegation also suggested that the reference to the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* be deleted, given that the 2003 Convention was not yet in force. It then said that while there was no uncertainty as to legal relationships between the two Conventions, there was uncertainty as to the interpretation of links between tangible and intangible cultural heritage, as those links could not be separated particularly with regard to cultural landscapes. New Zealand was satisfied with the provision contained in the current *Operational Guidelines* concerning cultural landscape and stressed that the integrity of the *World Heritage Convention* had come to meet the needs of many peoples in diverse ways, but the complementary relationship of the 2003 Convention to the 1972 *Convention* should first be proven before any such relationship could be considered.

The Delegation of **Chile** welcomed the statement by the Assistant Director-General for Culture and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand. It then referred to the Siena workshops on the legal tools for World Heritage conservation on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention* in October 2002 and stated that there might be a need to establish a legal team in the Culture Sector of UNESCO to provide appropriate advice on scope of and relationships between different legal instruments, given the increasing number of Conventions and related programmes in the field of heritage protection.

The Delegation of **South Africa** emphasized the importance of good coordination between different international legal instruments and stated that tangible and intangible cultural heritage were inseparable particularly in the African context. It supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand regarding the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*, considering that the 2003 Convention was not yet in force.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that its country strongly supported environment-related conventions and programmes, with which good coordination should be ensured when implementing the 1972 *Convention*. It stressed the importance of harmonizing reporting systems between different international legal instruments at both national and international levels.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its appreciation for the work of the World Heritage Centre over the past 30 years and informed the Committee that China had deposited its instrument of ratification of the 2003 Convention on 2 December 2004. The Delegation also expressed its wish that there be coherent coordination between 1972 and 2003 Conventions within the Secretariat of UNESCO and above all within the Culture Sector. It supported the draft Decision with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The Delegation of **Lebanon**, after having congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the clarity of the documents presented, praised the Assistant Director-General for Culture for his presentation, and considered first and foremost that it was premature to examine the relationship, justifiably proposed, between the 1972 and the 2003 Conventions when the latter had not yet entered into force. In its opinion, it would be wise to establish an order of priority between the different conventions for which an examination of links with the 1972 *Convention* is envisaged, and notably the Second Protocol relating to the Hague Convention (1954), about which a document would be welcome. Secondly, it warned against the confusion that might occur regarding the notion of an « integrated approach » which could be interpreted as a merge of the conventions into one another, while the idea was to emphasize their complementarity.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the quality of the working documents and encouraged it to continue to enhance coordination between related Conventions, especially the Convention on Biological Diversity. It further endorsed the statement in the working document that the UNESCO Secretariat would continue to stimulate intellectual debate and reflection concerning issues that needed to be elaborated in order to ensure appropriate and coordinated safeguarding of cultural heritage in all its forms. It also referred to document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.9* concerning the Yamato Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage, which had been adopted by the participants in the International Conference in Nara (19-23 October 2004), held jointly by the Japanese Agency for Culture and UNESCO. It also highlighted the interdependence and the differences between tangible and intangible cultural heritage and pointed to the necessity to develop different safeguarding measures wherever appropriate. The Delegation then urged other States Parties to ratify the 2003 Convention as soon as possible and stressed the need to ensure good coordination between the two Conventions.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** welcomed the discussion on cooperation and coordination between UNESCO's heritage conventions, and referred to the conference organized by the Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO on Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage (World Heritage Papers 13, 2004), which had recommended closer cooperation between natural and cultural sites and between tangible and intangible cultural heritage. The Delegation also pointed out the need to consider possible links between the 1972 *Convention* and the Hague Convention with its two Protocols. Moreover, it supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The meeting rose at 1.10 pm

SIXTH MEETING

Wednesday, 8 December 2004, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its sixth meeting, the Committee concluded examination of the relationship between the World Heritage Convention and other relevant legal international instruments, both within and outside UNESCO. Besides further exploring the relationship between the World Heritage Convention and the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention – a majority of speakers expressed caution about forcing links between both conventions – the importance of other instruments, such as the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention, the 1970 Convention on the prohibition of illicit transfer and appropriation of cultural property, and the 2001 Underwater Cultural Heritage Convention was acknowledged. The Committee then examined a report on the performance indicators for World Heritage Programmes, and began considering the status of the World Heritage PACT.

ITEM 9 COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE (continued)

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.9*

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that both Conventions had different scopes to protect different manifestations of cultural heritage, which required different safeguarding measures. It further sounded a note of caution regarding the status of the 2003 Convention, as it had not yet come into force and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The Delegation of **Argentina** welcomed the statement by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, which had highlighted the aspiration of UNESCO to promote an integrated approach to safeguarding tangible and intangible cultural heritage and to provide a consistent set of heritage policies to States Parties to both the 1972 and 2003 Conventions. It stressed the importance of taking into account other environment-related conventions. The Delegation referred to the First Regional Technical Meeting, Qhapaq Ñan – Main Andean Road (Lima, Peru, 1-2 April 2003), which had recommended complementarity between the World Heritage nomination and other initiatives, programmes and technical and financial projects whose objectives were consistent with the nomination process. The Delegation considered necessary to “go beyond the spell” of the 2003 Convention, and stressed the importance of coordinating the implementation of the *Convention* with the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage and the 2003 Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage.

The Delegation of **Benin** retraced the history of the different conventions, highlighting the relationship that exists between them. The right of seniority that the 1972 *Convention* can claim should not deny the existence of other conventions, notably the most recent which concerns intangible heritage. Recalling the circumstances which preceded the birth of the latest

convention, that is the recognition in the 1990s that entire areas of heritage were not taken into account by the 1972 *Convention*, the Delegation considered that rejections of that convention would exclude a whole part of humanity for whom oral expression was more important than the written. UNESCO, which is at the origin of all these conventions, could not accept such an amputation without failing in its vocation as a universal organization. The Delegation therefore supported the idea of building bridges between the different conventions, not only because their absence often leads to confusion, but also because they are the expression of a recognition of cultural diversity.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that it was premature to consider relationships with the 2003 Convention. It stressed the importance of working closely with other conventions. In particular, it referred to the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Cultural Property, and to the Action Plan adopted by a meeting in Bogotá concerning the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. The Delegation proposed a new paragraph for inclusion in the draft Decision which reads “Invites States Parties to the *Convention* to consider acceding to other international, regional and sub-regional instruments for the protection of natural and cultural heritage”.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recalled that the World Heritage sites were places of outstanding universal value according to Articles 1 and 2 of the 1972 *Convention* and stated that values of places were attributed by people’s perception as to whether they were cultural or natural sites. In that connection it remarked that the ceremonial opening of Parliament at the World Heritage site of Westminster Palace might be considered suitable for proclamation as Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity and that, in relation to World Heritage sites, the division between tangible and intangible was unhelpful since all values attaching to a place depended on people's beliefs and perceptions. Furthermore, the development of the *World Heritage Convention* to its current state had been based on ever greater recognition of the range of values that could be attributed to a place; such values had to be securely attached to the place nominated for the World Heritage List and to be judged by the Committee to be of outstanding universal value. Moreover, as some places might be subject to more than one listing system, particularly in view of the implementation of the 1999 Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention, it would be for each State Party to consider holistic approaches to such sites within their own territory. It supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand, there being no need to revise the *Operational Guidelines* at that stage.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** welcomed the statement made by the Delegation of New Zealand and supported its proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand. It announced that the Lithuanian Government was in the final stages of ratifying the 2003 Convention and urged other States Parties to follow suit. It also stressed the importance of working closely with the Hague Convention and its Second Protocol.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** underscored the relevance of intangible cultural heritage particularly in the African context. It considered that further revision of the *Operational Guidelines* would be costly, time-consuming and unnecessary, and therefore supported the amendment proposed by New Zealand.

The Delegation of **India** appreciated the statements made by the Delegations of New Zealand and Benin and thanked the World Heritage Centre for producing a clear working document. It announced that, in view of its rich intangible cultural heritage, India would ratify the 2003 Convention within the following two months and would establish a national commission for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. In its view, it was premature to consider any revision of the *Operational Guidelines* as the 2003 Convention had not yet entered into force.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** supported the need to develop a holistic and consistent set of heritage policies but was surprised at the preoccupation expressed in the working document with the 2003 Convention which had not yet entered into force. It supported the statements by the Delegations of New Zealand, Benin and the United Kingdom and stressed the necessity to show sensitivity towards issues related to indigenous people. It then pointed to the relevance of undertaking research to explore appropriate safeguarding measures for tangible and intangible cultural heritage and welcomed the provision of case studies and best practices in that regard, which would provide for areas of complementarity. It also referred to the 1970 Convention and the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention as tools for enhancing the protection of properties on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand and stated that while coordination between different international legal instruments was constructive, it was premature to consider the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* at that stage.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the statement made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand. It remarked that the Committee should continue to discuss the relationship between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions and that it was not appropriate to consider the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* at that stage.

The Delegation of **Hungary** (Observer) thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture for his presentation, as well as the World Heritage Centre for the work accomplished relating to that item of the Agenda. It wished to draw attention to the importance of the International Conference on Integrated Approaches for the Safeguarding of Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage organised in Nara in October 2004, in that it offered the opportunity to engage for the first time an essential debate between the two major branches of heritage, opening the way to an indispensable holistic approach in this domain. From this point of view, the resulting Yamato Declaration, marked not the end, but the beginning of a dialogue, that must be conducted with a view to complementarity preconised by Lebanon and without paying attention, at least not immediately, to the consequences of this development to the *Operational Guidelines*. For these reasons, the Delegation of Hungary felt that Committee members should accept, in the draft decision, the thanks that it is appropriate to address to the organisers of this Conference, the Japanese Agency for Cultural Affairs and the different sectors of UNESCO.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** was concerned that the 1972 *Convention* was being in practice subordinated to the 2003 Convention, and stressed the inadequacy of putting at the same level an instrument which was 32 years old and ratified by 178 States and another not yet into force and ratified by 6 States. It expressed its concern about the

undue influence being exerted, by demanding coordination between the *Convention* and the 2003 Convention, on those States Parties which had not supported the 2003 Convention. It further supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The Delegation of **France** (Observer), fully supporting the Delegation of New Zealand, considered that interaction between the two conventions was evident, as illustrated in particular by criterion (vi) of the *Operational Guidelines*. However, the 2003 Convention had not yet entered into force and this appeared to be the appropriate time to decide the modalities to bring together the two conventions, which France judged advisable, whilst respecting the specificities of each one.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** supported the statements made by the Delegations of New Zealand, Chile, South Africa, Lebanon, the Netherlands, Colombia and the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Algeria** (Observer), after having thanked the Assistant Director-General of UNESCO for Culture for his presentation, wished to reassure those who felt that the 2003 Convention would perturb that of 1972. It felt that it was sufficient to strengthen the specific mission of the latter because with such rich and varied heritage, there was room for several conventions, and furthermore its country was working with others on the elaboration of an instrument on movable heritage.

IUCN noted that the working document focused on the cultural heritage and that there was a pressing need to strengthen cooperation with the natural heritage component, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on the Law of the Sea, and programmes such as the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme; coordination should not be an end in itself, but should build synergies and enhance conservation on the ground. Consideration should be given to the potential of joint project activities with MAB, which had 76 biosphere reserves that were wholly or partly World Heritage sites. Furthermore, closer cooperation between the *World Heritage Convention* and the Biodiversity Convention should be envisaged in regard to protected areas. It supported the statement by the Delegation of Norway concerning the need to harmonize reporting systems and underlined the importance of the cultural value of natural sites, which had been stressed by the Delegation of New Zealand. IUCN had recognized such a link and had established a “Task force on cultural and spiritual values of protected areas” and was ready to provide assistance in that regard.

ICOMOS appreciated UNESCO’s initiative to enhance coordination between the conventions. It pointed out that there were some inconsistencies in the Yamato Declaration, in particular in relation to its paragraph 10. Referring to the Charter of Venice, it also highlighted the richness of authenticity as discussed at the 1994 Nara meeting, but considered that the Yamato Declaration did not reflect the spirit of the original Nara meeting, which had considered authenticity in form and design, use and function. It felt that the world could not be split into two parts, tangible and intangible, and stated that the concept of authenticity might be relevant to holy places in that their values depended on links between the tangible and intangible.

ICCROM welcomed the intellectual debate on the relationship between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions and appreciated the statements made by the Delegations of New Zealand and Benin.

It emphasised that the ultimate goal for the international community was to protect heritage in its all forms and therefore it was necessary to consider how to use the existing Conventions and programmes to accomplish that task. It said that many examples of intangible cultural heritage depended on the place for its manifestation and that the concept of authenticity as indicated in the *Operational Guidelines* of the 1972 *Convention* might also be relevant to intangible cultural heritage. It also remarked that the question should be how to take advantage of existing listing system for the safeguarding of the heritage and how to ensure good coordination for nomination, evaluation, the implementation of safeguarding measures, management and monitoring.

The President of **Culture, Heritage and Development International** recalled that at its 28th session in Suzhou, the Committee requested that not only should links with the 1972 *Convention* and the other conventions be studied, but also with the UNESCO Recommendations relating to heritage. In particular, he cited the 1972 Recommendation, adopted at the same time as the *Convention*, and that of 1976 on the environment in urban milieu, adopted in Nairobi, which could, in his view, assist the States in the development of national policies for the implementation of the *Convention*, in conformity with the conclusions of the presentation on Period Reporting for Africa.

The **Assistant Director-General of UNESCO for Culture** wished first of all to emphasize that the document under discussion, prepared at short notice, could undeniably benefit from improvement, notably with regard to links between the 1972 *Convention* and other conventions, and also, as some had pointed out, the recommendations adopted in this domain. To respond to the rich interventions that had marked the debate, he felt it was necessary to recall that the concept of cultural heritage and in particular world heritage, was in full evolution. Doctrinal evolution, had led the Committee to pass from an approach essentially focused on the recognition of monuments to a more global approach, including for example cultural landscapes. Also, evolution at the anthropological and even philosophical levels, as the Delegation of Portugal had remarked, which permitted, thanks to work in social anthropology of scholars such as Claude Lévi-Strauss, consideration of the added value of intangible heritage which an object or a site represents, in other words, values that are associated with it, the different perceptions of heritage according to the regions of the world. The authors of the 1972 *Convention* certainly appreciated the importance of these elements, but it was impossible for them at the outstart to deal with the complexity of the question in one instrument. In this respect, the Assistant Director-General thanked the States Parties which had announced the ratification or the ratification process for the 2003 Convention, thus subscribing to the necessary evolution of international instruments perfectly illustrated by the 1954 Hague Convention. Because it was realized after 30 years, that it no longer responded to all the situations of war and destruction that the 1999 Protocol was adopted. And it was during the destruction of the Giant Bouddhas in Bamyan, in 2001, that the absence of UNESCO's own instrument permitting it to face such a situation became clear, as well as the need for links between the various conventions. This has partially been remedied with the adoption by the General Conference of the Declaration concerning the wilful destruction of cultural heritage. Work in this direction must continue, reflection, research and documentation of all the parameters of heritage conservation in all its dimensions, inspired both by the circumspection preconised by the Delegation of New Zealand and the wise reflections of the Delegation of Benin. Work to be carried out with concern for complementarity so as to avoid categorizing which would have a negative effect on the effectiveness of those working in the field for heritage protection.

The **Rapporteur**, referring to the written amendments proposed by the Delegations of New Zealand and Norway and the amendment proposed orally by the members of the Committee during the discussion, suggested that the draft Decision would begin with “Having examined Documents *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9* and *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.9*”. He then proposed to delete the original paragraph 1 as the reference to the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* would not be retained in paragraph 5, to make minor modifications to paragraph 2 to bring its content into line with the statement by the Delegation of Colombia, and to delete paragraph 3 which had been replaced by the revised first paragraph. He then said that five new paragraphs would be necessary to reflect the discussion under the item:

- (a) “Emphasizing Article 3a of the 2003 Convention which provides that such Convention shall not be interpreted as altering the statute or diminishing the level of protection under the 1972 *Convention* of World Heritage properties with which an item of the intangible cultural heritage is directly associated”;
- (b) “Recognizing the primacy of the *World Heritage Convention* in relation to tangible cultural heritage and where the tangible cultural heritage has a clear link with intangible heritage which cannot be severed”;
- (c) “Also recognizing the importance of ensuring an appropriate coordination between the Convention and the global environment related conventions and programmes and welcoming to this regard the decision of the Conference of States Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to promote a liaison group among the secretariats of the biodiversity conventions”;
- (d) “Noting the recent entry into force of the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in Case of Armed Conflict, and aware of the importance of identifying appropriate links between the Convention and such Protocols”;
- (e) “Invites States Parties to the Convention to consider acceding to other international, regional and sub-regional instruments for the protection of natural and cultural heritage”.

Furthermore, minor drafting changes would be made to paragraph 4 and the reference to the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* would be deleted from paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia**, seconded by the Delegation of **Benin**, wished to see the revised draft Decision in writing before approving it provisionally, particularly because of its length.

The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that the Bureau would review all the draft Decisions before they were finally adopted under item 17.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** felt that the revised draft Decision was too long, in view of its greater scope for ambiguity. It commended the Rapporteur for his skilful synopsis of the discussion.

The Delegation of **Colombia** wished to see the revised draft Decision in writing before adopting it and thanked the Rapporteur for his work.

The **Rapporteur** remarked that it was his duty to take into account all points raised by the Committee while it was up to its members to decide on the final form it wished to adopt.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** restated its wish to consider the draft Decision in writing, as particular issues seemed to have implications for the mandate of the Director-General.

The **Chairperson** adjourned the discussion on item 9.

ITEM 10 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMMES

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/10

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced item 10, recalling that the Committee had pointed, at its 27th session, to the need to establish performance indicators to measure the impact of World Heritage activities that were supported by the Committee, other partners and UNESCO itself. The Committee's advice, wishes and guidance in that regard would be most timely in apposite in that it would be an input to the performance indicator review process currently under way in the World Heritage Centre preparatory to the drafting of Document 33 C/5 and would ensure harmonization between the quantitative performance indicators preferred by the World Heritage Committee and the more qualitative performance indicators generally used by UNESCO. He then outlined the main points of Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/10*, stressing, among other aspects, the importance of including marine and environmental indicators.

Referring to the table on output and outcome indicators, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** considered that the table contained only outputs and no outcomes, and requested that the document be amended to include outcomes, to reflect, in particular, the Global Strategy and the Cairns Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed, noting that some of the outputs listed in the table seemed rather unrealistic and did not reflect the impact of the Committee's work in other areas.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, supporting the comments of the Delegations of Saint Lucia and the United Kingdom, thought that the words « intermediate outcome indicators » and "outcome indicators" should be replaced by short- and long-term indicators. Furthermore, on page 9, under the heading "Conservation", it proposed to include monitoring indicators, to determine to what extent the recommendations of the Committee had been applied.

ICCROM stated that the information contained in the document was a good start in addressing concerns previously raised. It suggested that the objectives of the 4Cs should be further refined in order to address some of the concerns expressed by previous speakers regarding

the establishment of clearer outputs and outcomes. That could be achieved by breaking down overall objectives into sub-objectives, which would be a means of measuring achievements.

IUCN agreed with the Delegation of United Kingdom and pointed to the need for further work on indicators and the impact of other areas of work under the Convention.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, while agreeing with ICCROM, said that the table attempted to demonstrate that each indicator had an objective of its own. He acknowledged that it might be necessary to further define the outcomes and outputs and stressing the relevance of the time factor, said that outputs measured short-term, while outcomes measured long-term objectives. He called for the Committee's views on the subject in order to further refine the document and optimize the requirements expressed by the Committee and the Advisory Bodies.

The **Rapporteur** said that he had received no written or oral amendments to the draft Decision proposed in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/10*, but two introductory paragraphs had to be added to the draft Decision, one recalling that the Committee had examined the document and another recalling the Committee's previous decisions on the item. It was also necessary to add a new paragraph 5 referring to the table in Document *WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/10* and, should that table be approved by the Committee, it should also be included in the decision. Furthermore, the reference in parentheses to the Advisory Bodies in paragraph 6 was redundant and should be deleted.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the draft Decision should be shortened and that States Parties should be given the opportunity to submit comments to the World Heritage Centre before a revised document was drawn up for submission to the Committee at its 29th session in July 2005.

The Delegation of **Egypt** referred to paragraph 6 and noted that in addition to deleting the name of each Advisory Body, the adjective "relevant" before States Parties should also be deleted.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 12 WORLD HERITAGE PARTNERSHIPS INITIATIVE: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND PROGRESS REPORT

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/12
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/12.Corr*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, introducing the item, explained that the World Heritage Centre applied the existing UNESCO regulatory framework for working with various partners. As proposals by the Director-General for the selection of private sector partners in the Member States had not yet been considered by the Executive Board, the World Heritage Centre could not yet propose new guidelines for the partnerships initiative (PACT). He hoped that it would be possible to submit new guidelines for the PACT initiative to the Committee at its

29th session in 2005, and would welcome the Committee's suggestions as to the content of the guidelines.

The partnerships initiative, which had been welcomed by the Committee in 2002, originated in efforts to mainstream World Heritage into the development process and had three main lines of emphasis or "pillars": (i) UNESCO-wide and World Heritage Centre-specific bilateral agreements with States Parties, which had generated substantial extra resources for World Heritage conservation; (ii) arrangements with multilateral organizations such as the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank and Japan Bank for International Cooperation; and (iii) the Partnerships for Conservation (PACT) initiative, which aimed specifically to encourage involvement by private sector organizations in World Heritage conservation. The working document provided an overview of activity in the past two years. Although it showed an encouraging degree of success, it was clear that much remained to be done. The document also proposed performance indicators for the initiative, which would be further refined in line with those for World Heritage programmes discussed under item 10.

The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the World Heritage Centre's efforts to raise funds outside of the UNESCO regular programme, but it urged caution and stressed the need to take into consideration issues such as the cost effectiveness of the initiative.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for his report and indicated interest in the actual and potential partners included. However, it was concerned that the regulatory framework requested in the Budapest decision had still not been provided. It called for those guidelines to be submitted to the Committee at its 29th session in 2005. If the UNESCO framework was being used, the Committee needed to be sure that it was appropriately adapted to the World Heritage context. There was a very strong and sensitive link to *Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem*, particularly where tourism operators were concerned. It was important to be transparent about the amount of money raised and the proportion thereof that had been paid into the World Heritage Fund. It requested an amendment to the draft Decision to include a reference to Decision **26 COM 17.3** in paragraph 3 regarding the regulatory framework, to paragraph 5, indicating that funds generated through the World Heritage Partnerships Initiative should be channelled, to the extent possible, through the World Heritage Fund; and to paragraph 6, requesting the Director-General to ensure that the overheads charged on financial contributions accruing from partnerships were allocated in support of the World Heritage Centre. Those amendments were essential to enable the Committee to evaluate the experimental phase of the initiative at its 30th session in 2006.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Centre for the information on bilateral agreements contained in Annex 1 to the working document and requested that similar information be provided in the future on agreements with NGOs and private sector partners. It was pleased to announce that the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage outlined in Annex 1 had been extended for a further four years.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the effort to involve the private sector in promoting sustainable action to safeguard World Heritage sites. It was grateful to the donors who had already done so and would welcome an overview of existing agreements in future documents.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that it would be important to find a way of publicly acknowledging the contributions that donors had made, perhaps through a roll of honour; it stressed the need for partners wishing to enter into partnership with the World Heritage Centre to do so in consultation with the Centre under a contractual arrangement, to ensure optimum guarantees on both sides. It supported the Delegation of Saint Lucia in calling for greater clarity as to the substance of the agreements concluded.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** supported the observations of the Delegation of Saint Lucia and emphasized the need for primacy of consideration to be given to local populations at and around sites. Partnerships concluded at the international level should always involve local offices and communities to ensure that benefits at site level were taken fully into account.

The **World Monuments Fund** (WMF) said that while it did not provide direct financial support to the World Heritage Centre, it did feel a responsibility to support action at World Heritage sites in terms of project development, execution and sustainability. WMF would submit an annual report on such activities to the World Heritage Centre by March so that it would be ready in English and in French for the session of the Committee, and it would do so as from 2005.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted the Committee's concerns and helpful suggestions and said that the World Heritage Centre would work with UNESCO colleagues to draft a regulatory framework for consideration at Durban in 2005 and provide information on donations to the Fund and the use of overheads. No difficulties had been encountered in the use of the Emblem but it could become an issue as partnerships expanded, particular vigilance would be exercised in dealing with such requests, as the PACT initiative sought to nurture long-term partnerships for conservation. As to public acknowledgement of partnerships, the web tool was being designed to give due publicity to the contributions of the various partners. He thanked WMF for its offer to produce a report on its activities at World Heritage sites and suggested that it could be submitted to the Committee as an information document.

The **Rapporteur** noted the oral amendments to the draft Decision, adding that two introductory paragraphs would be inserted to inform future readers of the relevant working document and previous decisions on the issue.

Referring to the draft Decision, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it had specifically requested that the Centre provide a set of guidelines and principles specifically referring to the development of partnerships for consideration, adoption and incorporation into the Committee's *Guidelines and Principles on the use of the World Heritage Emblem*. It had also requested that the need to provide information on the use of overheads in line with Decision **26 COM 17** be specifically mentioned in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recalled that it had asked for information to be provided to future Committees on the nature, content and form of private sector partnerships.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the request would be included in the Summary Record of the discussion.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that written agreements between the World Heritage Centre and donors should include specific provisions about the need for a donor or partner to consult the World Heritage Centre on its own proposals relating to the use of the Emblem. Recalling its proposal that partners be publicly thanked, it suggested that an annual ceremony might be held at which certificates of appreciation were awarded.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Thursday, 9 December 2004, at 9.50 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its seventh meeting, after examining and provisionally adopting the draft Decisions concerning the relationship between the World Heritage Convention and other relevant legal international instruments, and the status of the World Heritage partnerships Initiative (PACT), the Committee reviewed the initiative to publish a compilation of World Heritage Basic Texts and a report on the use of the World Heritage Emblem. On the first topic, the main issues of debate were the contents of such compilation –with a majority of members wishing to include only the statutory texts–, its purpose, the languages in which it was to be published and the resources for its funding. On the Emblem, the main issues of the debate were the exact extend of protection of the Emblem protected –with a majority of members confirming that no new logo was being created - and the degree of involvement by WIPO.

ITEM 9 COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN THE UNESCO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING HERITAGE (continued)

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/9
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/INF.9
Revised Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 9*

At the invitation of the Chairperson, the **Rapporteur** introduced the revised draft Decision on item 9.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether further changes could be made to the amendment that it had originally proposed.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the discussion under item 9 had not been closed but merely adjourned.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that the revised draft Decision be examined paragraph by paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 1 to 4 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** queried the use of “statute” in paragraph 4 and suggested that “status” might be more appropriate.

The **Rapporteur** explained that, although he agreed in that “status” was the correct term, “statute” was used in the printed version of the text of the 2003 Convention. He then read out paragraph 5 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that paragraphs 4 and 5 dealt with the same point and therefore proposed that paragraph 5 be replaced by “Taking into account the respective scope of application of heritage related conventions”, stating that paragraph 4 should be retained as it would have more relevance to the cooperation required between the 1972 and the 2003 conventions.

The **Rapporteur** said that the Committee should choose between the proposal made by the Delegation of New Zealand and that made by the Delegation of Japan, given that they were substantially different.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegations of **Saint Lucia**, **Portugal** and **Norway**, said that the text proposed by the Delegation of Japan could be inserted as a separate paragraph, since it provided new substance, but that paragraph 5 based on the proposal made by the Delegation of New Zealand should be retained.

The Delegation of **Japan** felt that there was no need for both paragraphs 4 and 5 but it accepted the position of the majority.

The **Rapporteur** stated that the position of the majority was to insert the text proposed by the Delegation of Japan between paragraphs 4 and 5. It then read out paragraph 6 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that the word “decision” in line 3 of paragraph 6 should be clearly referenced and that “Conference of States Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity” should be deleted.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the paragraph should start with “welcomes” to be followed by “also recognizing” or “acknowledges”. It also pointed out that “environmental” should be replaced by “environment-related” and that “programmes” should be used instead of “programs”. The Delegation also remarked that as there was only one Convention on Biological Diversity, the phrase after “liaison group” should be “... the conventions related to biodiversity conservation”.

The **Rapporteur** proposed to amend the text after “welcoming” to read “... the initiative to promote a liaison group ...”. He then read out paragraphs 7 and 8 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that paragraph 8 should refer specifically to the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and that “for” in the second line of the paragraph should be replaced by “related to”.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recalled that there had been no consensus at the previous day’s meeting to include the issues referred to in paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, which had proposed the text in question, said that only the Delegation of Saint Lucia had commented on its proposal. The text itself had not been discussed, but the Committee had discussed a large number of heritage-related conventions.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** felt that the discussion should not be reopened at that juncture.

The **Rapporteur** acknowledging the assent of the Delegation of the United Kingdom to the consensus on paragraph 8, read out paragraph 9 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Portugal**, sought clarification on the mandate of the Director-General in relation to paragraph 9, wondering what it meant.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the points raised by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and requested that “nomination” be deleted from the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Norway** requested that “cultural heritage” be replaced by “heritage” in the third line.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, while supporting the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway, suggested that “cultural heritage” be replaced by “cultural and natural heritage”.

The Delegation of **Benin**, in agreeing to the need to improve the wording of this paragraph of the draft decision, observed that the assistance in question already existed and that it only required including it in the field of coordination envisaged.

The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that the idea behind the paragraph was to emphasize the need for cooperation between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions and felt that the addition of “wherever there is a link between the two” would give the requisite effect.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment to paragraph 9.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that the amendment was very wordy and cumbersome.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the paragraph should end after “ ... when assisting States Parties”, as the phrase covered the activities listed subsequently in the text.

The Delegation of **Benin** thought that one could clarify the misunderstanding by replacing, in paragraph 9, the expression « put on the Tentative List » by « elaboration of the Tentative List », it being understood that the inclusion of properties on this list was not the province of the Director-General.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that “elaboration of tentative lists” would be more appropriate.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed further amending the text to read “ ... when assisting States Parties in implementing the Conventions”.

The **Rapporteur** then read out paragraph 10 of the revised draft Decision, which had been amended to reflect the consensus on the removal of the reference to the revision of the *Operation Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested amending the text at the end of the second line to read “the tangible and intangible”.

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed a further amendment to paragraph 10 on the basis of the statement by the Delegation of Egypt to read “tangible cultural and natural heritage and intangible heritage”.

La délégation du **Bénin** souhaite savoir si le patrimoine naturel aussi est concerné par le lien avec le patrimoine immatériel ou si seul le patrimoine culturel est en cause.

The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that intangible heritage could also be closely related to natural heritage.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that “cultural” be deleted to leave only “tangible and intangible heritage”.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision therefore provisionally adopted as amended.

ITEM 12 WORLD HERITAGE PARTNERSHIPS INITIATIVE: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND PROGRESS REPORT (continued)

Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/12

Revised Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 12

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 1 to 5 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the idea of an annual ceremony was just one means of thanking donors and partners. It proposed that paragraph 5 be reworded to begin with a suggestion that the Director of the World Heritage Centre should promote public awareness of World Heritage PACT partnerships.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported Egypt, commenting that it was important to thank partners publicly.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** wondered how such recognition ceremonies would be funded.

The **Chairperson** said that as contributions were often in kind as well as cash, it was not inconceivable that a partner might wish to sponsor such events.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** wished to avoid placing any extra burden on the budget. Partners could be thanked as part of the Partners Day held at the Committee’s annual meeting, or other similar initiatives that did not require any additional funding.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that a measure of flexibility was highly desirable and, accordingly, the draft Decision should refer to the need to develop mechanisms for acknowledging partners' contributions, given the variety of ways in which that could be done.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 6 and 7.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** considered that paragraph 7 should include a precise reference to the need for the Committee to consider and adopt a regulatory framework for the initiative, including partner selection, and be informed of all matters outstanding under Decision **26 COM 17**.

The Delegation of **Norway** cautioned against making the draft Decision too detailed.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed to submit a working document containing a draft regulatory framework and an information document on the performance of PACT to the Committee in 2005. An overall evaluation of the initiative would then be made in 2006.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, seconded by the Delegation of **Chile**, stressed that the draft Decision should reflect the need for people, particularly in developing countries, to be sensitized to and involved wherever possible in activities to safeguard World Heritage properties.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed that such involvement was desirable; however, it entailed a level of micromanagement that was not appropriate for the World Heritage Centre. It urged against burdening the World Heritage Centre with a responsibility that it could not assuredly deliver.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by the Delegations of **Portugal**, **New Zealand** and **Norway**, agreed that it was desirable to involve local people but stressed that the draft Decision under consideration was not the appropriate medium for doing so.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, seconded by the Delegation of **Nigeria**, insisted that the involvement of local people should be addressed in the draft Decision and proposed the following text: *"Asks the Director of the World Heritage Centre to ensure involvement of local populations, whenever possible, in the implementation of PACT projects"*.

The **Rapporteur** reworded as follows: *"Recognizes the importance of fully involving local populations, whenever appropriate, in the implementation of PACT projects."*

The **Chairperson** declared the decision therefore provisionally adopted, as amended.

ITEM 13 PUBLICATIONS PLANS (INCLUDING BUDGETED PROPOSALS) FOR A COMPILATION OF WORLD HERITAGE BASIC TEXTS, GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS FOR THE PROTECTION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES THAT WOULD SUPPLEMENT THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES AND A HANDBOOK ON THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the item and highlighted the expediency of having all of the World Heritage texts in a single document, following the UNESCO Basic Texts form. The project had been estimated at US\$13,000, for a publication in glossy format, and costs would be met from activities that had been withdrawn. He also referred to the importance of financing the publication of conservation in the buffer zones prepared by an expert group chaired by Ms. Christine Cameron, which was preliminarily budgeted at US\$ 20,000. Extrabudgetary funds could be sought for this last purpose.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the proposal to make the Committee's work more efficient, but it did not think that a mission statement was necessary since the Committee's mission was set out clearly in the *Convention*. It was much concerned that the World Heritage Papers Series No. 12 (The State of World Heritage in Asia-Pacific Region – 2003) contained excerpts from *Operational Guidelines* that the States Parties had never seen before, and stressed that publications issued by the World Heritage Centre should use only official texts adopted by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** noted that the consolidated document referred to by the Director of the World Heritage Centre would be most welcome, but wondered how it could be used. He stressed the need to include photographs and illustrations in order to highlight the eminence of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Benin**, who found the initiative excellent, requested whether it would be possible, to avoid all confusion with other conventions, to indicate that it referred to the 1972 Convention. It furthermore wished to speak of the « Manual of the *World Heritage Convention* » and the inclusion in this Manual of the World Heritage List, although it did not know how it could be updated as the publication would not be annual.

The Delegation of **Portugal** recognized the usefulness of the handbook and stressed the need to translate it into other languages such as Portuguese, even though that would have financial implications. It then asked how the World Heritage Papers Series was distributed and who was entitled to receive it.

Referring to the comments by the Delegation of Benin, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** considered that the idea of a basic texts manual that would include the updated World Heritage List have serious financial implications, since it would required -as the own Delegation of Benin had recognized- to publish the manual every year. It added that the World Heritage Fund should not be used to finance such an initiative and that the World Heritage Centre should seek extrabudgetary funding and be guided by the need to reduce cost. It concurred with the Delegation of the United Kingdom on the use of excerpts from yet unapproved *Operational Guidelines*. It then pointed out that the World Heritage Centre should give priority to the

publication of statutory documents such as the reports of the Committee's 6th extraordinary session and 27th session, which had not yet been published.

The Delegation of **Colombia** welcomed the initiative to publish a handbook and expressed concern about the updating of the List of World Heritage properties and list of States Parties if they were to be included in the publication. It suggested that the handbook be published in a binder with easily removable sections to facilitate its updating and that an interactive CD-ROM be produced in several languages. The table of contents and the detailed budget should be included in paragraph 4 of the draft Decision. It also considered essential the publication of the "Cameron Group" referred to by the Director of the World Heritage Centre in his introduction.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that the publication proposed represented an important step for the Committee. It wondered, though, how such publication could be funded and to whom the first 2000 copies would be distributed. It then said that it was premature to discuss future editions and it pointed out that the documents in question were available on the World Heritage Centre's website.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the original suggestion in 2001 was that the compilation of World Heritage basic texts should include a mission statement written by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and a users' guide and that extrabudgetary funding should be used to finance its publication. In its opinion, regional periodic reports should be included, photographs should be used to make it more attractive, a print run of 1,000 copies in English would be insufficient for distribution to all States Parties and site managers, and a CD-ROM should be provided with the book. The book should offer more than the current World Heritage Centre's website, otherwise its publication would be pointless.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it was easy to compile such a publication, since the texts already existed, and that a format such as the *UNESCO Basic Texts* was appropriate and would reduce the costs. It should be designed as a document that should last for more than one year and therefore should not include the List of World Heritage properties or the list of States Parties. The objective was to produce a tool for the Committee and the States Parties, not a promotion tool.

The Delegation of **Chile** applauded the initiative unreservedly and emphasized the need to translate the publications into Spanish and to include international legal texts related to the 1972 *Convention*. An inexpensive and simple publication should be produced as soon as possible based on the *UNESCO Basic Texts*.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** welcomed the initiative and stressed the importance of translating it into Arabic. Should funding for translation be an obstacle, the Regional Groups should be approached for assistance. All language versions should be published at the same time.

The Delegation of **South Africa** welcomed the initiative and agreed with most of the points already raised. It did not recommend an introduction by the Chairperson of the Committee because of the revolving nature of the chairmanship the Committee, and pointed out that there was no introduction to the *UNESCO Basic Texts*.

The Delegation of **China** supported the proposal, which would be an asset in disseminating information on World Heritage protection and management. The compilation was meant for heritage professionals, while a handbook would be designed for site managers, having regard, in particular, to paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the proposed table of contents. Both publications should be translated into Chinese.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the initiative, which would provide key tools for all those who had to implement the *World Heritage Convention*. It stressed the importance of a Spanish-language version and called on the World Heritage Centre to seek extrabudgetary funds to ensure that those tools were available in all languages.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, considering that the best was the enemy of the good, said that the *Operational Guidelines* were sufficient and texts needing annual updating should not be included and ring binders should be avoided owing to the high costs involved. *Operational Guidelines* should not be changed every year. The World Heritage Centre should aim to produce an affordable and functional publication that would be valid for at least five years.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that in 2001 there were not many Internet users and not many World Heritage documents could be found on the Internet, but the situation had changed. An effort should be made to target a wider public, including site managers. A mission statement would be necessary as a key to the document, which would be used by field workers and PACT partners.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by the Delegations of **Colombia** and **Lebanon**, stressed that no mission statement or introduction were necessary and called for a vote on the issue.

The Delegation of **Hungary** (Observer) thought that a distinction had to be made between the publication containing the basic texts which was already agreed upon, and the manual designed to assist the members and the officers of the Committee to carry out their functions. It moreover wished to see in the annexes of the *Operational Guidelines* the former glossary updated as well as the *Venice Charter* and the *Nara Declaration*.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** said that an electronic version of the publication should be provided to the National Commissions to facilitate its translation into national languages.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** perceived a general consensus on the need for a simple text in the *UNESCO Basic Texts* style for use as a consultation tool. Financial resources could be found easily and a higher print run in French and English would have cost implications, but would be worthwhile. Partners would be sought for translation into the other official languages of UNESCO, although that would be a more lengthy process. As an updated List of World Heritage properties and the Brief Descriptions were distributed free of charge every year, they would not be included in the publication. He supported the idea of producing a CD-ROM. Further details on the publication “Principles for the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and interventions situated within their buffer zone” could be submitted to the Committee at its 29th session, although it might add to the agenda.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated its concern about the use of excerpts from the still unapproved *Operational Guidelines* in the World Heritage Papers Series No. 12.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that there had been a mistake and that a *corrigendum* would be issued.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the error had occurred not only on page 53 but also on page 57 of the World Heritage Papers Series No. 12, and wondered whether there were not other instances of material published from documents that had not been approved by the Committee.

The **Rapporteur**, referring to the draft Decision, said that no written amendment had been received, but several oral amendments had been made. Paragraph 2 would be amended to include the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Portugal and Benin; paragraph 3 should reflect the same recommendation made by the Delegation of Benin; paragraph 4 should reflect the proposal by the Delegation of Portugal concerning different language versions; and paragraph 4 should read as follows: “*Further requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to:*

- (a) *develop as part of the World Heritage Papers Series a publication on “Principles for the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and interventions situated within their buffer zone” and to seek extrabudgetary funding for the production of this publication;*
- (b) *submit at its 29th Session in Durban in 2005 an information document with the table of contents and detailed budget.”*

He also proposed to insert a new paragraph between paragraphs 2 and 3 as follows: “*Recognizes the importance of seeking extrabudgetary funding to ensure the translation into other languages.*”

The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification on the timeframe and budget, having understood that funds could be obtained after February.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the Rapporteur’s summing-up and stressed that what really mattered was not that the Director of the Centre should report on the budget for the publications but that he should find the necessary funds.

The Delegation of **Colombia** requested that the World Heritage Centre report on extrabudgetary funding for other publications since there were differences between the various publications. It expressed concern about the workload of the 29th session and did not recommend that any new items be placed on the agenda. It concluded by asking whether it would be easy to gather the required information.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reassured the Delegation of Colombia that it would not be a difficult matter.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with the Rapporteur's proposal concerning extrabudgetary funds and the insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph 2.

The **Rapporteur** suggested deleting paragraph 3 and referring to an information document to avoid adding to the agenda of the 29th session of the Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the Handbook would be ready as soon as the *Operational Guidelines* were approved.

The Delegation of **Egypt** insisted on an introduction to explain the purpose of the publication and its use.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested as a compromise a one-page introductory text.

The **Chairperson** declared the draft Decision therefore provisionally adopted, as amended.

ITEM 14 REPORT ON THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

*Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/14
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/14 Corr*

Introducing the item, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** summarized the origins and content of the Document, referring in particular to the Committee's discussions at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002) and Decision **26 COM 15** inviting the Director-General to take the necessary actions to ensure the legal protection of the World Heritage Emblem and "World Heritage" name and derivatives. He then explained the action taken by the World Heritage Centre to protect the World Heritage Emblem.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, noting that the World Heritage logo and the UNESCO logo were being used together, sought clarification concerning the Emblem that had been communicated to the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), inasmuch as the Committee had wanted its logo, over which it had authority, to be separate from the UNESCO logo, over which the Executive Board had authority. It asked whether the two logos together, which constituted a new emblem, was legally binding, and if so, whether protection would be afforded if the World Heritage Emblem were used alone.

The Delegation of **Japan** sought clarification as to whether States Parties seeking authorization to use the World Heritage Emblem were automatically entitled to use the UNESCO Emblem as well, especially as use of the UNESCO Emblem was governed by particular rules.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether WIPO and by extension States Parties to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property had been informed of the right of States Parties to substitute the words "Patrimonio Mundial" around the Emblem with equivalent words in their own language and whether the Emblem showing those equivalent words would be afforded protection

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** shared the concerns about protection afforded by the Emblem and asked for clarification on the methods used to deal with requests for authorization to use the World Heritage Emblem, as the table in the working document showed some inconsistency in the way in which they were handled.

The Delegation of **Benin**, subscribing to the observations of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, questioned the use of wording such as "transmitted" or "being evaluated" which indicated the follow-up accorded to the use of the World Heritage emblem in the table of the document being examined. Supporting the observations made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, it furthermore wished to know if the UNESCO Emblem and that of World Heritage were indissociable and their protection shared or whether the protection of the World Heritage Emblem was exclusive.

Also reflecting on the observations of the Delegation of Saint Lucia, the Delegations of **India** and **Norway** sought clarification as to whether the Emblem communicated to WIPO did constitute a new emblem, and if so, whether jurisdiction over its use lay with the Committee alone or was shared with UNESCO.

Following one comment of the Delegation of Egypt, the Observer Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification in respect of the text surrounding the World Heritage Emblem for countries with more than one official language, neither of which was English or French.

The **Chairperson** commented that South Africa had 11 official languages and asked whether it would be reasonable to include all of them in the registration process.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** said that Canada had trademarked the World Heritage Emblem alone and wondered whether the association created by the World Heritage Emblem and the UNESCO Emblem should also be trademarked. It supported the views expressed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom about the handling of requests for use of the Emblem, citing a case in Canada in which the national authorities had not seen the request, and suggested that the World Heritage Centre should systematically use the nominated World Heritage contact points for such issues.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** sought legal advice as to whether tourism organizations engaged in cultural tourism required special clearance from the World Heritage Centre to operate in World Heritage properties. More generally, it also sought legal advice on whether the use of the Emblem required clearance by the World Heritage Centre or by UNESCO.

Responding to the questions raised, the **Legal Adviser** said that the Committee's Guidelines and Principles on the use of the World Heritage Emblem set out the conditions under which the World Heritage Emblem could be used and the procedures to be followed in seeking authorization were included in Annex 3 to the *Operational Guidelines* currently in force.

WIPO operated an elaborate system of protection and it included a protocol covering flags and emblems of States and international organizations. States Parties to the Paris Convention were obliged to take steps to protect such emblems upon receipt of notification of registration by WIPO. The UNESCO Emblem had been registered and protected many years ago and the governing bodies of UNESCO had delegated authority to the Director-General in respect of

requests to use it for meetings, audiovisual products and non-monetary prizes. Other uses were governed by the Executive Board.

In regard to the World Heritage Emblem, the World Heritage Centre had sent WIPO a document showing the two Emblems side by side and they had been registered and communicated by WIPO as such. As it had not been obvious whether the World Heritage Emblem was afforded protection individually, the question had been put to WIPO but no clear answer had been received. It was therefore necessary to inform WIPO of the Committee's original intention to have the World Heritage Emblem protected separately so that remedial action could be taken to enable States Parties to the Paris Convention to provide effective protection for the Emblem. Moreover, protection would be afforded only to the World Heritage symbol and the text in the languages actually communicated to and notified by WIPO.

All tourism organizations wishing to use either the World Heritage or the UNESCO Emblem were required to request permission to do so and were bound by the laws of the country concerned in respect of rights to visit a particular property and by the respective guidelines governing the use of the Emblems. Furthermore, permission to use the World Heritage Emblem did not confer any right to use the UNESCO Emblem.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** acknowledged that the process to protect the World Heritage Emblem was not yet complete, since the request to WIPO had not been properly done. He undertook to communicate to WIPO a new request showing the World Heritage Emblem alone, stressing that it had not been the intention of the World Heritage Centre to create a new emblem. The World Heritage Centre was empowered to authorize use of the World Heritage Emblem, notably for international projects involving several properties and it did so in strict compliance with the established guidelines. National projects to promote inscribed World Heritage properties were encouraged and did not necessarily require specific authorization.

The guidelines and principles for the authorization of use of the World Heritage Emblem might require review in relation to the development of partnerships to ensure consistent application of the regulatory framework. The World Heritage Centre had received only 14 replies to a circular letter requesting States Parties to nominate focal points for issues relating to the use of the Emblem. Where no focal point had been nominated, the World Heritage Centre routinely wrote to the National Commission of the country concerned.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that if, as it had understood, languages other than French, English and Spanish would not be protected, States Parties then might be encouraged to communicate the desired translation(s) of the terms "World Heritage" to the World Heritage Centre for transmission to WIPO.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, turning to the list of requests for authorization to use the Emblem, was of the view that such requests should be referred to the States Parties. On the issue of the protection of the Emblem, it considered that the graphic image, with or without surrounding words, should be protected.

The Delegation of **Japan** sought clarification regarding to whom States Parties wishing to use both the UNESCO and World Heritage Emblems should apply.

In replying to the observations of the Delegations of Egypt and the United Kingdom, the **Legal Adviser** replied that if the Committee wished to permit languages to be written around the logo, it had to decide how many languages there could be. The best course might be for the World Heritage Centre to seek to register only the graphic image thus ensuring flexibility by allowing States Parties to add text in languages as they wished. He did warn, however, that only the graphics, and not the words, would in that case be protected. The Committee would also have flexibility to decide, through guidelines, which and how many languages could be used.

Responding to the question raised by the Delegation of Japan, the **Legal Adviser** said that the governing bodies of UNESCO had delegated authority to the Director-General to authorize use of the UNESCO Emblem for three purposes only. All other requests had to be submitted to the governing bodies as required. The National Commissions had no right to authorize third parties to use the UNESCO Emblem.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Legal Adviser for their explanations. It accepted that a mistake had been made in communicating two Emblems together to WIPO. In its view, the Committee should agree to the Director's suggestion of taking immediate corrective action along the lines recommended by the Legal Adviser, namely to protect only the graphic image thereby leaving a margin of flexibility to States Parties. The draft Decision should be amended, urging the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Legal Adviser, to amend the initial communication to WIPO to ensure protection of the World Heritage Emblem immediately, with or without written text, and to report on the matter to the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session.

The **Chairperson** urged caution in the drafting of any amendments to the draft Decision in view of the work that remained to be done with WIPO.

The **Legal Adviser**, recalling that the Committee had originally wanted the logo to be surrounded by text, suggested that the World Heritage Centre be requested to ensure that the graphic image was communicated to WIPO together with an indication that the words "World Heritage" in any language were to be registered in association with the graphic image to constitute the Emblem. If WIPO did not accept that proposal, then protection of the graphic image could be sought.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended that advice and asked that a report be presented to the Committee at its 29th session. It also requested the insertion in the draft Decision of a paragraph regretting the fact that the World Heritage Emblem was not yet protected.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested that the draft Decision be further amended to express the Committee's concern at the inconsistency in handling of requests to authorize use of the Emblem and its will that in future requests be forwarded to the State Party concerned.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

EIGHTH MEETING

Thursday, 9 December 2004, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its eight meeting, after examining and provisionally adopting the draft Decision concerning the protection of the World Heritage Emblem, the Committee considered the proposals by New Zealand to increase the voting procedures at the General Assembly for the election of the members of the Committee. Such proposals were unanimously supported. At the same time, many delegations stressed the need not to impinge upon the respect for geographical representation in the composition of the Committee.

ITEM 14 REPORT ON THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM (continued)

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/14
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/14 Corr.
Revised draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 14*

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 1 to 4 of the revised draft Decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Committee** said that “alone” should be added after “protected” in paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that “is not yet protected” should be replaced by “was not protected as requested”, stressing that the World Heritage Committee had never wanted its emblem to be protected in association with another.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested that reference be made to previous decisions on the issue and that paragraph 4 be placed before paragraph 3, since it was more important.

The **Rapporteur** said that Decision **26 COM 15** was the relevant decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the term “annual report” used in the working document implied annual examination by the Committee, which was not the case, and felt that “annual” should be deleted.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commented that the reference to an annual report on use of the emblem had to be retained in view of the provision to that effect in the guidelines.

The **Rapporteur** then read out paragraph 5 and suggested deleting the words “in particular as regards the use of any language” from paragraph 5(b).

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the use of “optionally and to the extent possible” added confusion to what WIPO was to be asked to do and felt that “words surrounding the graphics” should be used in paragraph 5(a) and (b).

The Delegation of **Norway**, referring to paragraph 5(b), believed that the reference to the Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem should be removed, as those Guidelines allowed States Parties to use their own language instead of the Spanish words “Patrimonio Mundial”, the French and English being compulsory.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 6 of the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** shared the concerns expressed in paragraph 6 but considered the wording too strong.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commented that the wording reflected its sentiments but consented to accept modifications if the Committee so wished. In its view paragraphs 3 and 6 should go together.

The **Rapporteur** proposed to change “the inconsistency” to “some inconsistencies” to temper the text in response to the point raised by the Delegation of India. He then read out paragraph 7.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted as amended

ITEM 15 NEW VOTING MECHANISM FOR THE ELECTION OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/15

The Delegation of **New Zealand**, supported by the Delegation of **Egypt**, said that its country was committed to greater transparency in the work of the World Heritage Committee. The reforms adopted at the last General Assembly had improved the election process but greater efficiency in the conduct of elections was still needed, as borne out by the fact that at the last election of new Committee members it took almost four hours to conduct the ballot and to count the votes, while interpreters were not available and small delegations could not participate simultaneously in the election process and in concurrent meetings of Commission IV of the General Conference. Clarity was therefore required as to the exact timing and schedule of the elections. It requested that its suggestions be reflected in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of New Zealand about the length and complexity of the voting procedures for the Committee members but it also recalled that there was a need to ensure geographical distribution. It would have no problem in supporting the draft Decision provided that the mechanism proposed would have no impact on geographical distribution which could only be determined on a ballot-by-ballot basis.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the voting mechanism proposed would have no impact on geographical distribution, which would be duly reflected. He added that the referred mechanism would leave more time for debates in the General Assembly.

The Delegations of **China** and **Colombia** thanked the Delegation of New Zealand for its proposal aimed at greater efficiency in the conduct of elections of the World Heritage Committee members and supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Benin** supported the initiative of New Zealand because it noted that during the meetings of the General Assembly, the elections had a tendency to prevail over the examination of fundamental questions, hence the importance of disassociating the two. However, to ensure a satisfactory implementation of this decision, it was appropriate in its view, to take a certain number of practical actions, notably to announce in a timely manner the scheduling of the different ballots and to announce the results as they were known, as they could modify the vote from one round to the next.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the draft Decision, but wondered how it would be possible to schedule the General Assembly before the Commissions of the General Conference of UNESCO, as proposed in paragraph 3 of the draft Decision, since the Executive Board usually met at that time.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the last General Assembly had been scheduled very late during the General Conference session and had overlapped with Commission IV of the General Conference. He would endeavour to hold the General Assembly session earlier in the General Conference to avoid any overlapping with the work of the Programme Commissions.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, while supporting the draft Decision, stressed the importance of taking the distinction between compulsory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund seriously and of providing an exact list of candidates vying for each post to avoid causing delays during the elections.

The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concerns expressed by the Delegation of New Zealand and accordingly seconded the draft Decision. In regard to the issue of the geographical distribution raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, it asked the World Heritage Centre to conduct an overall analysis of the geographical distribution of the World Heritage Committee and to report to the Committee for evaluation.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Delegation of New Zealand, endorsed its initiative in improving transparency in the election of the World Heritage Committee members and supported the draft Decision. It further agreed with the request of the Delegation of Japan for a report on the geographical distribution of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** hoped that the geographical distribution would be fully provided, ballot after ballot, during the next elections, in compliance with the General Assembly's resolution in that regard.

The Delegation of **Chile** thanked the Delegation of New Zealand for its proposal and supported the draft Decision. As to the specific issue of geographical distribution during the elections, it recalled that the so-called “New York agreements” on this matter were not applied in the case of the *World Heritage Convention* and that such a distribution was based on a gentleman’s agreement between Committee members and their respective geographical areas

The Delegation of **Benin** requested that it be indicated in paragraph 3 of the draft Decision, that it referred to « *Programme* » *Commissions* of the General Conference of UNESCO.

The **Rapporteur** said that no written or oral amendment had been received on the draft Decision apart from the proposal by the Delegation of Benin to add the word “programme” before the words “Commissions of the General Conference of UNESCO” in paragraph 3 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.

NINTH MEETING

Friday, 10 December 2004, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its ninth meeting, the Committee received the report of its open-ended Working Group on the Working Methods of the Committee, endorsed with amendments and decided that the Working Group would fulfil its mandate at the 29th session. The Committee also examined and approved the provisional agenda for its next session (Durban, 2005).

ITEM 4B WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE (continued)

*Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B
WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/4B.Add
Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM/4B.2
Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM/4C*

The **Chairperson of the Working Group on the working methods of the Committee**, the Ambassador of Lithuania, reported that the Working Group had dealt with very complex issues and had only seven hours in which to complete its task. She recalled that, following the indication of the Chairperson, the Working Group was integrated by the Delegations of Egypt, Kuwait for the Arab States, the Delegations of Benin and Nigeria for Africa, the Delegations of New Zealand and India for Asia-Pacific, the Delegations of Lithuania and the Russian Federation for Eastern Europe, the Delegations of Portugal and the United Kingdom for Western Europe, and the Delegations of Colombia and Saint Lucia for Latin America and the Caribbean and was open to observers. After an intense debate, the Working Group had drawn up two draft Decisions, unanimously approved by all its members, for consideration by the Committee. It had not, however, had sufficient time to discuss the important issue of Committee members voluntarily abstaining from submitting nominations as set out in paragraph I.A.4 of the working document. It therefore had proposed to the Bureau that the issue be handled by postponing debate on the matter to the 29th session in Durban, by discussing it in the plenary meeting or by referring it to the Working Group at the current session.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that those options had been presented to the Bureau, which had decided to discuss both draft Decisions proposed by the Working Group and then to propose to the Committee that the remaining issues be referred to the Working Group, which would continue its work at the 29th session. The Bureau had considered that the issue was of the utmost importance and therefore required adequate time for reflection.

The **Rapporteur** then read out paragraphs 1 to 4 of the draft Decision and a written amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by the Observer Delegation of Australia.

ICOMOS pointed out that its panel meeting to examine nominations had been scheduled for early February 2005, which meant that it could not meet the proposed deadline in 2005. It would request supplementary information before 15 February and would compensate by extending the deadline for the submission of supplementary information by the States Parties to 15 April.

IUCN noted that its panel meeting was scheduled for the following week and that therefore it had no problems with the proposed deadline of 31 January.

The **Rapporteur** accordingly proposed to amend the draft Decision to bring the deadline into force from 2006. He then read out paragraphs 5 to 10, pointing out that the annex mentioned in paragraph 7 would be discussed after the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Norway** felt that the two categories set out in paragraph 10 should feature in the working document submitted to the Committee in Durban.

The **Rapporteur** noted the proposed criteria would be presented in a working document, and then read out paragraphs 11 and 12.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** felt that paragraph 12 could be couched in more general terms and proposed the inclusion of the option for States Parties to file reports electronically.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed that “in addition to the normal practices” be inserted before the reference to the electronic submission of reports.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 13 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that the Working Group had decided that the subsidiary body referred to in paragraph 13 would be open-ended.

The **Rapporteur** then read out paragraph 14 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** proposed that the paragraph be amended by inserting “and operation” after “constitution” and “in parallel while the plenary is suspended” after “working groups”.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that it was unnecessary to predict the outcome of the investigation.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested clarification as to what was meant by “in parallel while the plenary is suspended”.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** explained that it had specifically suggested that the World Heritage Centre look into the working methods of the Convention on Biological Diversity, where the plenary was suspended to allow work to be conducted in different open ended and parallel working groups.

The **Rapporteur** felt that clarity would be ensured by inserting “*inter alia*” before “in parallel”. He then read out paragraphs 15 and 16.

With regard to the annex mentioned in paragraph 7 of the draft Decision, the Delegation of **Portugal**, supported by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, said that the Working Group had decided to make those recommendations to the Bureau, which was in charge of the organization of the meeting.

Introducing Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.2, the **Rapporteur** said that a new paragraph would be inserted to recall Decision 28 COM 13.1.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the Working Group had discussed two other issues that were not reflected in the proposed decision: the way of selecting the experts and their tasks.

The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that Decision **28 COM 13.1** had already established the mandate of the meeting and that the World Heritage Centre had indicated clearly that the experts would be appointed taking into account geographical distribution and according to the established procedures.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted, as amended.

He then turned to the Bureau's proposal to allow the Working Group to continue its work at the 29th session in Durban in order to address the remaining issues under item 4B.

The **Rapporteur** said that the Bureau's proposal, if accepted, would be the subject of a separate decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** agreed with the proposed way forward but proposed that the Working Group would also consider criteria for the selection of the 45 nominations that would be examined by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the draft Decision should explicitly state that the composition of the Working Group would remain unchanged and that it would start its work from the very beginning of the 29th session.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Japan.

The **Rapporteur** agreed that the draft Decision would explicitly state that the composition of the Working Group would remain unchanged. Furthermore, the suggestion of the Delegation of Japan, seconded by the Delegation of Norway, would be included in the draft summary records.

The Delegation of **Benin**, insisting on the need for monitoring the work of the Committee, recalled that the Working Group should take account of certain proposals already made in Cairns concerning, for example, the under-representation of certain categories of sites, for which documentation existed and which required more in-depth study.

The Delegation of **Portugal**, stressing that the voluntary abstention from nominations by Committee members was only part of the issue on transparency of the nomination process, requested that all the issues involved be addressed by the Working Group. It also agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Japan and asked the World Heritage Centre to provide to the Working Group all previous work on the issue mentioned by the Delegation of Benin.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, seconded by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported the proposal of the Delegation of Portugal and asked the World Heritage Centre why the list of nominations to be examined at the 29th session had not yet been transmitted to the Committee.

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that the list in question had not been annexed to the documents because it had to be updated at the end of the session and be made available to the public; however, it proposed to address this list to the Committee members by mail or electronically.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested an explanation as to why the list was confidential.

The Delegation of **Belgium** (Observer), also considering that all the States Parties should receive this list, suggested that the World Heritage Centre communicate it by circular letter at the time when it received the nominations for inscription, 31 March each year.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that apart from the list of nominations to be examined, it would be helpful if the Working Group could also be given some statistics on the number of nominations proposed by Committee members that were inscribed, deferred or not inscribed.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that this would be made available to the Working Group. He understood that two lists would be available to Committee members: one with the list of properties, and another with the statistics required by the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of **Egypt** clarified that the statistics should include information showing whether there is a link between being member of the Committee and inscribing properties.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that a list of nominations to be examined at the 29th session would be transmitted by 1st February 2005.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked why the members had to wait for such a period to have the information.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed and announced that the list would be circulated soon.

ITEM 16 REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29th SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Durban, 2005)

Document: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/16 Rev.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced item 16 of the agenda, noting the Bureau's decision that the 29th session would be held from 10 to 17 July 2005, and that the session will last for eight days. The Director of the World Heritage Centre further informed the Committee that the items of the agenda comprised first the opening of the session, followed by the submission and discussion of the reports and finally the adoption of the decisions and the closure of the session.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its approval of the provisional agenda. In regard to agenda item 17 "Provisional agenda of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee", the Delegation proposed that the item include the celebration to mark the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Committee and the ceremony to reward PACT partners for their contribution to the Convention.

The **Chairperson** suggested to the Delegation of Egypt that the proposed activity be discussed in Durban when considering the provisional agenda of the 30th session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, referring to the point raised by the Delegation of Egypt, said that the aim was to ensure flexibility in the celebrations to allow the Director General of UNESCO to award the certificates and that the activity linked to Africa Day should preferably not be an item on the agenda.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the provisional agenda and timetable of the 29th session should allow adequate time for the Committee to discuss periodic reporting. It then reminded the Committee that the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* would be held in 2005, and accordingly requested that an item be placed on the agenda of the 29th session to enable the Committee to discuss the outcome of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested whether the report of the expert meeting foreseen in Russia could be examined earlier, under item 5, in view of the fact that the conclusions of that meeting could guide the Working Group which must continue its reflection in Durban. It furthermore supported the observations of the Delegation of the United Kingdom and urgently requested the Bureau and in particular the Chairperson, to make the necessary arrangements, based on proposals formulated by the Working Group concerning the conduct of debates, so that in Durban the Committee may concentrate on its essential tasks and carry out to the utmost the work entrusted to it.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stressed the importance of including in each item of the provisional agenda the corresponding proposed relevant decision for ease of reference by the Committee. It then pointed out to the Committee that there was no agenda item on the report on the use of the World Heritage emblem, and suggested that the title of item 9 be amended to read “Report on the execution of the Programme and decisions of Suzhou”. In reference to item 15, the Delegation expressed concern as to when the decision concerning the date of the special expert meeting would be taken and suggested that the title of the meeting should read “Examination of the recommendations and conclusions of the special expert meeting” and that the words “... on the Outstanding Universal Value ...” be deleted since the meeting would also discuss other issues. In regard to the venue, the Delegation further remarked that the host country “Russian Federation” should be inserted after the name of the town, Kazan.

The Delegation of **India** observed that since the Working Group’s report to the 7th extraordinary session had been accepted, administrative and financial matters should be discussed by a specific working group to enable the work of the Committee to advance properly.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the point raised by the Delegation of India, and suggested that if the Committee wished to establish a subsidiary body, it should do so after the agenda item had been tabled at the plenary meeting.

The Delegation of **Norway**, expressing concern at the large number of items on the agenda, asked the World Heritage Centre whether other agenda items were to be added to the agenda under discussion. It appealed to the Committee to restrict the number of items on the agenda and urged the Bureau to take time before each Committee session to discuss and agree on how the Committee could work effectively.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, referring to the item concerning the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2006, asked which country would be hosting the session.

Referring to item 12C of the provisional agenda regarding periodic reporting, the Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** requested clarification from the World Heritage Centre on what was meant by “and Africa Regional Programme”. It then said that the results of the meeting of African experts to be held in the Republic of South Africa in March 2005 in Cape Town should be reflected on the agenda of the 29th session, since it was clear that the African meeting would result in an African position paper as to the way forward in implementing the

World Heritage Convention in Africa. Referring to Africa Periodic Report, the Observer Delegation pointed out that the Committee wished to see a focused presentation of the Africa Periodic Report. As an Action Plan and a calendar of implementation for 2003-2007 had been drawn up for the periodic report, the Observer Delegation pointed out that the Committee would wish the format to reflect the extent to which the targets had been met, what had or had not been achieved and the reasons why some targets had not been achieved. It was only in that way that the Committee would be able to ascertain progress in the implementation of the Periodic Report for the Africa Region.

In response to the comments and observations made by the Delegations of **Egypt**, **United Kingdom**, **Saint Lucia**, **Nigeria**, and the Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe**, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the report of the General Assembly would be placed on the agenda under item 6 and that issues concerning the emblem could be inserted for discussion under the item relating to administrative and financial matters. It hoped that the budget would be approved in Durban. The Committee might wish to bring the agenda item forward, for example, after agenda item 6 to allow adequate time for the working group established to complete its work. It agreed with the observation that the provisional agenda for the 29th session was already quite heavy and informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre did not wish to place any more items on the agenda. As to item 12C, it also agreed that it was redundant to refer to “Periodic Report for the Africa Region and the Africa Regional Programme” as both were one and the same for the follow-up to the Africa Periodic Report. In regard to the venue of the 30th session, the Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that a letter of invitation had been received from Lithuania offering to host that session in Vilnius.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether a proposal had been made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia to move agenda item 15 on the report of the Kazan meeting to agenda item 5.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that the Delegation of Saint Lucia had suggested modifying the title of the meeting, but had not suggested moving the item forward. The Director of the World Heritage Centre then said that the Committee should take into consideration the fact that the report of the meeting in Kazan might have an impact on the Committee’s discussions and should therefore consider where on the agenda the item might most appropriately be placed.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed that the report of the Kazan meeting might have an influence on the Committee’s previous decisions and felt that it was appropriate not to move the item.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that it only wished the examination of the Kazan report to be brought forward if the conclusions of the experts were deemed to be useful for the reflection of the Working Group. Its proposal aimed at providing the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau with a sufficient margin of time for the optimal organization of the Committee’s work.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision on item 16 paragraph by paragraph.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision provisionally adopted.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

TENTH MEETING

Saturday, 11 December 2004, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe
later: Ms Velez Jara
later: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its tenth and last meeting, the Committee adopted its Decisions, and attended a presentation by the Host Country of its next session (Durban, 2005).

ITEM 17 ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE 7th EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Paris, 6-11 December 2004)

Documents: WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/17
Draft Decisions: 7 EXT.COM.4B.2 and
 7 EXT.COM.4C

The **Chairperson** introduced item 17 and proposed that the Committee adopt the draft Decisions item by item, after which a short presentation would be made by the Delegation of South Africa concerning preparations for the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee in Durban in 2005, followed by the closure of the current session.

The **Rapporteur** said that the decisions of the 7th extraordinary session were to be applied and interpreted in the light of the summary records of the session (WHC-04/7 EXT.COM.INF.17), each decision had been set out on a new page and particular attention had been paid to improving the quality of the text in French. In that regard, he thanked delegations for pointing out errors in the French version. The Rapporteur then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 2 to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 2 adopted as amended.

The Rapporteur submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 3A to the Committee

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 3A adopted as amended.

The Rapporteur submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 3B to the Committee

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 3B adopted as amended.

The Rapporteur submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 3C to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 3C adopted as amended.

The Rapporteur then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 4A and asked the Committee to specify which provisions it specifically wished to refer to in paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed that paragraph 6 be amended by adding, “the same applies to transnational properties (sites that are not contiguous)” at the end and that paragraph 7 be amended to read “Decides that preliminary comparative analyses ...”, given that the inclusion of comparative analyses in nomination files was not compulsory under the current *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Benin**, recalling that the submission of tentative lists was a prerequisite for the examination of nominations for inscription, proposed to add to paragraph 3 of the decision a reference to paragraph 7 of the *Operational Guidelines*, which indicated the provisions of the *Convention* regarding these lists.

The **Chairperson** urged the Members of the Committee not to reopen the debate.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recalled that the Committee had discussed the differences between the definitions of transboundary serial sites and transnational serial sites. It did not support the amendment to paragraph 7 proposed by the Delegation of Egypt because it would alter the sense of the paragraph considerably.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** explained, in relation to paragraph 6, that transboundary serial site meant a property sharing adjacent borders, while transnational serial sites might consist of properties located in several countries that did not necessarily share borders. Accordingly, the phrase “the same applies” was not appropriate in that context.

The Delegation of **Egypt** then said that the phrase “... the same applies” referred to the principle that transnational properties needed to be nominated jointly by all States Parties concerned.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt could not be accepted in that context, given that transnational serial property did not, by definition, involve a shared border.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the statement made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom in relation to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt on paragraph 7. It then suggested that a separate paragraph might be added as 6bis on the definition of transnational serial properties.

The Delegation of **Hungary** (Observer) thought, like the Delegation of Colombia, that a distinct definition should be adopted for properties of a serial nomination, which involved several properties at the same time, while the expression transboundary site defined the same site situated on the territory of several countries.

The Delegation of **Portugal** sought clarification as to whether the current *Operational Guidelines* referred to the definition of transnational serial properties and, should there be no such references, proposed that a separate paragraph be added to Decision 7 EXT.COM 4A providing a clear definition of such properties.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed that a separate paragraph be inserted after paragraph 6 reading as follows: “Transnational nominations are serial nominations in the

territory of different States which need not be contiguous and are nominated with the consent of all States Parties concerned”.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to know the point of view of the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Portugal** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The representative of **IUCN** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom since the aim of the amendment was to clarify whether the territories of the States Parties concerned were contiguous or not.

To recapitulate, the **Rapporteur** said that a new paragraph providing a definition of transnational serial property would be inserted between paragraphs 6 and 7, and the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Benin’s proposal would be included in paragraph 3. There would be no change to paragraph 7 and “on the format of” would be inserted after “provisions” in paragraph 9.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 4A adopted as amended

The Rapporteur then turned to Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** wished to know exactly which year would be the gap year for the purposes of paragraph 3.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that as 2006 would mark the end of the first cycle of periodic reporting, 2007 would constitute the gap year for reflection on the reporting exercise.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5A.1 to the Committee.

The draft Decision was adopted. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5A.1 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5A.2 to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5A.2 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5B to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5B adopted as amended

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5C to the Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed that the title of the Annex be amended to read “List of Governments and Institutions that have contributed to the Africa Regional Programme and to the conservation of World Heritage properties in Africa”. He also said that the United Nations Foundation should be included in the list.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5C adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5D to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5D adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 5E to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed that “a detailed budget” be amended to “detailed budgets” in paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5E adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT. COM 5F to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 5F adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT. COM 6 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked why the request for international assistance from Sudan had not been included in the draft Decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the Bureau had examined the request for international assistance from Sudan because the amount requested had been within the limit that the Bureau could approve.

Consequently, the Delegation of **Belgium** (Observer) wished to know where the decisions of the Bureau were recorded.

The **Rapporteur** replied that the decisions of the Bureau corresponding to the functions of such organ in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Committee would be annexed to the final report.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 6 adopted as amended

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 7.1 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that paragraph 4 should end after “conservation of sites”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 7.1 adopted as amended

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT. COM 7.2 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** remarked that the word “exhibit” was not clear and suggested that “exhibition” be used instead. It hoped that the project would entail only the organization of an exhibition.

The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** pointed out that the meeting of the African Union would be held in Tripoli (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and not in Khartoum (Sudan).

The Delegation of **Egypt** hoped that the project should be more than poster and panel presentations and would include promotional events and lectures concerning the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Benin**, adopting a suggestion made by the Delegation of Algeria, (Observer), proposed to delete at the end of paragraph 2, the mention of the place, and furthermore requested that the World Heritage Centre indicate, in response to the concerns expressed by Egypt, whether it intended to organise other activities in addition to the exhibition cited.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the World Heritage Centre had planned to hold only an exhibition during the meeting of the African Union because it would be preparing for the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee to be held one week later.

The **Chairperson** clarified that “exhibit” would be replaced by “exhibition” and the reference to the location of the African Union meeting would be deleted.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 2 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 8 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** wondered whether “Takes note” in paragraph 2 should not be replaced by “Accepts”.

The **Rapporteur** replied that “Takes note” was a better reflection of the Committee’s discussion.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 8 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 9 and informed the Committee that he had changed the word “statute” to “status” in paragraph 4 in accordance with the official text of the 2003 Convention. He also said that the quotation marks in paragraph 4 would be deleted as the words contained were not an exact quotation of Article 3(a) of the 2003 Convention.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 9 adopted as amended

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT. COM 10 to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 10 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 11.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** proposed to make the tone of paragraph 6 more positive by adding “... and welcomes the financial commitment of the Chinese Government for such initiative”.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the spirit of the paragraph was to defend the regular budget of UNESCO and felt that the original wording should be retained.

The Delegation of **China** confirmed its Government’s full commitment to financing the initiative and agreed that the original wording should be retained.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 11 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 12 to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 12 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 13 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that the correct title of the proposed publication was “World Heritage Basic Texts on the *World Heritage Convention*” and that “and a handbook” should be deleted.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that references to “a Handbook” would be deleted.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 13 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 14 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed that the first section of paragraph 5 be amended to end as “industrial property in order to”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed to amend paragraph 3 to read “... was not protected as had been requested” and also sought clarification on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** clarified that its proposal was to amend the first section of paragraph 5 to end as “industrial property in order to protect (a) the graphics of ...”.

The **Rapporteur** noted the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** wondered whether the expression used in paragraph 5 should be “industrial property” or “intellectual property”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** was of the opinion that the paragraph deals with both intellectual and industrial property. He underlined the importance of protecting commercial properties and proposed that the last phrase of that section be amended to read “... for the protection of intellectual, commercial and industrial”.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** pointed out that the full official title of “*the Paris Convention*” was “*the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property*”, which meant that the current wording should be retained.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 14 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 15 to the Committee.

Whilst thanking New Zealand for having proposed a new voting mechanism, the Delegation of **Benin** questioned whether it was necessary to cite the author of each proposal, since, in adopting it, it became that of the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** said that it was for the Committee to decide whether to acknowledge New Zealand as a matter of elegance and recognition.

The Delegation of **Colombia** endorsed the statement by the Delegation of Benin and suggested that New Zealand should be thanked in the summary records as a matter of principle.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** agreed to the deletion of the acknowledgement from paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 15 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 16 to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that it might be more appropriate to use “review” rather than “examination” in the title of item 9 of the provisional agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee, out of deference to the experts who would be attending the meeting in Kazan (Russian Federation).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that “review” was not appropriate, as the Committee “examines” the items on its agenda, which was also the case for the examination of the state of conservation reports.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** assured the Committee that the corresponding word in French “*examen*” was the appropriate term in that context.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** considered that “Examination” was suitable in that context.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed “Examining”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Nigeria.

The **Rapporteur** stated that the title of each item should start with a noun and proposed “evaluation” or “assessment”.

The **Chairperson** endorsed “assessment”.

The **Rapporteur** noted the proposal of the Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 16 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.1 and said that “and nominations submitted on an emergency basis” in paragraph 3 should be deleted as it was inconsistent with paragraph 67 of the current *Operational Guidelines* and the future revised *Operational Guidelines*. He then turned to paragraph 5 of Annex 1 and stressed that the “standard form” to which it referred was to be used by Members for the submission of amendments.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with the Rapporteur that the reference to emergency nominations should be deleted from paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** wished to leave a degree of flexibility to the States Parties concerning the deadline of 31 January for Advisory Bodies, in order for them to be able to suggest information to the States Parties after the examination of their evaluation as indicated in paragraph 3. It therefore proposed to add “... the World Heritage Centre, unless exceptional circumstances arise, and ...”.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, in response to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, asked who would decide what constituted exceptional circumstances.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** questioned the purpose of allowing flexibility as to the deadline and suggested that no amendment be made to the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** explained that the proposal was intended to prevent the situation in which States Parties would be unable to submit supplementary information at the last minute, but it would accept the majority view.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** reminded the Committee that the proposed practice would be subject to future review.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.1 adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** then submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.2.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.2 adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted Draft Decision 7 EXT.COM 4C to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Japan**, referring to paragraph 2, asked whether the Working Group should finish its work before the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the Working Group intended to resume its work at the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee, as any intersessional meeting would have financial implications, unless work was carried out by electronic mail.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed that paragraph 2 be amended by inserting “with the same composition” after “mandate”, and asked whether the results of the Working Group on the methods of work of the Committee would be included in the agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee not to reopen the debate on the item.

The Delegation of **Egypt** then withdrew the amendment it had proposed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 7 EXT.COM 4C adopted.

The **Rapporteur** said that in future draft Decisions should be drawn up in a more rigorous manner and that they could be amended on screen in English and French during the discussion at the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2005. The summary records of the 7th Extraordinary Session of the Committee would be circulated to the States Parties for comment after 1 February 2005, and some stylistic changes would be made to the way summary records were drawn up in accordance with the Rule 47 of the *Rules of Procedure*. He would like future reports to consist of three sections: Decisions, Summary Records and List of Participants. He thanked that Chairperson and the World Heritage Centre for their support.

The **Chairperson** declared the decisions of the 7th Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee adopted.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commended the efficient way in which the Chairperson, the Rapporteur and the World Heritage Centre worked together.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of South Africa to inform the Committee of the progress achieved in preparations for the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005).

Ms Velez Jara took the chair.

The Delegation of **South Africa** gave an account of preparations for the next World Heritage Committee, providing details on the venue, transport arrangements, accommodation, field trip and post-Committee travelling arrangements.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of South Africa for its presentation.

Mr Wakashe resumed the chair.

The **Assistant Director-General** thanked all those who participated in the 7th Extraordinary Session of the Committee and remarked that the high level of attendance attested to the success of the *World Heritage Convention* and the role it played in the conservation of cultural and natural sites. The results of the meeting would be reported to the Director-General of UNESCO, who had been on mission during the session. He then thanked the Delegation of South Africa for its presentation.

Concluding in French, the Assistant Director-General for Culture commended the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for his leadership qualities, noting that he was a national of South Africa, as was the President of the Intergovernmental Expert Meeting responsible for the elaboration of a convention on cultural diversity, the drafting Committee of which would meet within the next few days,

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the staff of the Centre, colleagues from other sections of UNESCO, interpreters, as well as the Chairperson and the Rapporteur. He stressed that the Chairperson had great responsibilities in showing a vision and directing heritage policies in what was an increasingly complex domain. He then thanked the Advisory Bodies, the Members of the Committee and the Rapporteur for their support.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Ms Maathai Wangari, who had been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her work in protecting the environment in Kenya, and remarked that her achievement was not only a source of pride to African people but also had important implications for the *World Heritage Convention*. He further reviewed in brief the items examined by the 7th Extraordinary Session of the Committee and thanked the participants for their contributions to the discussion. He expressed his gratitude to the Delegation of Colombia for taking the chair on a number of occasions and extended thanks to the Rapporteur, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his staff. He then declared the 7th Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

The meeting rose at 12.52 p.m.

ANNEXES

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Seventh extraordinary session / Septième session extraordinaire

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris / Siège de l'UNESCO, Paris
6 – 11 December 2004 / 6 – 11 décembre 2004

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

I. STATES MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE / ETATS MEMBRES DU COMITE

ARGENTINA / ARGENTINE

Ms Maria Susana Pataro
Directora Adjunta
Departamento Organismos
Internacionales
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores,
Comercio Internacional y culto
Esmeralda 1212 piso 11 (1007)
Buenos Aires
Tel : +5411 481978247772
Fax : +5411 4819 1818119
E-mail : msp@mrecic.gov.ar

Mr. Ariel Gonzalez
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores,
Comercio Internacional y Culto
Consejería Legal
Esmeralda 1212 - Piso 15
C1007ABR - Buenos Aires

Mr José Luis Fernandez Valoni
Permanent Delegation of Argentina
to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
E-mail : jl.fernandez@unesco.org

BENIN

S. Exc. M. Isidore Monsi
Ambassadeur
Expert culturel
Secrétaire général adjoint du
Ministère des Affaires étrangères
et de l'Intégration africaine
01BP 318
Cotonou
Tel.: +229 93 68 08
Fax: +229 93 381970
E-mail: misidore2002@yahoo.fr
Decisions and Summary Record

M. Mahazou Ibrahim Gomina
Expert naturel (DFRN)
Directeur des Forêts et Ressources
naturelles
Ministère de l'Agriculture, de
l'Elevage et de la Pêche
BP 393
Tel: +229 33 61 89
Cotonou
Tel : +229 33 61 89
Fax: +229 33 04 21
E-mail: foret@bow.bj

M. Jules Bocco
Secrétaire général
Ministère de la culture et de
l'Artisanat et du Tourisme
BP 1728
Cotonou
Tel : +229 30 70 24
Fax : +229 30 70 31

M. Hector Festus Posset
Premier conseiller
Délégation permanente du Bénin
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 86

Mme. Françoise Medegan
Premier conseiller
Délégation permanente du Benin
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 85
Fax : +33 1 43 06 15 55
E-mail : f.medegan@unesco.org

Mme. Edith Lissan
2^{ème} Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Bénin
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 87
Fax : +33 1 43 06 15 55
E-mail : e.lissan@unesco.org

CHILE / CHILI

S. Exc. M. Herman Sandoval
Ambassadeur du Chili en France
Délégué permanent du Chili auprès
de l'UNESCO
2, Avenue de la Motte Piquet
75007 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1. 44.18.59.60
Fax: +33 1.44.18.59.61
E-mail : mschilling@amb-chili.fr

H.E. Mr Samuel Fernandez
Ambassador of Chile in Egypt
Asesor
42 Road 18 Maadi 5th floor
El Cairo
Egypt
Tel : +202 735 87 11
Fax : +202 735 37 16
E-mail : samuelfer@hotmail.com

Mr Gonzalo Fernandez
Delegado Permanente Alterno de
Chile ante la UNESCO
1, Rue miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 50

Fax : +33 1 47 34 16 51
E-mail : dl.chili@unesco.org

M. Angel Cabeza
Secrétaire exécutif
Conseil des Monuments nationaux
Ave. Vicuña Mackenna 84
Santiago
Tel. : +56.2 665 14 73 - 665 15 16
Fax : +56.2 665 15 21
E-mail : acabeza@monumentos.cl

CHINA / CHINE

H.E. Mr Zhang Xuezhong
Ambassador and Permanent Delegate
of China to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 34 56
Fax : +33 1 45 19 01 99
E-mail : dl.chine1@unesco.org

Mr Du Yue
Deputy Secretary-General
Chinese National Commission for
UNESCO
37 Damucang Hutong
Xichan, Beijing 100816
Tel : +86 10 6609 6445
Fax : +86 10 6601 7912
E-mail : duv@moe.edu.cn

Ms Hu Zhongping
Deputy Director-General
Ministry of Construction
9, Sanglibelu, Xicheng District
Beijing – 100835
Tel : 86 10 68 39 38 90
Fax : 86 10 68 31 36 69

Mr. Gu Yucai
Director-General
Department of Cultural Relics
Protection
State Administration of Cultural
Heritage
10 Chaoyangmenwai Bedajie,
100020 Beijing, China
Tel: 8610-65551554
Fax: 8610-65551555

Mr. Guo Zhan
Director of Division
State Administration of Cultural
Heritage
10 Chaoyangmenwai Bedajie
100020 Beijing, China
Tel: 8610-65551649
Fax: 8610-65551555

Mr Li Rusheng
Decisions and Summary Record

Assistant Director-General
Department of Urban Construction
Ministry of Construction
9 Sangliheliu, Xicheng District
Beijing 100835
Tel : 86 10 6839 4062
Fax : 86 10 6839 3014

Mr Liu Jiang
Director of Division of Science and
Culture
Chinese National Commission for
UNESCO
37 Damucang Hutong
Xidan, Beijing 100816
Tel : 86 10 6609 8170
Fax : 86 10 6601 7912
E-mail : liui@moe.edu.cn

Mr Su Xu
First Secretary
Chinese Permanent Delegation to
UNESCO
Tel : +33 1 45 68 34 16
Fax : +33 1 45 19 01 99
E-mail : dl.chine5@unesco.org

Ms. Sheng Weiwei
Deputy Director of Division of
International Cooperation
National Administration of Cultural
Heritage
Tel : +86-10 65 55 15 54
Fax : +86 10 65 55 15 55

Ms Yu Xiaoping
Program Officer
Chinese National Commission for
UNESCO
37, Damucanghutong, Xidan
Beijing 1008 16
Tel: 66097596
Fax: 66017912

Mr Feng Yu
253 Zhu Hui Road
Suzhou 215006

Mr Rong Chen
12 Pak Road
Suzhou 215006

Mr Jian Lin Shao
Suzhou 215004

Mr Wentao Xu
12 Park Road
Suzhou 215006
Tel : +86 512 65 11 5111

COLOMBIA / COLOMBIE

S. Exc. María Zulema Velez Jara
Ambassadeur
Déléguée Permanente de Colombie
auprès de UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1.45.68.28.56
Fax: +33 1.43 06.66.09
E-mail : dl.colombia@unesco.org

Ms María Claudia Lopez Sorzano
Directora
Dirección de Patrimonio Cultural
Ministerio de Cultura
Calle 9 No. 8-31
Bogotá
Tel: +57-1 336 0522/33
Fax: +57-1 282 5759
E-mail: mlopez@mincultura.gov.co

Mr Emilio Rodriguez
Coordinator Sistema Nacional Areas
Protegidas
Parques Nacionales
Camera 10 N°20-30, piso 3°
Tel : +571 3410265
Fax : +571 243 3004
E-mail :
erodriguez@parquesnacionales.gov.co

Mr Juan Claudio Morales
2ème Secrétaire
Délégation permanente de Colombie
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 28 73
E-mail : j.morales@unesco.org

EGYPT / EGYPTE

Professor Samir I. Ghabbour
Chairman Egyptian National MAB
Committee
Egyptian National Commission for
UNESCO
17, Kuwait Street (ex Ismaïl Aboul-
Foutouh)
Dokki Giza,
Cairo - Egypt
Tel : +202 3924804
Fax : +202 5780979
E-mail : ghabbour@aucegypt.edu

Ms Gihan Zaki
Lecturer of Egyptology

Faculty of Tourism and HoTels
Helwan University
Cairo
20 rue Tag el Din el Sobky
Ard el Golf Heliopolis
Le Caire
Egypte
Tel : 202 41 57 353
E-mail : gihanzaki@hotmail.com

Mr Mamdouh Mansour
Délégué permanent adjoint
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
E-mail : dl.egypte@unesco.org

INDIA / INDE

Mr C. Babu Rajeev
Director General
Archaeological Survey of India
Janpath
New Delhi – 110 011
Tel : +98 183 10416
Fax : +91 11 230 10 822
E-mail : cbrajeev@hotmail.com

H.E. Mrs Bhaswathi Mukerjee
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate of India to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
France
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 88
Fax : +33 1 47 34 51 88
E-mail : dl.india@unesco.org

Mr Jacob John
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of India to
UNESCO
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 88
Fax : +33 1 47 34 51 88
E-mail : dl.india@unesco.org

JAPAN / JAPON

H.E. Mr. Teichi Sato
Ambassador extraordinary and
plenipotentiary
Permanent Delegation of Japan to
UNESCO
148, rue de l'Université
75007 Paris
France
Tel: +33 (0)1 53 59 27 00
Fax: +33 (0)1 53 59 27 27

Mr Kunio Sato
Special Advisor
Decisions and Summary Record

Agency for Cultural Affairs
c/o Agency for Cultural Affairs
2-5-1 Marunouchi, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
Tel : +81 3 6734 3110
Fax : +81 3 6734 3813

Mr Yuzuru Imasato
Minister-Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of Japan
To UNESCO
E-mail : delj^pm.edu@unesco.org

Ms Takiko Sano
Director
Office of International Cooperation
of Cultural Properties,
Traditional Cultural Division
Cultural Properties Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs
Tel : +81 3 6734 2863

Ms Saori Hirai
Assistant Director
Biodiversity Policy Division
Nature Conservation Bureau
Ministry of the Environment
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8975
Tel: +81-3-3581-3351
Fax: +81-3-3591-3228
E-mail: SAORI_HIRAI@env.go.jp

Mr Hirasawa Tsuyoshi
Cultural Properties Senior Specialist
Monuments and Sites Division
Cultural Properties Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs
2-5-1 Marunouchi Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
Tel : +81 3 6734 28 76
Fax : +81 3 6734 38 22
E-mail : hirachan@bunka.go.jp

Ms Naoko Sato
Cultural Properties Senior Specialist
Traditional Culture Division
Cultural Properties Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs

Mr Toru Yoshikawa
Official, Multilateral Cultural
Cooperation Division
Cultural Affairs Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8975
Tel : +81 3 5501 81 41
Fax : +81 3 5501 81 40
E-mail : toru.yoshikawa@mofa.go.jp

Ms Kumiko Yoneda

Senior Research Scientist
Japan Wildlife Reserch Center
3-10-10 Shitaya, Taito-ku
Tokyo 110-8676
Tel: +81-3-5924-0963
Fax: +81-3-5824-0964
E-mail: kyoneda@jwrc.or.jp

KUWAIT / KOWEIT

S. Exc. Dr Abdulrazzak Al-Nafisi
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate
Delegation of Kuwait to UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
France
Tel : +33 1 45 68 26 69
Fax : +33 1 42 19 96 95
E-mail : amalnafisi@yahoo.com

Mr Taleb Al-Baghli
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Kuwait to UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 26 69
Fax : +33 1 40 65 93 05

Dr Muhammad Al-Shatti
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Kuwait to UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 26 69
Fax : +33 1 40 65 93 05

LEBANON / LIBAN

S. Exc.Mme Samira Hanna-El-Daher
Délégué permanent du Liban auprès
de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 79
Fax : +33 1 45 67 34 88

Mr Jade Tabet
Expert au Comité du patrimoine
mondial
33 bis, Avenue Reille
Paris 75014

Mme Samia Moukarzel
Attachée culturelle
Délégation permanente du Liban
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 79
Fax : +33 1 45 67 34 88
E-mail : s.moukarzal@unesco.org

LITHUANIA / LITHUANIE

H.E. Ms Ina Marciulionyte
Ambassador
Lithuanian Delegation to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
France
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 20
Fax : + 33 1 45 67 36 89
E-mail : i.marciulionyte@unesco.org

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Prof. Rick van der Ploeg
Former Secretary of State of Culture
of the Netherlands
Robert Schuman Centre for
Advanced Studies
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy
Tel: +39 055 4685 759
E-mail: Rick.vanderPloeg@IUE.it

Mr Herald Voorneveld
Head of Delegation
Deputy Permanent Delegate of the
Netherlands to UNESCO
Permanent Delegation of the
Netherlands to UNESCO
7, rue Eblé
75007 Paris
France
Tel: + 33 1 40 62 33 88
Fax: + 33 1 40 62 34 65
E-mail:
herald.voorneveld@minbuza.nl

Dr Carol Westrik
Coordinator World Heritage
Netherlands National Commission
for UNESCO
Kortenaerkade 11
Postbus 29777
2502 LT Den Haag
The Netherlands
Tel: + 31 70 42 60 301
Fax: + 31 70 42 60 359
E-mail: cwestrik@nuffic.nl

Mrs Caroline Manuel
Division Head Monumentenbureau
Dienst Ruimtelijke Ontwikkeling en
Volkshuisvesting
Scharlooweg 51
Curacao
Decisions and Summary Record

Netherlands Antilles
E-mail :
caroline.manuel@curacao-gov.en
Mr Robert de Jong
Co-ordinator RDMZ World Heritage
List UNESCO
Netherlands Department for
Conservation
Rijksdienst oor de Monumentenzorg
Broederplein 41
P.O. Box 1001
3700 BA Zeist
The Netherlands
Tel : +31 30 69 83 350
Fax : +31 30 69 16 189
E-mail : R.deJong@rdmz.nl

Mr Tjeerd de Boer
Ministry of Education, Culture and
Science
Cultural Heritage Department de
Hoftoren
P.O. Box 16375
2500 BJ Den Haag
E-mail : t.w.deboer@minocw.nl

Mrs Monique Krauwer
R.O.B
P.O. Box 1600
3800 BP Amersfoort
Tel : +33 422 76 40
E-mail : m.krauwer@archis.nl

NEW ZEALAND / NOUVELLE ZELANDE

Mr Tumu Te Heuheu
Head of Delegation
Paramount Chief - Ngati Tuwharetoa
C/- Department of Conservation
Taupo Field Centre
PO Box 528
Taupo
Tel: +64 7 378 3885
Fax: +64 7 378 3886

Mr Tata Lawton
Tumuaki, Kahui Kura Taiao (General
Manager - Maori)
Department of Conservation
PO Box 10-420
Wellington
Tel: +64 4 471 3190
Fax +64 4 473 3656
E-mail : hawton@doc.govt.nz

Mr John Paki
Deputy Chief Executive
Ministry of Maori Development
Te Puni Kokiri House
143 Lambton Quay
PO Box 3943

Wellington
Tel: +64 4 922 6000
Fax +64 4 922 6229
E-mail: pakij@tpk.govt.nz

Mr Andrew Bignell
Manager - International Relations
Department of Conservation
PO Box 10-420
Wellington
Tel: +64 4 74 3191
Fax +64 4 471 3049
E-mail abignell@doc.govt.nz

Prof. Al Gillespie
School of Law
Waikato University
PO Box 3510
Hamilton
Tel : +64 7 856 2889
Fax : +64 7 838 4417
E-mail : azg@waikato.ac.nz

NIGERIA

Dr. Omotoso Eluyemi
Director-General
National Commission for Museum &
Monuments
P.M.B. 171 Garki,
Abuja
Tel: +234 (0)9 523 0823
Fax: +234 (0)9 523 8254
E-mail: elurisa1@yahoo.com

Dr. J.O. Eboeime
Expert in Cultural Heritage
Director
Monuments, Heritage and Sites
National Commission for Museum &
Monuments
P.M.B. 171 Garki,
Abuja
Tel: +234 09 03 18 13 922
Fax: +234 09 523 82 54
E-mail: jobosng@yahoo.com

Mr Sikiru Akin Liaisu
Expert in Natural Heritage
Deputy Director, Heritage and Sites
National Commission for Museum &
Monuments
P.M.B. 171 Garki,
Abuja
Tel: +234 9 523 0823
Fax: +234 9 523 0854
E-mail : akintopsy2002@yahoo.com

Mr Yemi Lijadu
Adviser
Nigerian Permanent Delegation to
UNESCO

1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 27 27
Mrs Fatima Othman
Senior Counselor
Permanent Delegation of Nigeria
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 27 27
Fax : +33 1 45 67 59 41
E-mail : othmanfat@hotmail.com

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Mr Nils Marstein
Director-General
Riksantikvaren
Directorate for Cultural Heritage
P.O. Box 8196 DEP
0034 Oslo
Norway
Tel : (47) 22 94 04 00
Fax : (47) 22 94 04 04
E-mail : nm@ra.no

Mr Ole Briseid
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Norway to UNESCO
The Norwegian Permanent
Delegation to UNESCO
Tel : +33 1 30 53 22 43

OMAN

Mr Kamal Macki
Deputy Permanent Delegation of
Oman to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 48
Fax : +33 1 45 67 57 42
E-mail : kmacki@hotmail.com

Mme Hana Kawas
Coordinatrice
Délégation permanente d'Oman
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 50
Fax : +33 1 45 67 57 42

Mme Nadia Makeen
Coordinatrice
Délégation permanente d'Oman
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 22
E-mail : nadiamaken@hotmail.com

Mr Nathaniel Powell
Decisions and Summary Record

Stagiaire
Délégation permanente d'Oman
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 48

PORTUGAL

Mme Ana Paula Zacarias
Chargée d'affaires a.i.
Délégation permanente du Portugal
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 55
Fax : +33 1 45 67 82 93
E-mail : A.Zacarias@unesco.org

Mr José Sasportes
Président de la Commission
nationale portugaise pour l'UNESCO
Avenida Infante Santo 42, 5°
Lisbon
Tel : +351 21 39 20830
Fax : +351 21 39 20839
E-mail : cn.unesco.web.pt

Mme Ana Nave
Expert en patrimoine
Commission nationale portugaise
pour l'UNESCO
Ave. Infante Santo N°42 5°
Lisbon
Tel : +351 91 222 02 51
Fax : +351 21 392 0839
E-mail : cn.unesco@mail.Teleplc.pt

RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

Mr Valery B. Rounov
Deputy Permanent Representative
Permanent Delegation of the Russian
Federation to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 12 84 30

Mr Vladimir A. Sokolov
Permanent Delegation of the Russian
Federation to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 12 84 30

Mr Rassikh Sagitov
Vice-Chairman of the Kazan Council
of People's Deputies
str. Kremlevskaya, bld.7
420014 Kazan
Republic of Tatarstan

Tel: +8432 92 82 52
Fax: +8432 92 33 16

SAINT LUCIA / SAINTE - LUCIE

Ms Véra Lacoeyllhe
Head of Delegation
Permanent Delegation of Saint Lucia
to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 Paris Cedex 15
France
Tel: +33 1 53 23 80 23
Fax: +33 1 40 70 18 91
E-mail: dl.sainte-lucie@unesco.org

SOUTH AFRICA / AFRIQUE DU SUD

Mr Themba Wakashe
Chairperson of the World Heritage
Committee
Deputy Director-General
Department of Arts and Culture
P/Bag X89
Pretoria 0001
Tel : +27 12 33 7 82 75
Fax : +27 12 33 75 30
E-mail : themba.wakashe@dac.gov.za

Mr Vusithemba Ndima
Chief Director
Department of Arts & Culture
P/Bag X89
Pretoria 0001
Tel : +12 337 8032
Fax : +12 337 81 36
E-mail : vusi.ndima@dac.gov.za

Ms Maria Mbengashe
Chief Director
Biodiversity and Heritage
Dept Enviromental Affairs and
Tourism
Private Bag X447
Pretoria 0001
Tel : +27 12 310 370
Fax : +27 12 320 1714
E-mail : mmbengashe@deat.gov.za

Mrs N.M. Sibanda-Thusi
Ambassador of South Africa to
France
Permanent Representative of South
Africa to UNESCO
South African Embassy
56, Quai d'Orsay
75007 Paris
Tel : 01 53 59 23 73
Fax : +33 1 47 05 63 60

E-mail : multilateral@afriquesud.net

Fax : +33 1 47 83 27 77
E-mail : hj-izon@dfid.gov

Ms Louise Graham
Rapporteur
Counsellor Multilateral Affairs
South African Embassy
49 rue Edouard Nortier
72200 Neuilly sur Seine
France
Tel : +33 1 53 59 23 05
Fax : +33 1 53 59 23 09
E-mail : multilateral@afriquesud.net

Ms Pule Bosilong
First Secretary
South African representative to
UNESCO
South African Embassy
59, Quai d'Orsay
75007 Paris
Tel : 01 53 59 23 23
Fax : 01 53 59 23 63
E-mail : multilateral@afriquesud.net

Ms J. de Villiers
Department of Arts and Culture
P/Bag X89
Pretoria 0001
Tel : +27 12 33 7 82 75
Fax : +27 12 33 75 30
E-mail : Joan.Devilliers@dac.gov.za

Ms N. November
Deputy Director
Dept. Environmental Affairs and
Tourism
Private Bag X447
Pretoria

Mr Buthelezi Phakamani
Chief Executive Officer
The South African Heritage
Resources Agency
P.O. Box 34010
Rhodes Gift 7707
Tel : +021 462 4502
Fax : +021 462 4509
E-mail : phakamani_z@hotmail.com

Ms Laura Robinson
Board Member
Robben Island Museum
P.O. Box 16092
Vlaeberg
Cape Town 8001
Tel : +27 21 42 49 591
Fax : +27 21 42 43 159
E-mail : ctht@heritage.org.za

Mr Irvin Langeveld
Deputy Director
Department of Arts and Culture
Private Bag X897
Pretoria 0001
Tel : +27 12 337 8022
Fax : +27 12 331 8524
E-mail : irwin.langeveld@dac.gov.za

Mr S Mankotywa
CEO
National Heritage Council
594 Rudolf Street
Pretoria
Tel +82 90 92 792
E-mail : smankotywa@nhc.org.za

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Ms Sheelagh Evans
Head
Historic Environment Protection
Branch
Department for Culture, Media and
Sport
2/4 Cockspur Street
London SW1Y 5DH
Tel : +44 020 7211 2335
Fax : +44 020 7211 2389
E-mail : sheelagh.evans@culture.gsi.gov.uk

Dr Christopher Young
English Heritage
23 Savile Row
London W1S 2ET
London W1S 2ET
Tel : +44 0207 973 3849
Fax : +44 0207 973 3001
E-mail : chris.young@english-heritage.org.uk

Ms Alexandra Coxen
English Heritage
23 Savile Row
London W1S 2ET
Tel : +44 0207 973 3849
Fax : +44 0207 973 3001
E-mail : Alexandra.coxen@english-heritage.org.uk

Ms Hilary Izon
Third Secretary
Permanent Delegation of the United
Kingdom to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 27 85

II. ORGANISATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY / ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES / CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS)

Prof. Dr. Michael Petzet
Président
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 Paris
Tel : +49 89 211 42 60
Fax : +33 1 45 06 66 22
E-mail : mpetzet@icomos.org

Mme Susan Denyer
World Heritage Adviser
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 67 67 70
Fax : +33 1 45 06 66 22

Mme Gwenaëlle Bourdin
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 67 67 70
Fax : +33 1 45 06 66 22
E-mail : bourdin@icomos.org

Mr Giora Solar
Treasurer General
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 67 61 10
Fax : +33 1 45 06 66 22
E-mail : gioras@012.net.il

Ms Regina Durighello
Directeur
Programme Patrimoine Mondial
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 67 67 70
Fax : +33 1 45 06 66 22
E-mail : durighello@icomos.org

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND THE RESTORATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY (ICCROM) / CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA CONSERVATION ET LA RESTAURATION DES BIENS CULTURELS (ICCROM)

Mr Joseph KING
Acting Unit Director,
Heritage settlements
Via di San Michele, 13
Rome 00153
Italy
Tel : +39 06 58 55 33 13
Fax : +39 06 58 55 33 49
E-mail : jk@iccrom.org

Mr Gamini Wijesuriya
Project Manager
Heritage Settlements Unit
13, via de San Michele
00153 Rome
Tel : +39 06 58 55 33 16
Fax : +39 06 58 55 33 49
E-mail : gw@iccrom.org

THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN) / UNION MONDIALE POUR LA NATURE (UICN)

Mr. David Sheppard
Head, Programme on Protected Areas
IUCN The World Conservation Union
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 999 0165
Fax : +41 22 999 0015
E-mail: das@hq.iucn.org

Ms. Georgina Peard
Project Officer, World Heritage
Programme on Protected Areas
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: +41229990158
Fax: +41 22 999 0015
E-mail: gep@hq.iucn.org

Mr Kishore Rao
IUCN
Villa 44/4, Van Bao
Ipo Box 60
Hanoi
Viet Nam

III. OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

(i) STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION / ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

AFGHANISTAN

Mr Aziz Zahir
Ambassador
Permanent Delegation of
Afghanistan to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 6 73 33 76 01

Mr Ahmed Zahir Fagiri
Permanent Delegation of
Afghanistan to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 6 73 33 76 01

ALGERIA / ALGERIE

M. Sid Ahmed Baghli
Conseiller Culturel
Delegation permanente d'Algérie
auprès de l'UNESCO
1 Rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 60
E-mail : bsaboite@yahoo.fr

ANDORRA / ANDORRE

S.Exc. Mr Imma Tor Faus
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent d'Andorre
auprès de l'UNESCO
51bis, rue de Bouleinvilliers
75016 Paris
Tel : +33 1 40 06 03 30
Fax : +33 1 40 06 03 64
E-mail : tor@andorra.ad

Mme Maria Ubach
Délégué permanent adjoint
51bis, Bouleinvilliers
75016 Paris
Tel : +33 1 40 06 03 30
Fax : +33 1 40 06 03 64
E-mail : ambaixada@andorre.ad

ANGOLA

S. Exc. M. David Jorge M. Sanguende
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent de la République
d'Angola auprès
de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 75
Fax : +33 1 45 67 57 48

AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIE

Mr David Walker
Director, Natural and Overseas
Heritage Management Section
Heritage Division
Department of the Environment and
Heritage
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Tel: +61 2 62 74 2051
Fax: +61 2 62 74 2000
E-mail: david.walker@ea.gov.au

BAHRAIN/BAHREIN

Mr D. Abdullah Abdul Rahman
Yateem
Assistant Under Secretary for
Publication and Documentation
Ministry of Information
c/o Permanent Delegation of Bahrain
to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 10
Fax : +33 1 47 34 48 04

Mr Abdul Wahab Abdullah Al Khaja
Chief of Museum Processes
Ministry of Information
c/o Permanent Delegation of Bahrain
to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 10
Fax : +33 1 47 34 48 04

Mr Abdulaziz Mohammed Alrafaei
Abdulaziz
Head of Planning and Development
Ministry of Information
P.O. Box 2119
Manama
Tel : +973 201 207
Fax : +973 211 747
E-mail : alrafaei@hotmail.com

Mr Adnan Alhammadi
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Bahrain to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 10

BARBADOS / BARBADE

Ms. Alissandra Cummins
Chairperson
Barbados Museum and Historical
Society
St. Ann's Garrison
St. Michael
Barbados, W.I.
Tel: +246 426-6459
Fax: +246 429-5946
E-mail : director@barbmuse.org.bb

BELARUS

Ms Ekaterina
Permanent Delegation of Belarus to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

Mr Christian G Lepage
Deputy permanent Delegate
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris

Mme Gislaine Devillers
Première Attachée
Ministère de la Région wallonne
Direction générale de l'Aménagement
du territoire et du logement
Division du patrimoine
Direction de la Protection
1, Rue Brigades d'Irlande
5100 Namur

Tel : +32 81 33 21 64
Fax : +32 81 33 22 93
E-mail :
g.devillers@mrw.wallone.be

Mme Bénédicte Selfslagh
Conseiller Relations
internationales
Division du patrimoine (DGATLP)
Ministère de la Région wallonne
(Belgique)
p/a 30 avenue Junot
75018 Paris,
tél: +33-1-44 92 04 28
Fax: +33-1-44 92 07 28
E-mail:
benedicte.selfslagh@wanadoo.fr

Ms Suzanne Van Aerschot-Van
Haevebeek
Ajointe du Directeur
Ministère de la Communauté
flamande
Département, Environnement et
Infrastructure
Administration de l'Aménagement
du territoire, du logement, des
monuments et sites
Section Monuments et sites
Tel : +33 16 21 12 06
Fax : +33 16 20 55 26
E-mail :
Suzanne.VanHaevebeek@lin.vla
anderen.be

Ms Isabelle Leroy
Attachée à la Direction des
Monuments et sites
Ministère de la Région de
Bruxelles-capitale
Direction des monuments et des
Sites
80, rue du Pragu – 7è étage
1035 Bruxelles
Tel : +02 204 24 50
Fax : +02 204 24 15
E-mail : ileroy@mrbc.irisnet.be

BOLIVIA / BOLIVIE

Mr Lucia Chavez Paz
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de Bolivie
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 39
Fax : +33 1 45 68 30 37
E-mail : dl.bolivia@unesco.org

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE ET HERZEGOVINE

Ms Mirela Mulalic Handan
Executive Officer
Commission to Preserve National
Monuments
Obala Kulina Bana i/VI
71000 Sarajevo
Tel : +387 3 276 760
Fax : +387 33 276 768
E-mail :
[mirela.m.handan@aneksokomisja.co
m.ba](mailto:mirela.m.handan@aneksokomisja.co.m.ba)

BRAZIL / BRESIL

Mme Silvia Witaker
2ème Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Brésil
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
E-mail : s.whitaker@unesco.org

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Mr Hristo Bojinov
Director
National Nature Protection Service
Ministry of Environment and Water
Blvd. "Marija Luiza" 22
Sofia 1000
Tel: + 3592/940-65-41
Fax: + 3592 /980 96 41
E-mail /
bojinov@moew.government.bg

Mr TsveTelina Ivanova
National Nature Protection Service
Directorate
Ministry of Environment and Water
Blvd. "Marija Luiza" 22
Sofia 1000
Tel: + 3592/940-66-35
Fax: + 3592 /980 96 41
E-mail: tsvety_ivanova@abv.bg

Ms Ouliana Maleeva-Damianova
National Institute of the Protection of
Cultural Monuments
Director for Control of the Protection
of Cultural Monuments
16, Dondukov Blvd.
1000 Sofia
Tel: + 3592/987- 4801
Fax: + 3592 /987 4801
E-mail : uliana@gbg.bg

CAMBODIA / CAMBODGE

M. David Measkath
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Cambodge
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 25 15 02
Fax : +33 1 45 25 84 72
E-mail : dl2cambodge@wanadoo.fr

CAMEROON / CAMEROUN

M. Venant Meliga
Coordinateur général
Ministère de la Culture
BP 8044 Yaoundé
Tel : +237 222 13 13
Fax : +237 222 65 79

Mr Charles Assamba Ongodo
Deuxième secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Cameroun
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 33
Fax : +33 1 45 68 30 34
E-mail : c.assamba@unesco.org

CANADA

Mme Christina Cameron
Directeur général
National Historical Sites
Parks Canada
25, Eddy Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0M5
Tel: +1 819 994 1808
Fax: +1 819 953 4909
E-mail: Christina.Cameron@pc.gc.ca

Mr Gordon W. Fulton
Director, Historical Services, National
Historic Sites
Parks Canada
25, rue Eddy (25-5-R)
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0M5
Tel: +1 819-997-6966
Fax: +1 819-953-4909
E-mail: Gordon.Fulton@pc.gc.ca

CROATIA / CROATIE

S.Exc. Mme Neda Ritz
Ambassadeur de la Croatie auprès
de l'UNESCO
5, avenue Bosquet
75007 Paris
Tel : +33 1 47 05 04 42

Mr Josip Belamaric
Ministry of Culture
Head of Conservation
Department of Split
Porinova 2
21000 Split
Porinova 2
Tel : +3851 (0)21 305 444/430
Fax : +3851 (0)21 305 418
E-mail : jbelamaric@konst.htnet.hr

Mme Srečka Betica-Srsen
Déléguée permanente adjointe de la
Croatie auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 43 06 12 97

CUBA

Mme Maria Josefa Vilaboy
Morales
Area Asuntos Multilaterales y
Cooperación
Dirección de relaciones
Internacionales
Ministerio de Cultura
Calle 4 N° 251 e/ 11 y 13, Vedado,
La Habana
Tel : (537) 55-22 28
Fax : (537) 833-2053
E-mail : [fina@min.cult.cu](mailto: fina@min.cult.cu)

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

H.E. Ms Ednée Leventis
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate of Cyprus to
UNESCO
86, avenue Foch
75016 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 00 35 05
Fax : +33 1 45 01 20 53
E-mail :
delcypunesco@delcypunesco.9Tel.com

CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Mr Michal Beneš
Senior Official
UNESCO Unit
Ministry of Culture
Maltézské náměstí, 471/1
118 01 Praha 1
Tel.: +420-257 085 299
Fax: +420-224 310 668
E-mail: michal.benes@mkcr.cz

Ms Irena Moozová
Permanent Delegate to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
UNESCO House
75015 Paris, France
Tel.: 01.45.68.35.35
Fax: 01.42.73.21.80
E-mail:
unesco.paris@embassy.mzv.cz

EL SALVADOR

Mme Nanette Viaud Desroches
Délégée adjointe
Délégation permanente d'El Salvador
1, rue Miollis
Tel : +33 1 45 68 34 20
Fax : +33 1 47 34 41 86
E-mail : dl.el-salvador@unesco.org

ETHIOPIA / ETHIOPIE

Dr. Brook Hailu
Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Délégué permanent adjoint d'Ethiopie
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 34 61
Fax : +33 1 47 83 31 45
E-mail : dl.ethiopie@unesco.org

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Mr Jukka-Pekka Flander
Chief Inspector
Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 35
FIN 00023 Government
Tel : +358 9 160 39333
Fax : + 358 9 160 39364
Jukka-pekka.Flander@ymparisto.fi

Ms Margaretha Ehrstrom
Senior Advisor
National Board of Antiquities
Post Box 169
00511 Helsinki
Tel.+358-9-4050 9418
Mobil +358-50-350 62 59
Fax. +358-9-4050 9420
E-mail : margaretha.ehrstrom@nba.fi

FRANCE

Ms Isabelle Longuet-Payelle
Chargée de mission pour les actions
internationales
Ministère de la Culture et de la
Communication
Direction de l'Architecture et du
Patrimoine
8 rue Vivienne
75002 PARIS
Tel: +33 1.40.15.33.35
Fax: +33 1.40.15.33.07
E-mail:
isabelle.longuet@culture.gouv.fr

Mr Philippe Demeron
Chef de bureau
Ministère de l'écologie et du
développement durable
Direction de la nature et des paysages
Sous-direction des sites et des
paysages
Bureau des actions territoriales
20, avenue de Ségur
75007 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 19 20 41
Fax : +33 1 42 19 20 36
E-mail :
philippe.demeron@ecologie.gouv.fr

Mme Catherine Dumesnil
Chargée de mission auprès de la
Délégation
Délégation permanente de la France
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : (33) 01 53 69 99 35
Fax : (33) 01 53 69 99 49
E-mail:
Catherine.dumesnil@diplomatie.fr

Mr Hadrien Laroche
Conseiller technique pour la culture
Commission nationale française
57 bd des Invalides
75007 Paris
Tel : (33) 01 53 69 38 38
Fax : (33) 01 53 69 32 23
E-mail :
Hadrien.laroche@diplomatie.gouv.fr

Mlle Claire Tollis
Assistante technique patrimoine
mondial
Ministère de l'écologie et du
développement durable
90 rue Castagnary
75015 Paris
Tel : 06 74 18 18 83
E-mail : clairetollis@hotmail.com

Mr Olivier Poisson
Inspecteur général des monuments
historiques
Ministère de la culture et de la
communication
Ministère de la Culture
65, rue de Richelieu
75002 Paris.
Tel: +33 (0)6 10 27 15 85
E-mail: ol.p@free.fr

Mme Marie-Noël Tournoux
Chargée de mission
Convention France-UNESCO
Ministère de la Culture
Direction de l'architecture et du
Patrimoine
8, rue Vivienne
75002 Paris
Tel : +33 1 40 15 32 52
E-mail : mn.tournoux@unesco.org

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

H.E. Mrs Natia Djaparidze
Ambassador of Georgia to France
Permanent Delegate of Georgia to
UNESCO
104 Avenue Raymond Poincare
75116 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 02 16 16
Fax : +33 1 45 02 16 01
E-mail :
ambassade.georgie@infa.gov.ge

M. Zourab Eristavi
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de la
Géorgie auprès de l'UNESCO
104 Avenue Raymond Poincare
75116 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 02 16 16
Fax : +33 1 45 02 16 01
E-mail :
zourab.eristavi@infa.gov.ge

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

H.E. Mr. Hans-Heinrich Wrede
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate of Germany to
UNESCO
Chairman of the Executive Board
13/15 Av. Franklin Roosevelt
75008 Paris
France

Dr. Birgitta Ringbeck
Head of Division
Permanent Conference of the
Ministers of Culture
Ministry for Urban Development
and Housing, Culture and Sports
of the State of North Rhine
Westphalia
D - 40190 Düsseldorf
Tel: +49211-3843-592
Fax: +49211-3843-73592
E-mail:
birgitta.ringbeck@mswks.nrw.de

Ms Heike Britz
Second Secretary
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Nature Conservation and Nuclear
Safety
Robert Schumann Platz 3
53175 Bonn
Tel : +49 228 305 26 12
Fax : +49 228 305 26 84
E-mail : heike.britz@bmlu.bund.de

Ms Barbara Engels
Project Officer
Federal Agency for Nature
Conservation
Konstantinstr. 110
D-53179 Bonn
Tel : +49 22 8 84 91 242
Fax : +49 228 84 91 245
E-mail : engelsb@bfn.de

GREECE / GRECE

Mrs Elena Korka
Head of Department
Ministry of Culture
Bouboulinas 20
10286 Athens
Tel: + 30.210.8258650
Fax: +30.210.8229322
E-mail : Elena.korka@dpka.culture.gr

Mme Anastasia Tzigounaki
Conseiller des affaires culturelles
Délégation permanente de la Grèce
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue miollis
75015 Paris
+33 1 45 68 29 85
+33 1 43 06 00 30
E-mail : anastasiazigounaki@unesco.org

Ms Aikaterini Kyparissi-Apostolika
Head
Directorate of Prehistoric and
Classical Antiquities
Ministry of Culture
Bouboulinas 20-22
10286 Athens
Tel: + 30.210.8201262
Fax: +30.210.8201260
E-mail : protocol@dpka.culture.gr

GRENADA / GRENADÉ

Ms Chafica Haddad
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Grenada to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45683035
Fax : +33 1 49520014
E-mail : dl.grenada@unesco.org

GUATEMALA

M. Saria Schoenstedt Briz
Ministre Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Guatemala
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 10
E-mail : dl.guatemala@unesco.org

HOLY SEE / SAINT-SIEGE

Mons.Francesco Follo
Observateur permanent
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 31
E-mail : op.saint-siege@unesco.org

Ms Alessandra Uncini
Delegate
Muséi Vaticani
Vatican City
E-mail: musei@scv.va

HONDURAS

M. J.C. Bendana-Pinel
Chargé d'affaires p.i
Délégation permanente du
Honduras auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 65
E-mail : dl.honduras@unesco.org

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Mr. Tamás László Fejerdy
Head of Delegation
Vice-President of National Board
of Cultural Heritage
Táncsics Mihály Utica 1
H-1014 Budapest
Tel.: +36 1 225 48 65
Fax: + 36.1 225 48 68
E-mail: tamas.fejerdy@koh.hu

Mr Tomas Pinter
Head of Department of Hungarian
WHC Secretariat
Tangsigs M.V. 1
H-1014 Budapest
Tel : +361 48 70 933
Fax : +361 48 70 936
E-mail : vilagorokeg@axelero.hu

Dr. Janos Tardy
For mer Deputy Secretary of State
for Nature Conservation
Ministry of Environment and
Water Management
Fo utea 44-50
H - 1011 Budapest
Tel.: +36-1-457-33-07
Fax: +36-1- 357-94-11
E-mail: tardy@mail.kvvm.hu

ICELAND / ISLANDE

Mr C. Helgadóttir
Cousellor
Permanent Delegation of Iceland
Embassy of Iceland
8, avenue Kleber
75116 Paris
Tel: +33 1 44 17 32 85
Fax : +33 1 40 67 99 96
E-mail :
guduy.helgadottir@udu.sejr.is

INDONESIA / INDONESIE

Mr Musa Risman
Deputy Minister
Menko Kesra
Jl.Merdekarabat 3
Jakarta
Tel : +021 34 53 284
Fax : +021 345 32 84
E-mail : rismanmusa@hotmail.com

Mr Muhsin Syihab
Second Secretary of the Indonesian
Embassy in Paris
47-49 rue Constanbert
75116 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 03 07 60
Fax : +33 1 45 06 22 37
E-mail : msyihab@yahoo.com

IRAQ / IRAQ

S. Exc M. Muhyi Alkhateeb
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent d'Irak auprès de
l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris

M. Cawki Abdel Amir
Conseiller Culturel
Délégué permanent d'Irak auprès de
l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris

IRELAND / IRLANDE

Mr Frank Donnelly
Senior Architect
Dept of Environment
Heritage and Local Government
Dunseline – Harcourt Lane
Dublin – 2
Tel : +33 1 41 17 152
Fax : +33 1 47 81335
E-mail : fdonnelly@duchas.ir

ISRAEL

H.E. Mr Jacques Reevah
Ambassador of Israel to UNESCO
Permanent Delegation of Israel to
UNESCO
Tel : +33 1 40 76 54 51
Fax : +33 1 40 76 55 55
E-mail : israel@unesco.mfa.gov.il

Ms Dannan Parnes
Conseiller
Permanent Delegation of Israel to
UNESCO
Tel : +33 1 40 76 54 51
Fax : +33 1 40 76 55 55
E-mail : israel@unesco.mfa.gov.il

Professor Michael Turner
Chairman,
Israel World Heritage Committee
25 Caspi St
Jerusalem 93554
Tel: +972 2 6716492
Fax: +972 2 6732801
E-mail: turnerm@barak-online.net

Mr Ilan Elgar
Director
International Organizations
Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Hakirya
Jerusalem
Tel : +972 2 53 03 250
E-mail : ilanelgar@mfa.gov.il

ITALY / ITALIE

S.Exc. M. Francesco Caruso
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente d'Italie auprès
de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris,
Tel: +33 (0)1 45 68 31 41
Fax: +33 (0)1 45 66 41 78
E-mail: dl.italie@unesco.org

Ms Crisitna Carenza
First Secretary
Italian Permanent Delegation to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris,
Tel: +33 (0)1 45 68 31 41
Fax: +33 (0)1 45 66 41 78
E-mail: dl.italie@unesco.org

Ms Sabrina Urbinati
Doctorante en Droit International
Universita degli studi di Milano-
Bicocca
Tel : +39 33 87 98 30 81
E-mail : sabrurb@tin.it

Mr. Manuel Roberto Guido
Responsible of World Heritage
List Office
Ministry for Cultural Heritage and
Activities
Via Del Collegio Romani, 27
00186 Rome
Tel : +39 06 67 23 21 24
Fax : +39 06 67 23 21 05
E-mail : mguido@beniculturali.it

Ms Federica Mucci
International Law Expert of the
Italian Delegation
Researcher in International Law
University of Rome "Tor Vergata"
Via Orazio Raimondo 17
00178 Rome
Tel : +39 06 7259463
Fax : +39 06 725 92463
E-mail :
Federica.mucci@uniroma2.it

KENYA

Dr Ahmed Yassin
Director of Administration
National Museum of Kenya
P.O. Box 00100-40658
Nairobi
Tel : +254 020 3744 673
Fax: +254-020 3741 424
E-mail: rissea_da@museums.or.ke

Mr Alexander Kibebe Kungu
Deputy Secretary-General
Kenya National Commission for
UNESCO
P.O. Box 300400
Nairobi
Tel : 0254 20 78 07 81
E-mail : kncunesco@todays.co.ke

Ms R.A. Omamo
Permanent Delegate to UNESCO
Kenya Embassy
3, rue Feycinet
75116 Paris
Tel : 01 56 62 25 25

Mr F.M. Makindi
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation to
UNESCO
Tel : 01 56 62 25 25

LUXEMBOURG

M. Alex Langini
Président
Commission des sites et monuments
nationaux
Ministère de la Culture
26, rue Munster
L-2160 Luxembourg
Tel : +352 478 6650
Fax : +352 461 779
E-mail : alex.langini@ssmm.etat.lu

MACEDONIA / MACEDONIE

Ms Biljana Tanovska,
Head of Department for preservation of
cultural heritage
Ministry of Culture
Ilindenska b.b.
1000 - Skopje,
Tel.+ 38 92 31 35 468
Fax: + 38 92 322 69 20
E-mail: Tanovska@kultura.gov.mk

Ms Lidija Topuzovska
Secretary-General of Macedonian National
Commission for UNESCO
Ilindenska b.b. 1000 – Skopje
Tel.+ 389 2312 9311
Fax: + 389 231 29 311
E-mail: mkunesco@freE-mail.com.mk

MADAGASCAR

S. Exc. Mme Yvette Rabetafika-
Ranjeva
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent auprès de
l'UNESCO
40, rue du Général Foy
75008 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 93 34 77
Fax : +33 1 45 22 22 89
E-mail : depermadu@wanadoo.fr

Mme Ravaomalala Randriamamonjy
Délégué permanent adjoint
40, rue du Général Foy
75008 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 93 34 77
Fax : +33 1 45 22 22 89
E-mail : depermadu@wanadoo.fr

M. Benjamin Claude Babany
Conseiller Culturel
40, rue du Général Foy
75008 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 23 34 77
Fax : +33 1 45 22 22 89
E-mail : depermadu@wanadoo.fr

MALAYSIA / MALAISIE

Mr Paiman Bin Keromo
Director of Antiquities
Department of Museum and
Antiquities
Jalan Damansara
50566 Kuala Lumpur
Tel : +012 03 22 82 62 55
Fax : +012 03 22 60 60 99
E-mail : paiman@jma.gov.my

S.E. Mr Noor Azmi Ibrahim
Permanent Delegate of Malaysia to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
E-mail : dl.malaysia.unesco.org

Mr Abdullah Naharudin
Deputy permanent Delegate of
Malaysia to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
E-mail : nakamalaisie@hotmail.com

MALTA / MALTE

H.E. Mr Joseph Licari
Ambassador of Malta
46, rue de Longchamp
75116 Paris
Tel : + 33.1. 42 93 34 77
E-mail : josephlicari@hotmail.com

Mr Reuban Grima
Heritage Malta
National Museum of Archaeology
Republic Street
Valletta
Tel : +356 21 231 236
Fax : +356 21 24 36 28
E-mail : reuban.grima@gov.mt

MAURITIUS / MAURICE

Mr Fareed Chuttan
Principal Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Arts and Culture
Level 7 – R. Seenevassen Building
Cnr Maillard and Pope Hennessy
Streets
Port Louis
Republic of Mauritius
Tel : (230) 212 8377
Fax : (230) 211 3196
E-mail: fchuttan@mail.gov.mu

MEXICO / MEXIQUE

Dr. Francisco Javier Lopez
Morales
Director de Patrimonio Mundial
del INAH
Puebla 95
Mexico D.F 06700
Tel: (52 55) 55 14 59 63
Fax: (52 55) 55 14 16 79
E-mail:
direccion.pmundial@inah.gob.mx

M. Rodolfo Ogarrio
Presidente
Fundacion Mexicana Para la
Educacion Ambiental A.C.
Campos Euseos 400 pisa 19
Mexico DG 11000
Tel : +52 55 52 811 516
Fax : +52 55 52 806 774
E-mail : rogarrio@mx.intec.net

MONACO

Mme Corninne Magail
Déléguee permanent adjointe
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 34 04
Fax : ++33 1 45 67 24 52
E-mail : c.magail@unesco.org

MOROCCO / MAROC

S. Exc. Mme Aziza Bennani
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent du Maroc
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15
Tel: +33.1. 45 68 34 27
Fax: +33.1. 45 67 18 69
E-mail : dl.maroc@unesco.org

Mr Ahmed Naji Nejjar
Conseiller
Délégation permanent du Maroc
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15
Tel: +01. 45 68 31 31
Fax: +01. 45 67 18 69
E-mail : dl.maroc@unesco.org

Mme Souad Idrissi
Conseiller des Affaires étrangères
Délégation permanente du Maroc
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 33
Decisions and Summary Record

MYANMAR

Mr Myint Soe
Minister Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of the Union of
Myanmar to UNESCO
60, rue de Courcelles
75008 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 25 56 95
Fax : +33 1 42 56 49 41

Mrs L. Nang Tsan
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of the Union of
Myanmar to UNESCO
60, rue de Courcelles
75008 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 25 56 95
Fax : +33 1 42 56 49 41

PAKISTAN

Mme Ayesha Riyaz
Deputy Head of Mission
Permanent Delegation of Pakistan to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 25 4 2
Fax : +33 1 45 66 62 15
E-mail : dl.pakistan@unesco.org

PANAMA

Mr Jorge Patino
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.
Permanent Delegation of Panama
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 32 93
Fax : +33 1 43 06 02 51
E-mail : dl.panama@unesco.org

PERU / PEROU

Mr Carlos Herrera
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de
l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45682934
E-mail : c.herrera@unesco.org

Mr Carlos Cueto
Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Pérou
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 35
Fax : +33 1 45 68 29 20

PHILIPPINES

H.E. Mr Hector Villarroel
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate of the Philippines
to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 30 12
Fax : +33 1 45 67 07 97
E-mail : dl.pholippines@unesco.org

POLAND / POLOGNE

H.E. Ms Maria Wodzinska-Walicka
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate of Poland of
UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 96
Fax : +33 1 45 66 59 56

Mrs Aleksandra Wacławerek
Secrétaire Général adjoint
Commission nationale polonaise pour
l'UNESCO
Palac Kulturi
Nauki 7p
00901 Warszawa
Tel : +48 22 624 24 96
Fax : +48 22 620 33 61
E-mail : a.waclawerek@unesco.pl

Mr Tomasz Orłowski
Deputy Director
Department of the United Nations
System and Global Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
00580 Warszawa
AL Szuoha 23
Tel : +48 22 52 39 400
E-mail : tomasz.orlowski@mse.gov.pl

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA /
REPUBLIQUE DE COREE**

Mr Kim Young Han
Director
Conservation Science Division
National Research Institute of
Cultural Heritage
Cultural Heritage Administration
Tel : +33 1 40 56 38 88
E-mail : dl.coree-rep@unesco.org

Mr Kyoung Hwa Kim
Deputy Director of International
Affaires Division
National Research of Cultural
Heritage Administration
Cultural Heritage administration
DunsonDong Segu
Daesan City
Tel : +042 481 47 60
Fax : +042 481 47 69
E-mail : kyoungkwa@cpa.go.kr

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

S. Exc. M. Andrei Magheru
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de la
Roumanie auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 25 24
E-mail : dl.roumanie@unesco.org

Prof. Dumitru Preda
Ministre conseiller
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de la
Roumanie auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 26 45
E-mail : d.preda@unesco.org

SAN MARINO / SAINT MARIN

S.Exc. Mme Edith Tamagnini
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent
Délégation Permanente de
Saint-Marin
21 Place Vendôme
75001 Paris
Tel : +33 1 42 61 51 21

**SAUDI ARABIA /
ARABIE SAOUDITE**

Dr Abdallah Saud Al Saud
Director of the National Museum
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 3734
Riyadh 11481
Tel : +33 1 40 36 01 00
Fax : +33 1 420 299760
E-mail : a\saud2000@yahoo.com

Dr Mohammed Aldebian
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Saudi
Arabia to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 34 06

SENEGAL

Mr Ousman Diop Blondin
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente du Sénégal
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 90

**SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO /
SERBIE ET MONTENEGRO**

Mme Seunlic Tatijana
Ministre conseillère
Délégation permanente de Serbie et
Monténégro auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15
Tel: ++33 1 45 671076
Fax: ++33 1 40 56 30 59
E-mail: dl.serbie-montenegro@unesco.org

SLOVAKIA / SLOVAQUIE

Mr Jozef Klinda
Director-General
Sector of Environmental Concepts
Laws and Organization
Ministry of Environment of the
Slovak Republic
Nam L Stura 1
Bratislava
Tel : +42 17 59562001
Fax : +42 17 59562002

Ms Viera Dvorakova
Head of Division for State
Administration
Monuments Board of Slovak Republic
Pamiatkovi urad, 08571 N° Oervend
Most 6
81406 Bratislava
Tel : +421 254 789182
Fax : +421 254775844
E-mail :
dvorakova.viera@pamiathy.sk

Ms Katarina Kosova
Director-General
Monuments Board of Slovak Republic
Pamiatkovi urad, 08571 N° Oervend
Most 6
81406 Bratislava
Tel : +421 254 774785
Fax : +421 254 77 5844
E-mail : kosovakatarina@paniatky.sk

Mme Bozena Krizikova
Secrétaire générale de la Commission
nationale slovaque pour l'UNESCO
Ministère des affaires étrangères
Hlbola 2
Bratislava
Tel : +42 12 5978 3514
Fax : +42 12 59783516
E-mail :
bozena_krizikow@foreign.gov.sk

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Sr. Esther Rodriguez Gracia
Consejera Técnica de la Subdirección
General de Proteccion del Patrimonio
Historico
Ministerio de Cultura de Espana
Plaza del Rey s/n 28071 Madrid
Tel : +34 917017000
Fax : +34 917017381
E-mail : ergarcia@oapn.mma.es

Sr. D. Benito Burgos Barrantes
Técnico de la Subdirección General de
Protección del Patrimonio Histórico
Dirección General de Bellas Artes y
Bienes Culturales
Ministerio de Cultura
Tel: +34-91-7017000 Ext. 32455
Fax: +34-91-7017381
E-mail: benito.burgos@dgba.mcu.es

D^a. Carmen Añón Feliu
Asesora de la Subdirección General de
Protección del Patrimonio Histórico
Dirección General de Bellas Artes y
Bienes Culturales
Ministerio de Cultura

Tel: +34-620831369
E-mail:
carmenanon@Telefonica.net

Mr Pedro Navascues
Observador
Ministerio de Cultura
P° Dr Vallejo Nagera 42
Tel : +34 91 47 41 940
Fax : +34 91 47 31 041
E-mail : pnavascues@ya.com

SUDAN / SOUDAN

Mr Abdelaziz Elawad
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Sudan to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 79
Fax : +33 1 45 63 86 73

SWEDEN / SUEDE

Ms Birgitta Hoberg
Senior International Officer
National Heritage Board
P.O. Box 5405
S-114 84 Stockholm
Tel +46 8 5191 8020
Fax +46 8 660 7284
birgitta.hoberg@raa.se

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

S.Exc. M. Ernst Iten
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent de la Suisse
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue de Miollis
Paris Cedex 15
Tel: +33 1 45 68 3396
Fax: +33 1 43 06 21 39
E-mail: dl.suisse@unesco.org

Mme Ruth Oberholzer
Attachée
Délégation Permanente de la
Suisse
auprès de l'UNESCO
1 rue de Miollis
Paris Cedex 15
Tel: +33 1 45 68 3396
Fax: +33 1 43 06 21 39
E-mail: dl.suisse@unesco.org

M. Johann Mûmer
Chef de la Section Patrimoine
culturel et monuments historiques
Office fédéral de la culture
Hallwylstrasse 15
CH-3003 Berne
Tel : +41 31 322 80 59
Fax : +41 31 322 87 39
E-mail :
johann.muerner@bak.admin.ch

THAILAND / THAILANDE

Mr Adul Wichiencharoen
Chair of National World Heritage
Committee
Office of Natural Resources and
Environmental policy and Planning
(ONEP)
60/1 Soi Phibulwattana 7 Rama VI
Rd., Samsennai Phayathai
Bangkok
Tel : 66-2271-4219 ,
Fax : 66-34-351 944
E-mail :
adul@su.ac.th, profadul@onep.go.th

Mr Payung Nopsuwan
Minister's Advisor
Ministry of Natural Resource and
Environment
Pollution Control Department
Building 92 Phahonyothin Soi 7,
Phahonyothin Rd., Samsennai
Phayathai Bangkok
Tel : +66 2 2278 851

Mrs Orapin Wongchumpit
Deputy Secretary - General
For Secretary - General
Office of Natural Resources and
Environmental Policy and Planning
60/1 Soi Phibulwattana 7 Rama VI
Rd., Samsennai Phayathai
Bangkok
Tel : +66-2271-4219 ,
Fax : +66-34-351 944

Mr Vinich Rukchart
Director of National Parks
Development Division
National Park, Wildlife and Plant
Conservation Department
60/1 Soi Phibulwattana 7 Rama VI
Rd., Samsennai Phayathai
Bangkok
Tel : +66-2271-4219 ,
Fax : +66-34-351 944

Mr Songtam Suksawang
Director of National Parks Research
Division
National Park, Wildlife and Plant
Conservation Department
61 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak,
Bangkok 10900
Tel : +66-2561-4292-3 Ext 746
Fax : +66-2579-5964
E-mail : s_songtam@dnpp.go.th

Mr Tharapong Srisuchat
Director, The sixth Fine Arts Regional
Office, Sukhothai
Ministry of Culture
The Fine Arts Department
Address: The 6th Regional Office of
Fine Arts Sukhothai, Muang Kao,
Sukhothai, 64210
Tel : +055-697364
E-mail : tharapong@m-culture.go.th

Mr Surasak Srisam-Ang
Director of the Twelfth Fine Arts
Regional Office,
Ministry of Culture
The 12th Regional Office of Fine Arts
Department , Naimuang Phimai
District, Nakhon Ratchasima, 30110
Tel : +044-285096
Fax : +044-471518

Mr Jariyavidyanont Preeyanuch
Deputy Permanent Delegate for
Thailand
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 31 22
Fax : +33 1 45 68 31 23

TOGO

M. Kokou Kpayedo
Premier Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Togo
auprès de l'UNESCO
8, rue Alfred Roll
75017 Paris
Tel : +33 1 43 80 12 13
Fax : +33 1 43 80 06 05
E-mail : frankkpayedo@yahoo.fr

TUNISIA / TUNISIE

Mr Radha Jebali
Délégué
Délégation permanente de la
Tunisie auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 29 95
E-mail : r.jebali@unesco.org

UKRAINE

Mrs Tetiana Izhevskaya
Vice-Chairperson of the National
Commission of Ukraine to
UNESCO
1, sq Mykhailivska
01018 Kiev
Tel : +38 044 238 1537
Fax : +38 044 238 18 36
E-mail : ukgs@mfa.gov.ua

Dr Vadim Abyzov
Director of the National Research
Institute for Architecture and
Town-Urban Theory and History
President of ICOMOS National
Committee
9, v. Zhitomirskaya St
MSP 01601 Kiev 01025
Tel : +38 044 27 90 480
Fax : +38 044 27 95 194
E-mail : abyzov@nditiam.gov.ua

Mr Grygoriy Parchuk
Head of the International
Cooperation Division
State Agency for Protected Areas
Ministry for Environment of
Ukraine
35, Urytskogo Str.
Kiev
Tel : +38 044 206 33 09
Fax : +38 044 206 33 09
E-mail : parks@parks.freenet.kev.ua

Mr Igor Denissuk
First Secretary
National Commission of Ukraine
for UNESCO
1, Sq Mykhailivska
01018 Kiev
Tel : +38 044 238 16 01
Fax : +38 044 238 18 36
E-mail : ukgs@mfa.gov.ua

Ms Martynenko
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Ukraine to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 26 60
Fax : +33 1 45 68 26 61

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES / EMIRATS ARABES UNIS

Mr Feddoul Kammah
Conseiller
Permanent Delegation of UAE to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 27 24
E-mail : f.kammah@unesco.org

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA / REPUBLIQUE- UNIE DE TANZANIE

Mr Eliwasa E Maro
Principal Conservator of Antiquities
Antiquities Department
Box 2280
Dar Es Salaam
Tel : +255 022 21 16 554
Fax : +255 022 22 840
E-mail : eliwasamaro@yahoo.com

Mr Mohammed Shaaban Sheya
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Tanzania to UNESCO
13, avenue Raymond Poincaré
75116 Paris
Tel : 01 53 70 68 66 18
Fax : +33 1 47 55 05 46
E-mail : mssheya@noos.fr

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr Paul Hoffman
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish &
Wildlife and Parks
US Department of the Interior
Room 3156
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20240
Tel: +1 202 208-4416
Fax: +1 202 208-4684
E-mail: Paul_Hoffman@ios.doi.gov

Ms Fran Mainella
Director
National Park Service
1849 c Street NW
Washington DC 20240
Tel : +1 202 208 4621

Mr Stephen Morris
Acting Chief
Office of International Affairs
US National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20240
Tel: +1 202 354-1803
Fax: +1 202 371-1446
E-mail: Stephen_Morris@nps.gov

URUGUAY

H.E. Mr Pablo Sader
Ambassador
Délégué permanent de l'Uruguay
auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : 0145683472
E-mail : p.sader@unesco.org

VENEZUELA

Mme Yamelis Linares
Attachée à la Délégation permanente
du Venezuela auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 26 85
Fax : +33 1 47 34 28 93
E-mail : dl.venezuela.unesco.org

VIET NAM

Mme Nguyen Thi Nhu Phi
Conseiller
Permanent Delegation of Viet Nam to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
750015 Paris
E-mail : nhu-phi@wanadoo.fr

Mr Nguyen Man Cuong
Attaché
Permanent Delegation of Viet Nam to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris

ZIMBABWE

YEMEN

H.E. Mr Hamid Alawadhi
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate of Yemen to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 25
Fax : +33 1 45 66 01 51
E-mail : dl.yemen@unesco.org

Mr Abdulbasset Saad
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Yemen to UNESCO
1, Rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 25
Fax : +33 1 45 66 01 51
E-mail : dl.yemen@unesco.org

Mr Dawson Munjeri
Deputy Permanent Delegate of
Zimbabwe
12 rue Lord Byron
75008 Paris
Tel : 01 56 88 16 00
Fax : 01 56 88 16 09
E-mail : d.munjeri@unesco.org

(ii) AUTRES OBSERVATEURS / OTHER OBSERVERS

**PERMANENT OBSERVER MISSION OF PALESTINE TO UNESCO /
MISSION PERMANENTE D'OBSERVATION DE LA PALESTINE AUPRES DE L'UNESCO**

S. Exc. M. Ahmad Abdelrazek
Ambassadeur, Observateur permanent
de la Palestine auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15
France
Tel: +33 1 45683052
Fax: 1 456 833 40
E-mail: dl.palestine@unesco.org

Mr Issa Wachill
Conseiller
Mission permanente d'Observation
de la Palestine auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 68 33 42
Fax : +33 1 45 68 33 40

**(iii) INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS /
ORGANISATIONS GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES**

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE /

Mr Hans Dorn
Landscape architect
BDLA-IFLA-ICOMOS
Historic Gardens
Cultural Landscape Committee Chairman
PO Box 95312
2509 CH
The Hague
Netherlands
Tel : +31 70 31 40 884
Fax : +31 70 38 34 827
E-mail : IFLA@ifla.org

**(iv) NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS /
ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES**

GERMAN WORLD HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Ms Brigitte Mayerhofer
Managing Director
PO Box 401805
D-80718 Munich
Tel.: +49-89-30765101
Fax: +49-89-30765102
E-mail: info@welterbestiftung.de

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CARING COMMUNITIES

Mr Richard Jordan
26 Gramercy Park
P.O. Box 1562
Madison Square Station
New York NY 10025
USA
Tel : +1 212 545 4169
Fax : +1 212 759 5893
E-mail : richardjordan@mailcity.com

NORDIC WORLD HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Ms Kris Endresen
Director
Fridtjof Nansens Plass 4,
0160 Oslo, Norway
Tel: +47-24-14-01-03
Fax: +47-24-14-01-01
E-mail:
Kris.Endresen@nwhf.no

Ms Synnove Vinsryeg
Deputy Director
Fridtjof Nansens Plass 4
01600 Oslo - Norway
Tel : +47 24 10 01 02
Fax : +47 24 10 01 01
E-mail :
synnove.vinsry99@nwhf.no

Mr Harald Bauer Bredesen
Adviser
Fridtjof Nansens Plass 4,
0160 Oslo, Norway
Tel: +47-24-14-01-03
Fax: +47-24-14-01-01

WORLD MONUMENT FUND

Mr Gaetano Palumbo
Director of Archaeological Conservation
Africa, Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia World Monument Fund
34 Avenue de New york
75016 Paris
Tel : +33 1 47 20 91 51
Fax : +33 1 47 20 71 27
E-mail : gpalumbo@wmf.org

ASSOCIATION CHANTIERS HISTOIRE ET ARCHITECTURE MEDIEVALES (CHAM)

Mme Louisa Crispe
Coordinatrice internationale
5-7, rue Guilleminot
75014 Paris
Tel : +33 1 43 35 15 51
Fax : +33 1 43 20 46 82
E-mail : association.cham@wanadoo.fr

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ARCHITECTS / UNION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHITECTES

Mr Jean-Claude Riguet
UIA Secretary General
51, Rue Raynouard
75016 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 24 36 88
Fax : +33 1 45 24 02 78
E-mail : uia@uia-architectes.org

Mrs Paula Liberato
International Organizations Department
51, Rue Raynouard
75016 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 24 36 88
Fax : +33 1 45 24 02 78
E-mail : uia@uia-architectes.org

UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION

Mr Raymond E. Wanner
Senior Adviser on UNESCO Issues
United Nations Foundation
9143 Sligo Creek Parkway
Silver Spring, MD 20901
USA
Tel. 301-565-0408
Fax 301-565-4084
RWanner363@aol.com

**ISLAMIC EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION ISLAMIQUE POUR L'EDUCATION, LES SCIENCES ET LA CULTURE (ISESCO)**

Dr Asmaa Abdalla
Specialist in charge of Cooperation with International Organizations
ISESCO
Avenue Altine
Hay Road
Rabat
Morocco
Tel : +212 37 71 53 05
Fax : +212 37 77 74 59
E-mail: coop@isesco.org.ma

OTHERS / AUTRES

Mr Michel Sidhom
Président
Institut d'Orient
51, rue Lacépède
75005 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 35 50 50
Fax : +33 1 45 35 36 56
E-mail : orient@club-internet.fr

Ms Émiko Iinuma
Institut d'Orient
51, rue Lacépède
75005 Paris
Tel : +33 1 45 35 50 50
Fax : +33 1 45 35 36 56
E-mail : orient@club-internet.fr

Mr Jean-Louis Luxen
Président
CHEDI "Culture, Héritage & Développement – International
BP 121 Molenbeek 5
1180 Bruxelles
Belgique
Tel : +32 2 413 26 06
Fax : + 32 2 413 40 31
E-mail : luxen@cfwb.be

Mr Georges Zouain
Director
GAIA-Heritage (sal)
20-22 rue des Acacias
75017 Paris
Tel : +33 1 44 09 75 67
Fax : +33 1 44 09 75 67
E-mail : gszouain@gaia-heritage.org

Ms Britta Rudolf
BTU Cottbus
Postfach:101344
03013 Cottbus
Germany
Tel : +49 355/69 2552
Fax : +49 355/69 2535

Mr Thomas Fisher
Dean
University of Minnesota
89, Church Street, S.E.
Minneapolis
Minnesota
Tel : 1 612 626 90 68
Fax : 1 612 625 75 25
E-mail : FISHER633@UMN.EDU

Ms Véronique Bernard
Organisatrice
Bridge Initiative
11, rue Polotti
38400 SMH
Tel : + 06 13 80 38 88
E-mail : verobernard@wanadoo.fr

Mr Andrea Tramontana
Dottorando
Universita Bologna
DIP Comunicazione
Via Ordonez 38
54033 Carmara (MS)
Italy
Tel : 347 53 86 303
E-mail : andreatramontana@libero.it

Mme Dominique Sewane
Consultante ethnologue
368, rue de Vaugirard
75015 Paris
Tel : 06 84 29 11 71
Fax : +33 1 48 28 56 58
E-mail : dosivane@wanadoo.fr

VI. UNESCO SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO

Mr Mounir Bouchenaki

Assistant Director-General for Culture / Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture

World Heritage Centre / Centre du patrimoine mondial

Francesco Bandarin

Director / Directeur

Lon Addison

Simone Bader

Alessandro Balsamo

Justine Bitot

Giovanni Boccardi

Véronique Dauge

Guy Debonnet

Christine Delsol

Nina Dhumal

Lazare Eloundou-Assomo

Dilek Elveren

Eric Esquivel

Lodovico Folin Calabi

Nicoletta Glodean

Margarita Gonzalez Lombardo

Karim Hendili

Luba Janikova

Feng Jing

Yvette Kaboza

Sophia Labadi

Anne Lemaistre

Christelle Marine

David Martel

Akim Merlo

Akane Nozaki

Fumiko Ohinata

Junko Okahashi

Lynne Patchett

Marc Patry

Kasia Peala

Art Pedersen

Grazia Piras

Marianne Raabe

Deolinda Ribeiro

Marielle Richon

Carlos Romero

Mechtild Rössler

Nuria Sanz

Joanna Serna-Sullivan

Sylvia Simmonds

Shama Sunderraj

Nana Thiam

Frédérique Tsai-Klassen

Nathalie Valanchon

Ron Van Oers

Flora Van Regteren Alterna

Richard Veillon

Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy

Elizabeth Wangari

Bureau of public information – Audiovisual section / Bureau de l'information du public – section audiovisuelle

Claude Van Engeland

Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs / Office des normes internationales et des affaires juridiques

John Donaldson

Yuki Daijo

Division of the Comptroller – Financial Reporting and Account Section / Division du contrôleur financier – Section des rapports financiers et de la comptabilité

John Haigh

Special Advisor to ADG/CLT / Conseiller spécial auprès de l'ADG/CLT

Prof. Dr. Bernd von Droste

92, Rue de Tennerolles

F-92210 Saint Cloud

France

REQUESTS FOR OBSERVERS STATUS/ DEMANDES DU STATUT D'OBSERVATEUR

**SECTION A : List of Observer requests received in accordance with Rule 8.3
of the *Rules of Procedure of the Committee* /
Liste des demandes du statut d'observateur reçues en
conformité avec l'Article 8.3 du Règlement intérieur du Comité**

Mr Richard Jordan
International Council for Caring
Communities, Inc. (ICCC)
24 Central Park South
New York, NY 10019
United States of America

M. Christian Piffet
Chantiers Histoire et Architecture
Médiévales (CHAM)
5 et 7 rue Guilleminot
75014 Paris
France

Mrs Brigitte Mayerhofer
Deutsche Stiftung Welterbe
PF 40 18 05
D-80718 München
Germany

Ms Bertil Pittsa
Mijà Ednam
Köpmangatan 19
962 21 Jokkmokk
Sweden

M. Jean-Louis Luxen
Président
Culture, Heritage & Development -
International
(C H E D I)
BP 121, Molenbeek 5
1080 Bruxelles
Belgium

Mme. Dominique Sewane
368, rue de Vaugirard
75015 Paris
France

M. Naguib-Michel Sidhom
Mme. Émiko Iinuma
Institut d'Orient
51, rue Lacépède
75005 Paris
France

Mr Thomas Fisher
Professor and Dean
College of Architecture and Landscape
Architecture
University of Minnesota
101 Rapson Hall
89 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

M. Georges S. Zouain
Gaia Heritage s.a.l
Paris
France

Mission Permanente d'Observation de
Palestine auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
France

Mr. Raymond E. Wanner
United Nations Foundation
1225 Connecticut Avenue
NW Fourth Floor
Washington, DC 20036
United States of America

Dr Andrea Tramontana
Università Bologna, Dept. Comunicazione
Via Ordenez 38
54033 Carrara (MS) Italy

SECTION B : Other NGO/IGO representatives and other Observer organizations invited by the Director-General of UNESCO in accordance with Rule 8.4 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the Committee /
Autres représentants des ONG/OIG et d'autres organisations Observateurs invités par le Directeur général de l'UNESCO en conformité avec l'Article 8.4 du *Règlement intérieur* du Comité

Mr Kofi Annan
 Secretary-General
 United Nations
 New York, N.Y. 10017
 United States of America

Mr James D. Wolfensohn
 President
 The World Bank
 1818 H Street N.W.
 Washington D.C. 20433
 United States of America

Mr Jacques Diouf
 Director-General
 Food and Agriculture Organization
 of the United Nations
 Via delle Terme di Caracalla
 00100 Rome
 Italy

Mr Kim Hak-su
 Executive Secretary
 United Nations Economic and Social
 Commission
 for Asia and the Pacific
 The United Nations Building
 Rajadamnern Nok Ave.
 Bangkok 102009
 Thailand

M. Denis Ricard
 Secretary General a.i.
 The Organization of World Heritage Cities
 15 rue Saint-Nicolas
 Québec (Québec)
 GIK IM8 Canada

Mr Rodolfo Certeza Severino
 Secretary-General
 ASEAN Secretariat
 70 A Jalan Sisingamangaraja
 Jakarta 12110
 Indonesia

Dr A. Bin Othman Altwaijri
 Director-General
 ISESCO
 Avenue Attine, Hay Ryad
 BP 2275
 10104 Rabat
 Maroc

Mr Tamari'i Tutangata
 Director
 South Pacific Regional Environment
 Programme (SPREP)
 P.O. Box 240
 Apia, Samoa

Dr Thomas Rosswall
 Executive Director
 International Council for Science (ICSU)
 51 Bd. de Montmorency
 75016 Paris
 France

Dr Abdelouahed Belkeziz
 Secretary-General
 Organization of the Islamic Conference
 (OIC)
 B.P. 178
 Jeddah 21411
 Saudi Arabia

Mr Mongi Bousnina
 Director-General
 Arab League Educational, Cultural and
 Scientific Organization (ALECSO)
 B.P. 1120
 Tunis
 Tunisia

Mr Luigi Eynaudy
Secretary-General a.i.
Organization of American States (OAS)
17th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20006
United States of America

Dr Arief S. Sadiman
Director
South-East Asian Ministers of Education
Organization (SEAMEO)
Darakarn Building
920 Sukhumvit Road
Bangkok 10110
Thailand

Dra. Ana Milena Escobar Araujo
Executive Secretary
Andrés Bello Convention 'SECAB)
Apartado Aéro 53465
Avenida 13 n° 85-60
Santafé de Bogotá
Colombia

Ms Diane Menzies
Secretary-General
International Federation of Landscape
Architects (IFLA)
Flat 16, 25 Peterborough Street
Christchurch
New Zealand

Mr Kwasi Myles
Secretary-General
Organization for Museums, Monuments
and Sites of Africa (OMMSA)
P.O. Box 3343
Accra
Ghana

Dr Claude Martin
Director-General
World Wide Fund for Nature
WWF International
Avenue du Mont Blanc
CH-1196 Gland
Switzerland

Mr John Zvereff
Secretary General
International Council of Museums (ICOM)
UNESCO House
1, rue Miollis
Paris
France

Mr Miguel A. Corso
Director
The Getty Conservation Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive
Suite 700
Los Angeles CA 90049-1684
United States of America

Mr Enrique V. Iglesias
President
Inter-American Development Bank
1300 New York Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20577
United States of America

Mrs Paula Liberato
Secrétariat Général UIA
Union Internationale des Architectes
51, rue Raynouard
75016 Paris
France

Ms Bonnie Burnham
President
World Monuments Fund
95 Madison Avenue, 9th Floor
New York NY 10016
United States of America

Monsieur Jean Claude Riguet
Secrétaire général
Union internationale des architectes (UIA)
51 rue Raynouard
75016 Paris
France

Monsieur Alpha Oumar Konaré
Président
Commission de l'Union africaine
B.P. 3243
Addis Ababa
Ethiopie

Monsieur Terry Davis
Secrétaire général du Conseil de l'Europe
B.P. 431 R.6
Palais de l'Europe
67075 Strasbourg Cedex
France

Son Eminence le Cardinal Angelo Sodano
Secrétaire d'Etat
Cité du Vatican
Saint Siège

TIMETABLE

7th Extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee – Paris, 06-11 December 2004 – Room II - Timetable

	SATURDAY 04 DECEMBER	MONDAY 06 DECEMBER	TUESDAY 07 DECEMBER	WEDNESDAY 08 DECEMBER	THURSDAY 09 DECEMBER	FRIDAY 10 DECEMBER	SATURDAY 11 DECEMBER
Morning session 09.00–13.00	09.30 – 13.00 BUREAU MEETING (Room VIII)	08.30 onwards REGISTRATION	09.00 – 09.30 BUREAU MEETING (Room VII)	09.00 – 09.30 BUREAU MEETING (Room VII)	09.00 – 09.30 BUREAU MEETING (Room VII)	Report preparation by the Secretariat and the Rapporteur	Report preparation by the Secretariat and the Rapporteur
		09.00 – 09.45 BUREAU MEETING (Room VII)	09.30 – 13.00 11. Progress Report on the Global Training Strategy 5A. Progress Report on the preparation of the Periodic Report for Europe and North America 5B. Follow-up on the Periodic Report in the Arab States 5C. Follow-up on the Periodic Report in Africa 5D. Follow-up on the Periodic Report in Asia – Pacific 5E. Follow-up on the Periodic Report in Latin America and the Caribbean	09.30 – 13.00 8. Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006-2007 (Draft 33C/5) and 34C/4 9. Co-operation and coordination between the UNESCO Conventions on Heritage	09.30 – 13.00 13. Publication plans (including budgeted proposals) 14. Report on the use of the World Heritage Emblem 15. New voting mechanisms for the election of the World Heritage Committee members		
		10.00 1. Opening address by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee 10.15 Address by the UNESCO Director-General or his representative 10.45 2. Request for Observers status 11.15 3A. Adoption of the Agenda 3B. Adoption of the provisional timetable 11.45 3C. Report of the Rapporteur of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004) 12.15 4A. Progress Report and discussion on the revised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>					
13.00-15.00 LUNCH		Possibility of Working group	13.00-14.30 Room XI Meeting on Periodic Reporting for Europe and North America 13.30-15.00 Working group Room VII	Possibility of Working group	14.00 – 15.00 Demonstration and tutorial on database and World Heritage Centre Web site		
Afternoon session 15.00- 18.00		4A. Progress Report and discussion on the revised <i>Operational Guidelines</i> (continued) 4B. Working methods of the World Heritage Committee	5F. Progress Report on the nomination of Qhapaq Ñan (the Main Andean Road) 6. Examination of International Assistance requests 7. Adjustments to the budget 2004-2005	9. Co-operation and coordination between the UNESCO Conventions on Heritage (continued) 10. Performance indicators for World Heritage Programmes 12. Progress Report on the Partnerships for World Heritage Conservation (PACT)	16. Review of the provisional Agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, South Africa, 2005)	Report preparation by the Secretariat and the Rapporteur	Room XI 17. Adoption of the Decisions 18. Closure of the session
		19.00 Cocktail hosted by the World Heritage Centre					

INDEX OF DECISIONS

Decision No.	Context of decision: Document(s) WHC-04/...	Theme	ID	Name of the property/ Description of the activity	State(s) Party(ies)	Deadline	Focal Points	Status	Documents	Comments
7 EXT. COM 2	7 EXT.COM/2	GEN		Request of observer status			POL	Done	7 EXT.COM/2	
7 EXT. COM 3A	7 EXT.COM/3A.Rev 7 EXT.COM/INF.3A.Rev	GEN		Adoption of the agenda			Committee	Done	7 EXT.COM/3A	
7 EXT. COM 3B	7 EXT.COM/3B.Rev	GEN		Adoption of the timetable			Committee	Done	7 EXT.COM/3B	
7 EXT. COM 3C	7 EXT.COM/3C 7 EXT.COM/INF.3C 7 EXT.COM/INF.3C.Add	GEN		Report of the Rapporteur of the 28th session of the Committee			POL	Done	7 EXT.COM/3C 7 EXT.COM/INF.3C 7 EXT.COM/INF.3C.Add	
7 EXT. COM 4A	7 EXT.COM/4A	GEN		Database on Tentative Lists Entry into force of the revised <i>Operational Guidelines</i>		31st session, 2007 2 February 2005	POL POL	On-going Done	 WHC-05/2	
7 EXT. COM 4B.1	7 EXT.COM/4B 7 EXT.COM/4B.Add	GEN		ABs to forward their final questions regarding nominations Deadline for States Parties to submit supplementary information New procedures in the elaboration of documents Proposals on ways and means to optimize the interrelation between Periodic Reporting and SOC reports One annual session, and the possibility to hold an extraordinary session, and creation of a n open-ended subsidiary body on		31 January of each year 31 March of each year 30th session, 2006 (evaluation) 29th session, 2005 29th session, 2005 29th session, 2005	States Parties WHC POL	 Done On-going	 29.COM/7B 29.COM/18	

Decision No.	Context of decision: Document(s) WHC-04/...	Theme	ID	Name of the property/ Description of the activity	State(s) Party(ies)	Deadline	Focal Points	Status	Documents	Comments
				administrative and financial matters Recommendations regarding the operation of working groups in various conventions Impact of measures above-mentioned		29th session, 2005 31st session, 2007	POL POL	Done	29.COM/18	
7 EXT. COM 4B.2	7 EXT.COM/4B	CRED		Special Meeting of experts on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, Kazan, Russian Federation Conclusions and proposals		6-9 April 2005 29th session, 2005		Done	29.COM/9 29.COM/INF.9 A 29.COM/INF.9B	
7 EXT. COM 4B.3	7 EXT.COM/4B 7 EXT.COM/4B.Add	GEN		Working group on working methods of the Committee		29th session, 2005	POL	Done	29.COM/18	
7 EXT. COM 5	7 EXT.COM/5A 7 EXT.COM/5B 7 EXT.COM/5C 7 EXT.COM/5D 7 EXT.COM/5E	CONS		New cycle suspended by one year		2007	POL / EUR/NA	Done		
7 EXT. COM 5A.1	7 EXT.COM/5A	CONS		Periodic report for North America	North America	29th session, 2005	EUR/NA	Done	29.COM/11A	
7 EXT. COM 5A.2	7 EXT.COM/5A	CONS		Section I of Periodic Report for Europe Section II of Periodic Report for Europe	Europe	29th session, 2005 30th session, 2006	EUR/NA	Done On-going	29.COM/11B 29.COM/11B	Report Progress report
7 EXT. COM 5B	7 EXT.COM/5B	CONS		Outcome of the regional meeting foreseen on 2005	Arab States	30th session, 2006	ARB	Postponed to December 2005		Document will be ready for the 30th session

Decision No.	Context of decision: Document(s) WHC-04/...	Theme	ID	Name of the property/ Description of the activity	State(s) Party(ies)	Deadline	Focal Points	Status	Documents	Comments
7 EXT. COM 5C	7 EXT.COM/5C	CONS		Results and progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Periodic report for Africa	Africa	29th session, 2005	AFR	On-going	29.COM/11C	
7 EXT. COM 5D	7 EXT.COM/5D	CONS		Periodic report for Asia - Pacific	Asia-Pacific	30th session, 2006	APA	On-going	N/A	N/A
7 EXT. COM 5E	7 EXT.COM/5E 7 EXT.COM/INF.5E	CONS		Workshop to further develop the Caribbean and the Latin America Action Plans into operational work plans, timetables and detailed budgets Report on the implementation of the Caribbean and Latin America Action Plans		Beginning of 2005 30th session, 2006	LAC LAC	On-going On-going	N/A	Just announcement at the 29th session
7 EXT. COM 5F	7 EXT.COM/5F	CONS		Follow-up on the Qhapaq Nan nomination process		30th session, 2006	LAC	On-going		
7 EXT. COM 6	7 EXT.COM/6 7 EXT.COM/6.Add	BUD	C 944	GIS for the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway – not granted	India		N/A	N/A	N/A	No follow-up required
7 EXT. COM 7.1	7 EXT.COM/7 7 EXT.COM/INF.7	BUD		Reallocation of US\$30,000 for the retrospective inventory Reallocation of US\$20,000 to identify main indicators for the state of conservation of properties			ADM ADM	Done Done		
7 EXT. COM 7.2	7 EXT.COM/7 7 EXT.COM/INF.7	BUD					AFR			
7 EXT. COM 8	7 EXT.COM/8 7 EXT.COM/INF.8	BUD		Proposals on the preparation of the budget 33 C/5 and 34 C/4			ADM	Done	7 EXT.COM/8 7 EXT.COM/INF.8	

Decision No.	Context of decision: Document(s) WHC-04/...	Theme	ID	Name of the property/ Description of the activity	State(s) Party(ies)	Deadline	Focal Points	Status	Documents	Comments
7 EXT. COM 9	7 EXT.COM/9 7 EXT.COM/INF.9	GEN		DG to continue stimulate intellectual debate and reflection concerning the interconnectedness between the tangible and intangible heritage			WHC	On-going		
7 EXT. COM 10	7 EXT.COM/10	CRED		Performance indicators for World Heritage programmes		29th session, 2005	POL + Units		29.COM/12	
7 EXT. COM 11	7 EXT.COM/11 7 EXT.COM/INF.11	CAPA		Proposal on budgetary provisions for the implementation of a Global Framework Programme		29th session, 2005	IUCN	On-going	29.COM/10	ICCROM may have been included by mistake
7 EXT. COM 12	7 EXT.COM/12 7 EXT.COM/12.Corr	COM		Submission of the regulatory framework for World Heritage PACT Performance of the World Heritage PACT Accurate inventory of the agreements concluded in the framework of World Heritage PACT		29th session, 2005 29th session, 2005 29th session, 2005	PACT PACT PACT	Done Done Done	29.COM/13 29.COM/13 29.COM/13	Awaiting Decision by Committee at its 29th session
7 EXT. COM 13	7 EXT.COM/13	COM		Table of contents and detailed budget for the financing through extrabudgetary resources for the publication of the "Principles for the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and interventions situated within their buffer zone"		29th session, 2005	PPE	Done	29.COM/21	Committee required an Information Document to be prepared for its 29th session; this has been prepared as a Working Document with a Draft Decision.

Decision No.	Context of decision: Document(s) WHC-04/...	Theme	ID	Name of the property/ Description of the activity	State(s) Party(ies)	Deadline	Focal Points	Status	Documents	Comments
7 EXT. COM 14	7 EXT.COM/14 7 EXT.COM/14.Corr	COM		Request WIPO to amend communication about the registration and protection of the World Heritage Emblem to foresee protection of the Emblem by itself and with the words “World Heritage” surrounding it in any language.		Immediately	PACT	Done	29.COM/17	
				Proposals for the use of the World Heritage Emblem which are within their competence referred to the concerned States Parties		Immediately	PACT	Done	29.COM/17	
7 EXT. COM 15	7 EXT.COM/15	GEN		New voting mechanism						
7 EXT. COM 16	7 EXT.COM/16.Rev	GEN		Provisional agenda of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee		10-17 July 2005	POL	Done	29.COM/3A.Rev2	
7 EXT. COM 17	7 EXT.COM/17	GEN		Report of decisions Summary records			POL	After the session	29.COM/22 29.COM/INF.22	

**DECISIONS and RECOMMENDATION OF THE BUREAU
OF THE 7TH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF
THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
(UNESCO, 6-11 December 2004)**

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Decision 7 EXT.COM/BUR 2.1

The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined the preparatory assistance request made by South Africa regarding the preparation of a nomination file for Richtersveld mixed heritage, as presented in Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/BUR.2**;
2. Decides to approve this preparatory assistance request for mixed heritage for US\$ 20,000 under the 2004 budget.

Decision: 7 EXT.COM/BUR 2.2

The World Heritage Bureau,

1. Having examined the preparatory assistance request made by Sudan regarding the preparation of a nomination file for the property 'Island of Meroe, as presented in Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/BUR.2**;
2. Decides to approve this preparatory assistance request for cultural heritage for US\$ 20,000 under the 2004 budget.

Recommendation: 7 EXT.COM/BUR 2.3

The World Heritage Bureau,

1. Having examined the technical cooperation assistance request made by India regarding an improved geographic information system (GIS) for Darjeeling Himalayan Railway (DHR), as presented in Documents **WHC - 04/7EXT.COM/6** and **WHC-04/7EXT.COM/6 Add**,
2. Noting that in accordance with Decision **28 COM 10A**, four requests for technical cooperation will be submitted to the Chairperson / Committee in 2005 for a total amount US\$ 104,915;

3. Considering that only an amount of US\$ 160,000 is available for cultural properties under technical cooperation assistance in the 2005 budget;
4. Taking into account ICOMOS' comments as well as the amount of international assistance provided to the DHR in recent years (US\$ 58,000);
5. Recommends to the Committee not to approve this request for technical cooperation.

Decision 7 EXT.COM/BUR 2.4

The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined the technical cooperation assistance request made jointly by Mongolia and the Russian Federation regarding the elaboration of a Joint Mongolian-Russian Federation Site Management Plan for theUvs Nuur Basin, as presented in Document **WHC-04/7 EXT.COM/BUR.2**,
2. Decides to approve this technical cooperation assistance request for natural heritage for US\$ 26,000 under the 2004 budget.